

**BASAK TANULKU**

**BA, MA**

**AN EXPLORATION OF TWO GATED  
COMMUNITIES  
IN ISTANBUL**

**Ph.D. THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
LANCASTER UNIVERSITY**

**OCTOBER 2009**

I dedicate this thesis to my mother and father...

I, Basak Tanulku, declare that this thesis is my own work, and this is not submitted elsewhere for the award of a higher degree.

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS (REMOVED)**

## ABSTRACT

In the process of globalisation, big cities in Turkey have witnessed the emergence of gated communities a much debated issue in public opinion. This thesis is a comparative research, which distinguishes it methodologically from the rest of the Turkish literature. Contrary to the mainstream literature, I will show that gated communities interact with their surroundings, rather than being isolated housing developments. For this purpose, I selected the communities of Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba built by the same developer company in Gokturk and Omerli. I have four main interests in this research. First, I examine the relations established with the residents in nearby communities, the local populations and municipalities which lead to economic, political and cultural changes in Gokturk and Omerli. Second, I examine how residents establish boundaries with different groups. In doing this, I argue that gated communities are the reflections of different class and cultural groups so that each social group has its “socially situated symbolic capitals” relevant for that group. Third, I also examine how space is shaped by and shapes people’s lives. For this purpose, I examine the competition between imaginary and real spaces, i.e. “designed” and “lived” places, which gives interesting results about how residents experience their homes leading to the re-evaluation of “sign-value”. Fourth, I explore the “security” aspect of gated communities. For this purpose, I examine how residents perceive Istanbul which has become a dangerous city due to increasing crime rates and the threat of a future earthquake. I also examine how security is ensured inside gated communities. Finally, I argue that gated communities do not create totally safe and isolated places, but they lead to new insecurities.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>TABLES OF CONTENTS</b>	V-VII
<b>FIGURES AND TABLES</b>	VII-VIII
<b>CHAPTER ONE: AN EXPLORATION OF TWO GATED COMMUNITIES IN ISTANBUL</b>	
1.1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.2 THESIS STRUCTURE	4
<b>CHAPTER TWO: ISTANBUL: MICROCOSM OF GLOBAL PROCESSES</b>	
INTRODUCTION	12
2.1 ECONOMIC RESTRUCTURING AND NEW LABOUR MARKETS	14
2.2 NEW POWER: CITIES IN THE GLOBAL ECONOMY	19
2.3 GLOBAL ISTANBUL	23
2.4 THE NEW URBAN SPACE	25
2.5 FRAGMENTATION OF PUBLIC SPACE AND CONFLICTING ISTANBULS	31
2.5.1 <i>Tensions in Istanbul: The Entrapment of Elites</i>	41
2.6 FROM A GLOBAL CITY INTO A CITY OF FEAR	43
2.6.1 <i>“The Moment when Time Stopped...”</i>	48
CONCLUSION	51
<b>CHAPTER THREE: AN EXAMINATION OF THE LITERATURE ON GATED COMMUNITIES</b>	
INTRODUCTION	54
3.1 GATED COMMUNITIES AROUND THE WORLD	55
3.2 SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHANGES AND THE SEARCH FOR SECURITY	60
3.3 A SUBURBAN PHENOMENON	65
3.4 A COMMUNITY LIFE	69
3.5 “MICRO-GOVERNMENTS”	72
3.6 WHO LIVES THERE?	76
3.6.1 <i>Status and Distinction</i>	78
3.7 DIFFERENT FORMS OF GATED COMMUNITIES	80
3.8 RESEARCH QUESTIONS	81
3.9 METHODS	87
CONCLUSION	94
<b>CHAPTER FOUR: A TALE OF TWO VILLAGES: GOKTURK AND OMERLI</b>	
INTRODUCTION	98
4.1 A SYMBIOTIC RELATION	98
4.1.1 <i>“Permeable Closeness” : Social and Economic Relations</i>	107
4.2 COOPERATIVE COMPETITORS	112
4.3 MODERNITY, BUT HOW?	121
4.3.1 <i>Different Relations</i>	128
4.3.2 <i>In-between Modernity: A Gendered Dimension</i>	131
4.3.3 <i>Honest Villagers and Natural Village Life</i>	135

CONCLUSION	141
<b>CHAPTER FIVE: PLURAL DISTINCTIONS IN A SINGLE SPACE</b>	
INTRODUCTION	145
5.1 SOCIAL CLOSURE AND PLURAL DISTINCTIONS	146
5.2 RESIDENTS AND LOCAL POPULATIONS	155
5.3 DIFFERENCES INSIDE THE SAME COMMUNITY	167
5.4 “WHICH ONE IS THE BEST?”	174
5.4.1 “ <i>We Are Not as Snobbish as Kemer Country</i> ”	180
CONCLUSION	187
<b>CHAPTER SIX: THE COMPETITION BETWEEN IMAGINARY AND REAL COMMUNITIES</b>	
INTRODUCTION	191
6.1 IMAGINARY COMMUNITIES	192
6.1.1 <i>Different Niches in the Same Neighbourhood</i>	192
6.1.2 <i>A House “with a Soul”</i>	196
6.1.3 “ <i>It Seems 40 Years Old</i> ”	201
6.1.4 <i>The Competition between Foreign and Local Architects</i>	208
6.1.5 <i>Advertisements and Other Visuals</i>	211
6.1.6 <i>The Crown of Distinction</i>	213
6.2 REAL COMMUNITIES	216
6.2.1 <i>Turkish Life in an American House</i>	226
CONCLUSION	232
<b>CHAPTER SEVEN: “GUANTANAMO CAMPS” IN SUBURBAN ISTANBUL</b>	
INTRODUCTION	237
7.1 THE FEAR OF URBAN SPACE AND EARTHQUAKE	238
7.1.1 <i>Children</i>	242
7.1.2 <i>A Safe and Mobile Life</i>	247
7.2 SAFE LIVING	248
7.2.1 <i>Panopticon in Reverse</i>	248
7.2.2 <i>Spontaneous Security</i>	254
7.3 NEW FORMS OF INSECURITY	257
7.3.1 <i>Class and Ethnic/Religious Segregation</i>	257
7.3.2 <i>The Forest: Protection and Danger</i>	260
7.3.3 <i>Different Forms of Visibility: A Gendered Dimension</i>	264
7.3.4 <i>Less Traffic, Longer Road</i>	267
7.3.5 “ <i>Enemy Inside</i> ”	271
CONCLUSION	274
<b>CHAPTER EIGHT: CONCLUSION</b>	278
8.1 MAJOR CONTRIBUTION	280
8.2 MUTUALLY-INCLUSIVE FACTORS	289
8.3 FUTURE RESEARCH	295

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **CHAPTER 3**

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PARTICIPANTS	298
1. Interview Questions for Residents	298
2. Interview Questions for Experts	299
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESIDENTS	300
1. Istanbul Istanbul	300
2. Kasaba	303

## **APPENDIX 2**

### **CHAPTER 5**

THE LOCATION OF PREVIOUS RESIDENCES: Istanbul Istanbul	307
THE LOCATION OF PREVIOUS RESIDENCES: Kasaba	308

<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>309</b>
-------------------	------------

## **FIGURES AND TABLES**

### **FIGURES**

FIGURE 1.1: THE LOCATIONS OF ISTANBUL ISTANBUL AND KASABA	4
FIGURE 1.2: THE MAP OF ISTANBUL	11
FIGURE 4.1.1.1: ALEV PRIMARY SCHOOL	109
FIGURE 4.2.1: ISTANBUL AVENUE	117
FIGURE 4.2.2: A SECONDARY ROAD NEAR ISTANBUL ISTANBUL	118
FIGURE 4.2.3: ISTANBUL AVENUE	119
FIGURE 4.3.1: THE PAST AND THE PRESENT OF GOKTURK	122
FIGURES 4.3.2 AND 4.3.3: THE PAST AND THE PRESENT OF OMERLI	124
FIGURE 4.3.4: OMERLI REPUBLIC PARK	125
FIGURE 4.3.2.1: LOCAL WOMEN IN OMERLI	132
FIGURE 5.2.1: A MANGAL SET	157
FIGURE 5.2.2: A BARBEQUE	158
FIGURE 6.1.2.1: THE PLAN OF ISTANBUL ISTANBUL	198
FIGURE 6.1.2.2: THE SOCIAL CLUB BUILDING IN ISTANBUL ISTANBUL	200
FIGURE 6.1.2.3: THE PLAN OF KASABA	201
<b>FIGURE 6.1.3.1: [Image Removed]</b>	<b>207</b>
FIGURE 6.1.3.2: ISTANBUL ISTANBUL	207
FIGURE 6.1.4.1: MIPIM AWARD OF ISTANBUL ISTANBUL	210
FIGURE 6.1.6.1: AN ADVERTISEMENT OF “CASABA”	214
FIGURE 6.2.1: ISTANBUL ISTANBUL	218
FIGURE 6.2.2: KASABA	224
FIGURE 6.2.1.1: THE SKETCH OF THE FIRST FLOOR OF A HOUSE IN KASABA	230
FIGURE 7.1.1: KASABA AND ITS’ EARTHQUAKE RESISTANCE	239
FIGURE 7.2.1.1: THE ENTRANCE OF KASABA	250
FIGURE 7.2.1.2: THE ENTRANCE OF ISTANBUL ISTANBUL	250
FIGURE 7.2.2.1: CARICATURE OF BEHIC AK	254
FIGURE 7.3.2.1: KASABA AND THE FOREST	263



**TABLES**

TABLE 2.1.1: MAIN ECONOMIC SECTORS IN TURKEY	18
TABLE 2.1.2: FIRE SECTORS IN TURKEY	18
TABLE 2.1.3: FINANCIAL FLOWS IN TURKEY- EXPORTS AND IMPORTS	18
TABLE 2.6.1: COMPARISON OF CRIME STATISTICS OF TURKEY	44

# **CHAPTER ONE**

## **AN EXPLORATION OF TWO GATED COMMUNITIES IN ISTANBUL**

### **1.1 INTRODUCTION**

In the process of globalisation, Turkey has witnessed the emergence of “gated communities” started in Istanbul, the biggest and the most populated city. In most of the literature gated communities have had negative meanings and have often been described as developments which increase social polarisation and further urban fragmentation (Caldeira, 2000) while sociologists generally regard gated communities as exclusionary, elitist and anti-social (El Nasser, 2002). They lead to paradoxes, as in the words of Lang and Danielsen, such as they create civic engagement and avoidance, deregulation and hyperregulation, integration and segregation and vigilance and negligence toward crime (Lang and Danielsen, 1997: 875-876).

Notwithstanding increasing worldwide interest in gated communities, this is a new subject to explore in Turkey. One reason which led people to move to gated communities has been the degrading aspects of city life (Alver, 2007; Ayata, 2002; Isik and Pinarcioglu, 2005; Oncu, 1999; Senyapili, 2003). The negative understanding of the “urban” has resulted in suburban expansion as depicted in the literature (Perouse and Danis, 2005; Kurtulus, 2005b). Gated communities have become a part of suburban expansion in Istanbul since the 1980s, accelerated by political arrangements and the rise of the new middle classes and a search for lifestyle. In most of the media, gated communities have different and sometimes conflicting representations. For instance, professional chambers of architects and urban planners have depicted gated communities as homogenous settlements which reinforce urban fragmentation.

In this context, gated communities are also regarded as illegal developments which raid forestry lands and destroy natural resources such as the news' headlines:

Construction cannot swallow forest (Fikret Bila, Milliyet Newspaper, 3 December 2006)

Slaughter Started on 12 September (Miyase Ilknur, Cumhuriyet Newspaper, 6 December 2006)

These quotations show that the construction of gated communities is regarded as “slaughtering” of forestry lands which is situated in a new socio-economic and political period of liberalisation started after the coup d’etat of 12 September 1980. However, developer companies regard gated communities as examples of planned housing, which could be models for the rest of the population as depicted in these quotations taken from brochures or advertisements:

Kasaba, much more than a beautiful house and garden, a total way of lifestyle. (Brochure of Kasaba)

156 families have chosen to live “in the best” of the world. If you wish, you can also join them. (An advertisement of Istanbul Istanbul, published in Vizyon Decoration Magazine, June 2002)

Bryman argues that there are different reasons to conduct research, such as the availability of the topic or the personal experiences of the researcher. Also a pressing social problem can be the reason behind a research study (Bryman, 2004: 4). The above dichotomised representation of the subject explains why I became interested in gated communities. Gated communities are worthy of interest because they are regarded as a problem (raid of forestry lands and illegality) as well as a solution (as planned housing developments) for the problem they created.

In the media, gated communities have also been represented by cultural concepts. For instance, an article in Tempo magazine titled “The Whitest Turks are the Northerners” (2004) explains a new form of mobility towards the Northern suburban areas in Istanbul. However, apart of being a new form of mobility in Istanbul by using the concept of “Northerners”, this

article also uses “White Turks”, to describe the people who move out of Istanbul, a concept which describes cultural differentiation in Turkey. I wondered whether people who moved to gated communities were homogenous as depicted in this news article and could be generalised as “White Turks”. My main idea was based on the comparison of gated communities in order to detect similarities and differences between them and argue for a categorisation of gated communities. This also shows that gated communities can also reflect social and cultural groups and need a wider analysis.

In this research, I argue that rather than being isolating developments, gated communities are parts of urban space which reflect certain class and cultural backgrounds. Although it is argued that the relations with the outside world are “conflicting” by drawing the contrast between inside and outside of the gates (Kurtulus, 2005b), residents establish relations with nearby gated communities, local populations and municipalities. I argue that gated communities interact with the outside and bring not only economic but also political and cultural changes to their surroundings. For this purpose, I locate gated communities in a wider context in order to understand their relations and their dichotomised meanings in the public opinion.

While a case study provides a deep understanding of a single case, it may lack a wider perspective of a social phenomenon such as interaction with the outside. Methodologically and in terms of its range this thesis is the first attempt conducted in Turkey. This research is comprehensive in its scale which “goes out” and examines their interactions with the outside. For this purpose, I chose two gated communities built by the same developer company. The first is Istanbul Istanbul, built in the Gokturk municipality, on the European side of Istanbul by the partnership of Koray Construction and Yapı Kredi Bank. The second is Kasaba built in the Omerli municipality, on the Anatolian side of Istanbul by the partnership of Koray Construction and Is Bank.

## Image Removed

**Fig 1.1:** The locations of Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba, map taken from the brochure of Kasaba. Istanbul Istanbul is in Gokturk (left side inside the dark circle), while Kasaba is in Omerli (right side inside the dark circle). There is also a lake in Omerli. In this map the two bridges over the Bosphorus and the main expressways of Istanbul are also shown.

## 1.2 THESIS STRUCTURE

In Chapter 2, I explain the socio-economic and political changes which have taken place in Istanbul since the 1980s, known as the globalisation period. In this chapter I also use materials from the media on crime, fear of crime and a potential earthquake as well as news about the supposed fragmentation of public space. I discuss the literature on the “world city” (Friedmann and Wolff, 2006: 58), “global city” (Sassen, 2001: 4) and the economic and political situation of Turkey in the aftermath of the 12 September 1980 military coup d'état. The changes in the labour markets, the rise of the new middle classes and their consumption habits went together with increasing social polarisation which created “varoslu” in Turkey, a similar concept to the “underclass” in the world literature. Either in the form of class polarisation or cultural differentiation, this process has resulted in the visibility of difference, by the display of wealth of the “new rich” and “yuppies” and the emergence of “others” in urban space. In this context, I also discuss the emergence of “cultural colours” in Istanbul such as “White Turks”, “Black Turks” and “White Muslims”.

The biggest and the most populated city of Turkey, Istanbul has become a “dual city” due to increasing income polarisation, and a “divided” city due to the conflict between different groups (Keyder, 2000: 36). In this period, known also as the “neo-medieval age” (Urry, 2000: 13), Istanbul has become a city of crime and danger which has been transformed into a “carceral archipelago” (Soja, 2000: 298) in which security became a major concern (Davis, 1998: 224) and everyone observes each other in a city which has been transformed into a CCTV camera itself. I also discuss the housing market in terms of the impact of large capital

(Sonmez, 1996: 79), the decline of small construction firms (Oncu, 1988: 54) and the emergence of new spatial patterns which has resulted in “quartered city” (Marcuse, 2000: 270) where gentrified neighbourhoods, residences, gated communities together with luxury shopping malls have been constructed in nearby squatter towns.

In Chapter 3 I discuss the literature on gated communities. I begin with historical examples of social segregation on the basis of the difference between ghetto and enclave (Miller, 2001: 8) and how gated communities differ from these earlier examples. Then I provide various definitions of gated communities in the current literature. I move to the example of Turkey to give a general preview of the main studies. I look at socio-economic processes and the search for security as one of the main reasons behind gated communities. The development of gated communities in Istanbul is mostly associated with the suburban expansion after the 1980s, which is said to be a different period of suburbanisation from the past when urban land was transformed into a new form of capital accumulation (Kurtulus, 2005a).

One of the promises of developer companies has been a “community” life for those living in a gated community. However, the likelihood to live with “culturally similar neighbours”<sup>1</sup> might also create other problems such as apathy towards the outside (Calderia, 2000; Soja, 2000) and the privatisation of public space due to the provision of amenities inside the “micro-government” (Lang and Danielsen, 1997: 871). I also discuss the target groups i.e. who lives in gated communities. Although residents in gated communities are similar in terms of demographic characteristics, as being mostly families with children, this similarity is erased by the introduction of cultural differences of residents (Danis, 2001; Kurtulus, 2005b), which shows the differentiation within the upper class. Gated communities have become signs of status and distinction for the new middle classes (Bartu, 2002). I also explain different forms of

---

<sup>1</sup> Enis Tayman, “En Beyaz Turkler: Kuzeyliler”, Tempo Magazine, March, 2004.

gated communities in Turkey, mostly categorised on the basis of spatial and class differences. In the end of the chapter, I criticise the literature and put forward the research questions and the methods of this thesis.

From Chapter 4 onwards, I explore Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba and I examine the transformation of nearby settings, Gokturk and Omerli over the years, from villages into municipalities. I explore economic, political and cultural changes brought by those communities to nearby towns/villages. Gated communities establish relations with different actors. In economic terms, there are symbiotic relations between gated communities and local governments. In this context, I also explain how the Koray Group of Companies operates in suburban municipalities which also provide amenities. However, although amenities are provided through a network established by developer companies, this does not mean that they can act independently from local municipalities. Gated communities are dependent on local municipalities to solve larger regional problems. Developer companies build gated communities as long-term investments so they can continue their operations in suburban municipalities. There are also other actors, influenced by gated communities, such as the local populations who experienced both dispossession and access to new job opportunities. Residents in gated communities have also benefited by opening new businesses and investing in the region. While gated communities allow residents to establish relations, they are also proof of already existing communities (religious, ethnic or professional ties).

In terms of politics, although there is conflict between gated communities and local municipalities, there are other forms of conflicts and cooperation, which render gated communities dependent on other actors. Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba show difference in terms of their relations with local municipalities indicating greater socio-political conflict in Turkey, which has shaped political agenda since the 1980s. Finally, gated communities in the same region might be in conflict due to the competition between them. Lastly, there are also cultural

changes brought by gated communities. In the literature, the relations between residents in gated communities and local populations are regarded as conflicting. However, by indicating the differences between the two cases, I show several results challenging to the mainstream literature: Firstly, some gated communities are more engaged than others. Secondly, not everyone is equally influenced in the local population. The terms “5<sup>th</sup> Levent” and “educated and working women” show how cultural values have expanded across Istanbul. In this section, I discuss an interesting gender aspect by the contrast between modern and traditional women, which has had a long history in the Turkish modernisation process. Thirdly, the rural life and the locals also change residents’ material and symbolic lives by the impact of unspoilt rural life which stands in contrast to the greedy, artificial and cheating urban life.

The expansion of cultural values in suburban Istanbul will also provide a starting point to Chapter 5, in which I analyse how residents establish boundaries to differentiate the self and their communities from the rest. I explore cultural, economic and moral boundaries (Lamont, 1992) established with the local populations, inside the same community and between other gated communities. Firstly, residents establish boundaries with the local populations, on the basis of economic and cultural differences. While economic difference is based on income level, cultural difference is based on the illiteracy and conservatism of local people. Examples are the rejection of eating meat sold in local butchers, in contrast to their willingness of eating locally-grown fresh fruits and vegetables and planting rare flowers brought by “local men”. Secondly, residents establish boundaries inside the same community on the basis of economic and cultural differences such as attitude and behaviour towards service personnel. Thirdly, they also establish boundaries with the residents who live in other gated communities on the basis of economic differences, source of wealth and characteristics of social relations. However, this time it was the residents in Istanbul Istanbul who claimed to have better social relations with



each other, in contrast to Kemer Country in Gokturk which was described as “the highest” or “extreme” gated community.

By doing this, I show that while gated communities are regarded as status symbols for upper classes in the literature, “distinction” is established by social relations. By adopting an alternative theory to Bourdieu (1984) and Lamont (1992) and linking the two by proposing the concept of “symbolically accepted moral boundaries” I discuss Hall’s “socially situated distinction” (1992: 265) which extends the limits of class toward a more pluralistic notion of cultural capital. I will propose the concept of “socially situated symbolic capitals” to show how pluralistic moral criteria are used by different groups indicating both the importance of the rise of Islam in a capitalist world and how residents in Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba differentiate themselves from illegal ways of earning money (“black economy”). I also compare the two cases with other gated communities in Istanbul to understand why residents choose to live in these two communities. I also explore the relations with the outside to understand how residents describe local people and how they establish relations with them. Lastly, I also argue that there is not only a plurality of boundaries adopted by different social groups, but also the same person uses different boundaries at different situations which I call “multiple socially situated distinctions”. In the end, I argue that boundaries vary on the basis of different social groups, situations and even persons, who use different boundaries in different situations.

In Chapter 6, I analyse spatial characteristics of Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba. At first, by expanding the “myth of ideal house” (Oncu, 1999: 27) into the overall process of design, I analyse the ways in which gated communities are rendered original by the use of “stylistic distinctions” such as spatial features (artificial lakes or forest), eclecticism in the architecture, the involvement of foreign architects and the use of a personal language in advertisements, and lastly, their names. However, gated communities are not idealised by residents as stated in most of the literature. Residents perceive their homes differently, who give importance to “functional

distinctions” such as the size of the house and garden, a green environment, and the name of the developer company. Moreover, they challenge the house as designed by architects and modify it. This result allows me to re-evaluate the theory of “sign-value” (Baudrillard, 1998: 90). I argue that function has become the sign of a house in a gated community based on the usefulness and exchangeability of a house in the housing market.

In Chapter 7, I raise some further challenging points to the existing literature by analysing safety mechanisms in gated communities. In this chapter I explore how residents in both cases perceive Istanbul and describe their security concerns around crime, a future earthquake and children, reminding “security-obsessed urbanism” (Soja, 2000: 303). I argue that there are two different forms of security. The first one is “ready-made” security provided by the community itself such as technological devices (CCTV cameras) and humanised security, such as private guards and staff which results in the reversal of the logic of Panopticon. However and interestingly, there is another form of security, which I call “spontaneous security”. This is provided by the residents who look after each other’s child in case of need and check their neighbours’ homes, a neglected dimension in the literature. However, there are also new insecurities arising outside and inside of gated communities, which show that gated communities are not totally safe havens. Outside insecurities are arising due to the conflict between residents and local populations based on class, gender and religious differences, as well as spatial differences between gated communities which can render residents to feel safer by eliminating the outsiders’ gaze or render them open to any outsider threat, as well as the traffic during weekends and lack of health institutions. There are also insecurities arising inside gated communities by the threat of the “stranger”, similar to Bauman’s depiction of “enemy inside” (Bauman, 1998: 48).

In the last chapter of the thesis, I give a brief summary in terms of both research undertaken and the consequences derived from it. I also highlight the novelty of the research

and give some examples of possible changes on urban space and politics brought by gated communities. In this chapter, I also discuss why I chose Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba which have different spatial layout, class configuration, demographic characteristics of residents and the history of construction. I will also discuss a new way of understanding of gated communities in Istanbul. I propose a new categorisation on the basis of the information I gathered during my research which reflect differences based on space (space as distance and space as the overall plan of a gated community), time, demographic characteristics (age, gender, marital status, having children and working life), affiliations (religious, ethnic and professional) and plurality of distinctions (economic and cultural capital) which are interrelated and not mutually-exclusive categories.

Lastly, I also discuss the need for future research about gated communities, such as longitudinal study to understand belonging and participation and the relations of residents with the city. Research can also be conducted by focusing on local populations to understand their views about suburban change to examine whether this change would create more integration due to the interaction between residents and the locals by aid campaigns, or conflict due to the dispossession experienced by the locals. Also gender difference should be considered in future research, because my study has shown an important “gendered dimension” especially in terms of the relations with the local populations and security. Lastly, comparative research should be conducted in order to understand similarities and differences which can provide clues about more general socio-spatial changes.

### **Image Removed**

**Fig 1.2:** The geographical map of Istanbul which is divided into two parts by the Bosphorus. The Eastern part is the Anatolian side while the Western part is the European side. The Northern lands on both sides are covered by forests (all green zones in this map) which have experienced an increase in the number of gated communities. In the Southeast part in the Marmora Sea there are the Prince Islands. Taken from the web page [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Istambul\\_and\\_Bosporus\\_big.jpg](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Istambul_and_Bosporus_big.jpg) accessed on 04.06.2009.

## CHAPTER TWO

### ISTANBUL: MICROCOSM OF GLOBAL PROCESSES

*I have always admired Anatolia, instead of the Capital of Greed, Istanbul. I dedicate this Chapter to Anatolia, which has lost lots of her character, but still got the soul.*

#### INTRODUCTION

In 2006 a TV serial, “The Falling of Leaves” an adaptation of a novel of the same title written by Resat Nuri Guntekin started in one of the leading Turkish TV channels. It was about the story of a family who migrated to Istanbul and got divided into fragments over the years due to the influence of urban values to which the family could not adapt. In this TV serial there was a contrast between traditional family values represented by the father of the family and contemporary values represented by the “degenerated” family members affected by Istanbul. The conflicting values depicted in this TV serial are representations of the larger social changes which took place in the 1980s leading to a new urban form which resulted in the emergence of gated communities in Turkey.

In this chapter I discuss changing discourses over the years about cities and specifically about Istanbul. Similar to the changes worldwide, since the 1980s Turkey has experienced great restructuring in socio-economic, political and cultural fields which resulted in a neo-liberal economy, a new labour market and a fragmented public space. I explain four major shifts in Turkey: firstly, a new economic structure with the rising service and financial sectors. In this period, also cities have re-emerged as the new centres of global economy. Economic changes have led to the increasing importance of “urban (land) rent” due to high inflation which has

become the most important source of profit. Istanbul was shaped by new developments such as gentrified areas and residences, shopping malls and business towers in inner city and gated communities in suburban lands alongside squatter houses. Secondly, the changes in economy have resulted in a new labour market and a more fragmented class structure. While the new professionals have become the winners, there has been a growing number of underclass and lower classes, without the opportunity to earn and spend. Istanbul has become a dual city due to income polarisation as well as a fragmented city due to the conflict between different social groups (Keyder, 2000: 36), which has lastly been transformed into a city of crime. During this period, continuous immigration to big cities and the fall of the Socialist Bloc has led to third change: The political arena has become more fragmented with the rising ethnic and religious movements.

Finally, these social and political changes have become visible in urban space. The ever fragmenting social life and the rise of new groups with different and conflicting lifestyles have transformed Istanbul into a “city of walls” (Caldeira, 2000: 314) and “carceral archipelago” (Soja, 2000: 298). City and in this case Istanbul has become a dangerous place to live in, not only due to social tensions between groups, but also due to the threat of a future earthquake. In the end, this chapter will provide the theoretical and historical background of empirical chapters of the thesis: economic, political and social conflicts which shape urban space, competition between different groups which reflect class and cultural differences, how space is created and shaped by developer companies for various target groups and lastly, security as one of the most important problems of Istanbul.

## **2.1 ECONOMIC RESTRUCTURING AND NEW LABOUR MARKETS**

The period between 1945 until the mid-1970s had been characterised by stable economies and class structures in which nation states had the power of fair allocation of resources through rules and regulations. This period is also known as the Cold War between the “free” and “democratic” Western World dominated by the United States and the “undemocratic” Eastern World dominated by the Soviet Union. The wall erected between the two Berlins represented the dichotomy and competition between the two worlds. However, since the mid-1970s major socio-economic and political changes have taken place due to the global economic crises, known as the “neo-liberal” age. Harvey explains that one reason was the rise of new economic powers of Europe and Japan in search of new markets for their developing economies. At the same time, newly industrialising countries such as the four tigers of East Asia (Hong Kong, Singapore, Taiwan, and South Korea) as well as other developing countries such as Hungary, India, Egypt, Brazil, and Mexico began to compete with the United States which led to the increasing unemployment rates in the United States.

In 1966/7, credit difficulties and the strength of Eurodollar market signalled the loss of the United States’ domination in world economics. The collapse of Bretton Woods in 1971 indicated that the United States could not control international financial markets anymore. The agreement on a flexible (floating) currency has become another hallmark of a declining United States’ hegemony over the world economy. In 1973, another important crisis took place due to the increase in oil prices by four times caused by the oil embargo put by Arab countries because of the Arab-Israeli War. This led to a change in the economic structure based on oil (as technology) while the flow of petrodollars caused a crisis in the stability of world financial markets (Harvey, 1990). The period since the 1970s has led to the capitalist restructuring in

which the old regime of accumulation (Fordism) based on mass production and consumption, mass political organisation and welfare state has been replaced by a new regime of accumulation (post-fordism) based on flexible capital accumulation, niche markets, decentralisation, deregulation, privatisation and the erosion of nation state (Harvey, 2001: 123).

This period can be regarded as “globalisation” which has since changed the socio-economic paradigm. It was this period which resulted in a more fragmented class structure. However, if a historical perspective is adopted, it can allow thinking of other “global” periods and different forms of globalisation. As Keohane and Nye argue, there are different forms of globalism, such as economic, military, environmental and lastly, social and cultural one. The period between 1850 and 1914, regarded as the First Global Age was an economic globalisation which had declined during 1945-1975. However, military globalism rose between the two World Wars (Keohane and Nye, 2000). The repetition of history after one hundred years is explained as:

It is strange, that the free flow of financial capital toward capital markets and in-out movements of capital did not come back right after the Second World War; only it became possible in the second half of the 1970s after the decrease in profit on capital. It was similar to the globalisation of finance of Great Britain in the 1870s, after one hundred years. (Kazgan, 1999: 28)

Marcuse and Kempen use the term “really existing globalisation” in order to differentiate the globalisation which has taken place since the 1970s from previous examples (Marcuse and Kempen, 2000: 5). Marcuse explains three important characteristics of this period such as the information and transportation technology, the increase in the concentration of private economic power, and lastly the cross border integration of production and investment together with cultural homogeneity, the United States’ dominance, social inequality and polarisation, environmental movement and culture and the spatial structure of cities (Marcuse, 2006: 362). Marcuse also points to different forms of globalisation existing at the same time. For instance, “another world is possible” is an alternative model to the existing form of

globalisation which has mostly been regarded to create social polarisation. However, it was not the technological changes which led to a change in the economy; instead, the capitalist economy has been reconstructed by the new technology, and changed every category of the past including time and space (Kazgan, 1999):

The globalisation brought by scientific innovations is not the cause of the globalisation of capital. The cause which created the second is different. Of course, the development of the communication -transportation- accelerates and makes easier the movement of capital. But, while the same technological opportunities globalised capital from 1850s until the First World War, the most advanced technology survived with controlled economies up to the mid-1970s. It creates a conceptual chaos to argue that the pressure over nation -states comes from liberalisation-privatisation as a ‘technological change from outside’. (Kazgan, 1999: 29)

The global crisis in the 1970s has affected both sides of Atlantic as well as the developing world, including Turkey’s economy which had previously been based on ISI (import substitution industrialisation) and agricultural production. The increase in oil prices worsened the balance of payments and led to decrease in real wages and rise in inflation rates as high as over 100 % between the years 1977 and 1980 (Danielson and Keles, 1985:47). While these changes brought neo-conservatism to the Western countries<sup>2</sup> with Reagan in the United States and Thatcher in Great Britain, in Turkey it was carried out by the economic policies accepted on 24 January 1980, known also as the “Ozal decisions”. These new policies aimed at opening of the Turkish commodity market to foreign markets, the liberalisation of import regime which was previously protected with strict rules of trade quotas, the flexibility of foreign currency through high devaluation, an export-oriented industry and the liberalisation of national financial markets linked with foreign financial markets (Yeldan, 2002: 25).

This period has resulted in the erosion of the protection mechanisms of nation states and the repression of class-based politics. In the post Second World War era, nation states which were previously decorated with the “welfare” prefix in the West and “ISI” (import substitution

---

<sup>2</sup> Although “the West” is not a homogenous term, which has variations in itself, from now on, I use the term “West” to simplify.



industrialisation) in developing countries provided a more unified society and public space due to the solidarity created around the concept of “citizenship”. In Turkey the erosion of state has been supported by -ironically- the state itself through the leaders of military coup d’etat which took place on 12 September 1980 and politicians who stressed on “the reduction of the state” and the repression of leftist politics. However, this could be regarded as “tragicomic” if the link between state, ruling class and capitalism is considered.

The well-known quotation of Turgut Ozal, who was the prime minister between 1983 and 1989 and the president between 1989 and 1993, “it should not be a problem to suspend the Constitution once”, summarises the liberal period of the 1980s, which means that the Constitution of a country can be sacrificed for people’s wishes. For Turkish society, state has always been known as “father state” which organised the economic and social agenda, a tradition which goes back to Ottoman times. The new Turkish Republic, established in 1923, as a developing country transformed the image of “father state” into a welfare state by adopting ISI policies directed towards internal market based on a broad consensus between social classes. However, with the coming of the 1980s, the old system gave way to a liberal economy and a “liberal” society. Thus the “superior identity” of Turkish citizenship which smoothed over social differences gave way to politics based on ethnicity and religion, leading to a “powerless” state:

Therefore, the nation-state is increasingly powerless in controlling monetary policy, declining its budget, organising production and trade, collecting its corporate taxes, and fulfilment its commitments to provide social benefits. In sum, it has lost most of its economic power, albeit it still has some regulatory capacity and relative control over its subjects. (Castells, 1997: 254)

The economic restructuring was enabled by the restructuring of politics through the military coup on 12 September 1980 which gave way to the domination of the central right party ANAP (Motherland Party), often regarded as the combination of four trends (nationalism, religion, liberalism and social-democracy). This process has resulted in great declines in sectors

which relied on durable consumer commodities and production directed towards internal market (Isik and Pinarcioglu, 2005: 124). The restructuring of economy has changed the production processes and labour markets resulting in more flexible labour markets, a growing service sector and declining industrial and agricultural sectors.

**TABLE 2.1.1 MAIN ECONOMIC SECTORS IN TURKEY**

	Agriculture	Manufacturing	Service
LABOUR FORCE	27.3 %	25.4 %	47.3 %

Source: TUIK, 2006 data, official statistical information

**TABLE 2.1.2 FIRE (FINANCE, INSURANCE AND REAL ESTATE) SECTORS IN TURKEY**

	1988	1999	2007
LABOUR FORCE	338,000	524,000	921,000

Source: TUIK, 2007, Urban Statistics of Turkey

The 1980s also witnessed the liberalisation of financial flows established through legal arrangements. In 1981 interest rates were liberalised, followed by the liberalisation of foreign currency in 1984 (Yeldan, 2002: 129). These developments were followed by the establishment of the Capital Markets Board of Turkey in 1986 and re-establishment of Istanbul Stock Exchange. In 1987 the Central Bank initiated open market operations and in 1989 foreign exchange controls were eliminated. In 1989, the Turkish currency became convertible leading to the liberalisation of external financial activities and foreign capital flows' towards Turkish markets (Yeldan, 2002: 129).

**TABLE 2.1.3 FINANCIAL FLOWS IN TURKEY  
EXPORTS**

	1980	1990	1995
Billion dollars	2,910, 122	12,959,288	21,637,041

**IMPORTS**

	1980	1990	1995
Billion dollars	7,909,443	22,302,126	35,709,011

Source: TURKSTAT, Turkey Statistical Yearbook 2000.

## **2.2 NEW POWER: CITIES IN THE GLOBAL ECONOMY**

Although it is stated that space has been surpassed by time through the development of new technologies and new ways of accumulation (Harvey, 1990), space re-gained its importance for the functioning of the new economy where hyper-mobile capital needs spatial fixity to global cities (Sassen, 2002: 167):

In the period of national developmentalism, cities were important according to their places in a national model...Territorial state based on centrality -which was not different from the nation state in terms of political intervention to the economy- did not allow city to be an autonomous entity. While trying to take its political power, the state also tied city to its political control... The concepts such as global city and world city are the products of such above developments...The integration of countries to the global market must be related to cities, as I've mentioned above... (Keyder, 1996: 95-99)

Although cities acquired independence from nation states, by the 1980s, “world city” literature located and tied cities to capitalist development, which showed the effect of the economy over urban space (Harvey, 1990; Sassen, 2001) and more specifically the effect of capitalism upon capitalist cities (Marcuse, 2000; Savage and Warde, 1996). By analysing the relation between urban change and economic restructuring, Harvey argues that capital accumulation has been the major driver behind the historical and geographical transformation of the West which created “new” cities such as Los Angeles, Edmonton, Atlanta and Boston and transformed old cities like Athens, Rome, Paris and London (Harvey, 2001: 121). The impact of the shift from fordism to post-fordism can be seen in the decline of Chicago and Detroit regarded as the models for “organised capitalism” while Los Angeles has emerged as the model for post-fordism (Lash and Urry, 1994: 166). The relation between capital accumulation and urban change is questioned by Sassen as:

Do changes in the global flow of factors of production, commodities, and information amount to a new spatial expression of the logic of accumulation? (Sassen, 2001: 23)

The relation between capital accumulation and urban change has become a major theme for the world city theorists. Among important theorists of the “world city”, Friedmann and Wolff argue that instead of national economies, world cities have become the motors of contemporary capitalist development in the new international division of labour (NIDL) since the 1970s (Brenner and Keil, 2006: 57). Friedmann and Wolff divide the social structure of world cities into seven groups. The first group consists of professionals (transnational elites) who work in finance and service sectors. The second group, dependent on the first group, works in real estate, construction, hotel services, restaurants, luxury shopping, entertainment, private police and domestic services. The third group consists of international tourism sector and the fourth group consists of manufacturing labourers and contrary to the first three groups, witnesses a decline. The fifth group consists of those who work in government services concerned with the maintenance and reproduction of world cities and the provision of services for collective consumption. The sixth group consists of informal, floating or street economy ranging from casual services to fruit vendors, dealers and artisans. Most of this work is done by women and children who are immigrants. Some of them deal with illicit occupations. Lastly, there are those without a steady income dependent on family or public charity (Friedmann and Wolff: 2006: 63). As a result of these changes, world cities have become the centres of social polarisation:

They are luxurious, splendid cities whose very splendour obscures the poverty on which their wealth is based. (Friedmann and Wolff, 2006: 61)

A more recent term in urban sociology has been the “global city”. Sassen argues that global cities have become the nodes which connect global flows of finance, and the centres for operating big business of multinationals corporations, NGOs and media. In the global era, major cities such as New York, London and Tokyo, have acquired new meaning under “a spatially dispersed yet globally integrated organization of economic activity” (Sassen, 2001: 3). They became major command points of the global economy, key locations for finance and

services, locations of production of manufactured goods and production of innovations and lastly, markets for these products (Sassen, 2001: 4). Sassen's use of the "global" based on the comparison of New York to Tokyo and London marks the shift in urban studies which located the city in the global age (King, 1990: 24).

Sassen distinguishes world city and global city on the basis of the history of the city. While world cities appeared in Asia prior to the West, global cities might appear as the new sources of power without the need of having a long history (Sassen: 2004: 373). Contemporary global cities are mostly world cities but some of the global cities are "global" without being "world cities" (Sassen, 2004: 373). Short and Kim argue that New York, London and Tokyo are regarded as global cities, although there are differences between them. For example, Tokyo is not as heterogeneous as New York and London in terms of population. London, often regarded as a global city, is also a world city with its long colonial and imperial past which makes it different from New York (Short and Kim, 1999: 53).

Despite the variety of terminology used in the literature, such as "exurb", "spread city", "urban village", "megalopolis", "outtown", "sprawl", "slurb", "the burbs", "non-place urban field", "polynucleated city" and "technoburb" (Fishman, 1995:400), this new urban form carries several similarities to the portrayal of Friedmann and Wolff. The first important feature is the similarity of these cities either in or beyond the West, described as:

We see a homogenising in the urban forms of advanced economic sectors in cities with such disparate histories and cultures as New York, London and Tokyo. This pressure towards homogeneity overrides history and culture. (Sassen, 1996: 23)

The second important feature is a new class structure which is characterised by the rise of the new middle classes (known as the new professionals or "yuppies") in the upper strata of class spectrum and the rise of the "underclass" at the lower end of class spectrum. Thirdly, a polarising class structure gave way to the "dual city" thesis which later was challenged due to a more complex social dynamic and hence, being replaced by the "divided city" thesis

(Mollenkopf and Castells, 1991: 16-18). Lastly, there has been a new urban configuration, defined as “quartered city” in which public space is divided between spaces for the rich and ghettos for the poor (Marcuse and Kempen, 2000: 4).

In the “quartered city” residential areas are divided into “residential city” or “citadels” as the combination of office and commercial areas for the wealthy classes, while “gentrified city” in central city areas is renovated and purified from the poor to be resided by the “gentry”. While the “suburban city” is resided by better-paid working class, blue and white collar workers, lower middle classes and petit bourgeoisie, “tenement city” or “slums” consists of social housing and less expensive housing to be resided by the lower middle class, blue and white collar working class and for those who work in irregular employment. Lastly, there is “abandoned city” or “ghetto” which is lived in by the socially excluded and homeless people who deal with informal and illegal activities (Marcuse, 2000: 272-274). As argued by Marcuse (2000) not only residential areas but also business areas are divided into five parts, as the controlling city, where big decisions are made by the wealthy, followed by the “city of advanced services” which can be found either in edge of cities or inner city. The “city of direct production” and the “city of unskilled work” deal with small-scale manufacturing, warehousing, sweatshops, technically unskilled consumer services and immigrant industries. Lastly, there is the “workless city”, not because its residents do not have work, but because their work is rated as informal and illegal (Marcuse, 2000: 275). In the next section, I explain how this “global urban form” is being experienced in Istanbul.

## 2.3 GLOBAL ISTANBUL

The not necessarily mutually exclusive terms of “global city” and “world city”<sup>3</sup> have combined in Istanbul, a world city of 2,500 years.<sup>4</sup> Istanbul’s population was near five million in 1980 while it reached over 7 million in 1990 and over 10 million in 2000 and it is estimated that in 2010, it will reach approximately eighteen million (Diren, 1993). Istanbul has the highest urban population density among other cities in Turkey while has been ranked 10<sup>th</sup> among the most populated cities in the world in 2004 after Shanghai, Bombay, Buenos Aires, Moscow, Karaka, Delhi, Manila, Sao Paulo and Seoul.<sup>5</sup>

In this period, Istanbul has acquired similar characteristics to its counterparts in the rest of the world. Keyder argues that Istanbul has been transformed into a city to be “consumed” with restaurants, boutiques, luxury cars and new residential complexes. Along with fast food chains such as McDonalds, Indian, Mexican, Chinese and Italian restaurants have also been opened. The opening of permanent bureaus of newspapers became one of the signs of Istanbul’s connectedness to global networks (Keyder, 2000:15) along with a growing leisure sector in night life and cultural events to transform Istanbul into a “city of festivals” which attracts more than 300,000 spectators and more than 2,500 artists each year (Islam, 2006: 49). One developing sector was insurance, so that 56 out of 57 insurance companies are located in Istanbul (Hacisalihoglu, 2000: 52). Since the 1980s, 60% of foreign companies in service sector and 95% of foreign companies in finance and banking sectors are located in Istanbul (Enlil, 2003).

---

<sup>3</sup> For a similar description see Caglar Keyder’s interview in Istanbul Magazine, 1993.

<sup>4</sup> On the basis of latest excavations, Istanbul is now thought to date more than 8,500 years ago. See Wikipedia <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Istanbul> accessed on 16.02.2009 and Hurriyet’s article “This discovery can change history”, <http://arama.hurriyet.com.tr/arsivnews.aspx?id=10027341> (03.10.2008) accessed on 16.02.2009.

<sup>5</sup> “Sayilarla Istanbul”, Istanbul, 2005, vol. 5, April.

Despite the great decline in industrial sectors, together with the transfer of industrial production to other smaller cities nearby, Istanbul is still the centre of “command and decision-making” of the industry (Hacisalihoglu, 2000: 149). Sonmez also states that even if investment in service sectors increased, during the 2000s, Istanbul still continued to remain an important centre of industrial production with a share of approximately 54% in the sectors of automotive, textile, metallurgy, plastic, chemicals, electronics, and machinery (Sonmez, 2006). He states that on the basis of official 2006 data, in terms of investments Istanbul has a share of 53.7% in industrial production, 45.7% in service (transportation, tourism, health, trade, and infrastructure) 0.5 % in energy and 0.1 % in mining.<sup>6</sup> Due to the increase in FIRE sectors (finance, insurance, real estate) and service sectors<sup>7</sup> (Keyder, 2000:29), a new class has emerged regarded as “service class” (Simsek, 2005: 14):

Thus, in characterising the distinctiveness of the ‘new class’, Bell (1976) emphasises the control of scientific knowledge; Goulter (1979) the control of culture; Goldthorpe (1982) delegated authority and the exercise of autonomy and discretion; Wright (1985) the control of skill and organisational assets. (Esping-Andersen, 1993: 9)

Isik and Pinarcioglu also argue that yuppies have had an active role in developing economic networks and they have also been regarded as the symbols of global consumer behaviour (Isik and Pinarcioglu, 2005: 139). Yuppies in Turkey have generally graduated from a good high school such as Robert College or Galatasaray and if not, graduated from the departments of management, and/or economics of Bosphorus or Middle East Technical University who work in banking, finance, public relations or foreign capital trade companies (Kozanoglu, 1993: 57-58).

Another change in the labour market has been the rise of flexible jobs, such as illegal work, subcontracting, working at home and part-time jobs. The share of women, children and

---

<sup>6</sup> [http://www.sendika.org/yazi.php?yazi\\_no=8595](http://www.sendika.org/yazi.php?yazi_no=8595) accessed on 14.07.2009.

<sup>7</sup> In the areas of “marketing, accounting and management, telecommunication, banking and finance, transportation, insurance, computer, data processing, legal services, auditing, consulting, advertising, design and engineering” (Keyder, 2000: 29).



elderly has also increased in working population in Istanbul (Sonmez, 1996: 73). In the Western literature a new term emerged, the “underclass” regarded as the victims or the losers of the global age. While transnational elites, most of whom are professionals between 30 and 50 years old and predominantly males who enjoy urban life, permanent employment, steady income and complete legality with subordinate middle sectors, the “underclass” are the victims of world cities (Friedmann and Wolff, 2006: 63). The underclass consists of those who does the dirty work for the ruling class and are formed of people from different ethnic origins (Friedmann and Wolff, 2006: 63). They are excluded from labour markets without the opportunity of social and political participation (Jewson and MacGregor, 1997: 3-5):

It is more a collection of disparate group defined principally in terms of “race”, ethnicity, and gender and linked together by their status as “inferior” citizens, whether or not that status is seen as deserved. (Nash, 2000: 195)

The gini coefficient of income polarisation in Istanbul has risen from 0.38 in 1978 to 0.43 in 1984 and to 0.58 in 1994 (Isik and Pinarcioglu, 2005: 125). Sonmez argues that while Istanbul has 27.5% of total income, its gini coefficient is 0.59. If Istanbul is considered as a country in itself, with its gini coefficient, it would be the sixth worst country in terms of income polarisation (after Sierra Leone, Brazil, Guatemala, South Africa and Paraguay). The rate of unemployment in Istanbul has been 20% while approximately 3 million people live on below one dollar of income per day (Sonmez, 2005).<sup>8</sup>

## **2.4 THE NEW URBAN SPACE**

The increasing income polarisation in cities, including Istanbul, has changed urban vocabulary. New terms replaced the old terminology to describe the new class structure in the West which seems “fragmented, partitioned -at the extreme, almost drawn and quartered, painfully pulled apart” (Marcuse, 2000: 270) and the new city is regarded as “fractal city” which has been characterised by “metropolarities”, as a result of a more polymorphous and

---

<sup>8</sup> [http://www.sendika.org/yazi.php?yazi\\_no=3771](http://www.sendika.org/yazi.php?yazi_no=3771) accessed on 14.07.2009.

fractured society (Soja, 2000: 265), all of which can be used to describe Istanbul's new social structure. In this aspect, Istanbul can be said to have a "dual" class structure due to the increasing income polarisation and a "divided" urban space based on the interplay between class and cultural differences, as argued by Keyder (2000:36). Besides statistics, another proof of the increasing social inequality has been the display of wealth of a minority while the rest was suffering. Class differences became visible in public space by the consumption of luxury commodities and the contrast between luxury residential complexes and nearby squatter houses, a scene often depicted in newspapers.

Besides increasing social polarisation, another important factor which has altered Istanbul's urban space is the influence of the discourse of "globalisation" in developing countries, regarded as an inescapable process (Oktem, 2005).<sup>9</sup> Keyder argues that "the global Istanbul" was imagined in the minds of politicians as the dominant centre in the Balkans, the Middle East and the Black Sea region (Keyder, 2000: 22) and regarded as the political project reflected on urban space (Oktem, 2005: 38). By these means, Istanbul has become an "entrepreneurial city" which cooperates with the NGOs, semi-public organisations, self-help organisations and neighbouring organisations in urban renewal projects (Mayer, 1996: 232). This new stage in urban governance shows also that entrepreneurial cities have become rivals to nation states. Mayer argues that state's privilege was replaced by private, voluntary or semi-public structures while welfare state was replaced by employment and labour market policies. In this period, local governments began to negotiate with different actors which compete for

---

<sup>9</sup> Oktem criticises the discourse of "global city" for not taking into account the actors behind these processes (Oktem, 2005: 35). I think this is an ideological question related to contemporary social sciences which take "globalisation" as a stage in human history instead of explaining the economic processes behind it. Contemporary social sciences disregard economic processes and in particular capitalism. For instance, Jessop argues that globalisation and technological changes are taken as given, normal and natural processes without taking into account economic, political and social forces behind them (Jessop, 2002). See Jessop's *Liberalism, Neoliberalism and Urban Governance: a State-Theoretical Perspective*, in *Antipode*, 2002.

Globalisation is regarded as a magical concept to explain everything although it is a further stage in capitalist development. For cities and in this case for Istanbul the discourse of global city has been another important factor to shape Istanbul's urban space. Oktem argues that Istanbul has not experienced globalisation only as an economic and technological process, but also as a political and ideological project accepted by politicians (Oktem, 2005: 38).

their own benefits (Mayer, 1996: 233). City governments explored new ways of urban renewal such as establishing cooperation with big investors and private firms in order to remake cities more attractive. There is mutual benefit in this cooperation. While private firms benefit because they can expand their operations in inner cities, local governments can attract financial resources for investment which also allows them independence from national governments (Mayer, 1996: 234).

Another goal of the politicians of that era was to attract capital to big metropolises, including Istanbul, with new legal arrangements which allowed big business to be introduced into the construction market. In this period ANAP initiated the liberalisation process which transformed Istanbul into a “global” city and continued over the years with other political parties’ administrations, although there have been different interpretations of “global city” (Oktem, 2005).<sup>10</sup> Istanbul’s Governor, (1984-1989) Bedrettin Dalan tried to build a new image for Istanbul as a city for cultural consumption (Keyder, 2000: 26). This was achieved through the transfer of heavy manufacturing away from the urban centre, the transformation of urban centre into tourist centres, the construction of five-star hotels, shopping malls, luxury residential developments imitating examples in New York and the linking of all these to major roads (Oktem, 2005: 46).

Politicians also aimed at developing a financial and business centre in Istanbul with high towers and high technology demanded by financial sectors. This idea was summarised in the words of Bedrettin Dalan who wanted Istanbul to be “a city of towers” and in the words of Ozal and Dalan who stated that skyscrapers could make a city beautiful (Oktem, 2005: 48). For Sonmez this would be realised through the acceptance of “Regulation Act of Encouragement

---

<sup>10</sup> For instance, between 1989 and 1994, there was conflict between the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality governed by SHP, which was a social democratic party relying on social justice and the central government governed by ANAP, relying on liberal economies (Oktem, 2005: 52). The global Istanbul had still been the major goal when Refah Party came into power which was relying on nationalist development and social justice. It gave priority to the development of relations with the Muslim World and to an initiative to create a Neo-Ottoman idea of multiculturalism (Oktem, 2005).

for Tourism” launched in 12 March 1982 which allowed the construction of big projects such as five-stars hotels, office towers and residences, shopping malls, plazas and company headquarters in Maslak (Sonmez, 1996: 81). Later the Buyukdere and Maslak axis would be transformed into the financial centre on the European side (Oktem, 2005: 46) which facilitated the expansion of Istanbul towards the north. The second financial centre lay on Altunizade and Kozyatagi axis on the Asian side (Anatolian side) but it was a minor centre compared with that on the European side.

Hacisalioglu argues that the opening of the Istanbul Stock Exchange in 1984 in Maslak and the concentration of the headquarters of national and foreign banks in Istanbul were important indicators of the increase in financial activities (Hacisalihoglu, 2000: 51). The growth in FIRE sectors and the rise of the new middle classes together with the demand of business centres on both sides of Istanbul have also led to the emergence of “residences” which include a variety of services ranging from catering, health services and sports and are generally combined with shopping and office sections. The target group consists of a variety of people ranging from businessmen to high-rank executives and from newly-wed couples to artists (Gokgur, 2006: 144) and those who share an individualised lifestyle in need to visit Istanbul frequently (Bali, 2004: 122).

Although political arrangements encouraged capital to operate, there were other factors which made large capital turn its attention towards the internal housing market. Keyder explains that in the 1980s the Middle East was not attractive for Turkish developer companies due to the war between Iraq and Iran and the internal conflict in Beirut (Keyder, 2000: 22-23). Oncu also argues that the high inflationary economic situation transformed urban lands into a source of profit rent (Oncu, 1988). Similarly, Sonmez adds that in the end of the 1970s, industrial production targeting the internal market had been the highest profitable sector. However, although big business had already used urban land as a source of investment,

between 1980 and 1990, urban rent has become the most important source of profit by the construction of luxurious housing, hotels and business centres (Sonmez, 1996: 76-77).

So, during the 1980s, both the internal political situation and the international political situation pushed big developer companies towards the internal housing market. As a result of this, urban land has been transformed into “urban rent” by becoming the most important source of profit in the high inflationary economy. Istanbul has become the new arena of contestation among different groups to share the urban rent such as the urban poor ready to do everything to acquire urban rent in peripheral zones, the middle classes looking for land in suburban areas in order to build cooperative housing and lastly the upper classes, who abandoned the city to live in protected residential complexes with high walls and private security systems (Isik and Pinarcioglu, 2005: 128).

Another change in inner city areas has been gentrification, developed in a similar pattern to Western examples, differentiated only in timing, speed and scale (Islam, 2006: 58). Since the end of the 1970s, gentrification started in Bosphorus and continued in inner city neighbourhoods of Beyoglu, Galata and Cihangir and lastly in the historical peninsula, in Fener and Balat (Ergun, 2006: 22). All these neighbourhoods are old and cosmopolitan residential areas in which different communities lived together in the Ottoman Empire and were composed of stylish old houses with a view of the Bosphorus or the Halic Bay (Sen, 2005: 147). Islam argues that there are various actors behind gentrification such as a group within the new professionals with specific cultural and consumption habits, as well as institutions and capital (Islam, 2006: 47).

However, Keyder warns that gentrification is limited in Istanbul if compared with other examples in the West, due to the characteristics of Turkish society in which early marriage with children has always been encouraged while an individualised and single lifestyle which targets gentrification has been discouraged (Keyder, 2000: 188). Besides the relatively low numbers of

“gentrifiers”, other factors were the difficulty of finding low interest rate credits for mortgage, the popularity of private car ownership among the middle classes and economic and bureaucratic restrictions to renovate old houses. The economic crisis in 2001 also affected the professional middle classes working in FIRE sectors so that approximately 23,000 banking workers and 3,000 media workers lost their jobs (Islam, 2006: 50).

Inner city areas have also witnessed “slummification” by becoming ruined and abandoned for the new immigrant groups facing hardship because of the absence of social networks to deal with poverty. Oncu argues that in the 1980s urban lands have been transformed into a source of profit (rent) and fixed income groups have lost their chances to acquire a house or a flat due to the increases in cash down payments and instalments. This has resulted in the collapse of “one man construction firms” which had previously provided housing for lower and middle classes at a low cost of construction. Home ownership became difficult due to high inflation which increased the cost of construction and credits for small scale industry with interest rates as high as over 70 % and also the lack of public land (Oncu, 1988: 54). Over the next twenty five years, Istanbul would be expanded to show the process of “splintering urbanism”:

Such a transition exposes strange urban landscapes where the marginal can be central; centrality can be on the urban margin; and the ‘urban’; expands far into spaces previously considered as ‘countryside.’ (Graham and Marvin, 2001: 115)

The opening of the second Bosphorus Bridge in 1988, legal arrangements to facilitate expansion towards suburban lands near forests and lakes, the development of financial centres especially on the European side, the increasing share of cooperative housing in overall housing market, the shortage of land in the Bosphorus region to construct luxurious housing developments accelerated Istanbul’s suburban development and lead to the proliferation of gated communities. In the last years, the ideal of a “global Istanbul” has continued to progress by much-debated urban renewal projects, such as the Dubai Towers in Maslak, the Haydarpasa

Trade and Tourism Centre in Kadikoy, Galataport in Karakoy and Formula 1 Track in Kurtkoy. The “quartered Istanbul” in which public space has been fragmented and divided into residential and business areas for different groups and classes can be regarded as similar to the depiction of Marcuse and Kempen’s (2000) explanation of the quartered city.

## **2.5 FRAGMENTATION OF PUBLIC SPACE AND CONFLICTING ISTANBULS**

The 1980s also signalled cultural fragmentation in Turkey which became visible in the urban space when nation states and its control mechanisms have been superseded by the rise of new identities, also signalling the end of politics based on class conflict. Besides nation state and citizenry another concept which has lost its legitimacy was “class”, especially after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989. The demolition of the Berlin Wall represents the integration of the “undemocratic” Iron Curtain into the “democratic” Western world. It has been argued that in the last twenty five years, social and spatial divisions in cities shifted from equality to difference (Soja, 2000: 280) where “the solution to social contradiction is not equalization, but differentiation” (Baudrillard, 1998: 94). Caldeira refers to Taylor and explains that “politics of difference” is supported by minority groups and especially feminists, who argue that liberal universalism has always excluded certain groups to reach universal equality. By contrast, these groups aim to reach a perspective of difference, rather than sameness (Caldeira, 2000: 303).

In the 1980s, the declining power of nation-states, national citizenship and class politics have led to the emergence of new identities based on ethnic, gender, tribal and religious differences which can be regarded as “more natural” identities and to the emergence of new social movements such as feminism, environmentalism, transgender and “human rights” movements among intellectuals and -once- leftist people who run their own media, magazines

and TV channels. These new identities are a reaction to repressive nation states which have been unsuccessful to fulfil the demands of their citizens and led people to search for their “real identities” and communities. Best and Kellner summarise this process in the West as:

...Known as “identity politics”, which often has radical aspirations but which usually falls short of advancing systemic change and new forms of radical struggle. Identity politics has its origins in the “new social movements” of the 1970s and 1980s and, ultimately, the struggles of the 1960s...In the 1970s, however, the “movement” fragmented into the “new social movements”, which included feminist, black liberation, gay and lesbian, and peace and environmental groups, each fighting for its own interest...By the 1980s and 1990s, as the balkanization process continued, the “new social movements” had become transformed into “identity politics”, the very name suggesting a turn away from general social, political, and economic issues and towards concerns with cultural and personal identity. (Best and Kellner, 1997: 273-274)

The fragmentation of public space was regarded as the “democratisation” process. Ironically, this democratisation went together with the “democratisation” of capitalism by the invention of a more fragmented or “niche” markets. The old class structure transformed into a more diverse one, compared to the solidarity created in the post Second World War era, known as the age of welfare states. Harvey explains that the post Second World War era established a more stable economy in which mass production and mass consumption repressed symbolic capital through forced democratisation and egalitarianism of taste. This process created repressed demand although it could not create a repressed desire (Harvey, 1990). However, since the 1970s global economic crisis has created much more segregated product markets called “niche markets” which have been associated with the individualisation and fragmentation of life.

Interestingly, when “class” as a concept lost its legitimacy to explain social change, cities have become places of tension due to increasing social polarisation. This irony is best described by Lash and Urry who argue that the shift to “quasi-Weberian approach” in social sciences is related to the Marxist processes of capital accumulation (Lash and Urry, 1994: 147). I think that “class” did not lose its meaning but its legitimacy to explain social changes due to the influence of “post age” in the academia. One of the most important aspects of this



period has been the domination of the theories based on consumption and cultural differentiation. Instead of theories based on Marxism, these theories focused on consumption instead of production and on cultural differentiation instead of class. Although there are still theories based on class which explain the reasons behind increasing global class polarisation, most of the theories have turned towards cultural (ethnicity, religion, racial and gender) explanations. This is explained by Frank who argues that cultural studies escape from studying economy due to the fear of being labelled:

...To be Marxist determinist of the '30s or even to be elitist of Frankfurt School. (Frank, 2002: 33)

However, an economic analysis can provide the hidden relation between companies (capitalism) and the state itself, two interconnected and inseparable entities. Especially the collapse of the Soviet Union provided a new discourse for the ideologists of capitalist world: the end of history thesis put by Fukuyama (1992) who argued that capitalism had now “won” the entire world as the ultimate stage in human history. “Freedom” has become another important concept for the new economy which was against the rigidity imposed by national state mechanisms and for the new social movements which based their existence on sine qua non characteristics of contemporary society such as human and minority group rights, ethnicity, and religion. In this aspect, the state has become the enemy for the new economy and new social movements, which limits their “freedom” to act (Frank, 2002).

Similarly in Turkey, in the aftermath of 1980, Kurdish nationalism and Islamic fundamentalism<sup>11</sup> have increased their importance in the politics due to the continuous immigration towards big metropolises, such as Istanbul as in my case. The immigration of Kurdish people and the increase in social polarisation led people to search for strategies of survival in cities by turning inward, to their origins, tribes, religions and ethnicities which have

---

<sup>11</sup> These have been major movements. However, they were different sects within each movement. There were also many communities and movements based on ethnicity and religious affiliation.

resulted in the erosion and fragmentation of public space. Isik and Pinarcioglu argue that although big cities had been receiving large immigrant population since the 1950s as the labour power needed for a developing economy, it was the 1980s that has changed the balance between immigrants and locals towards a relationship based on conflict and violence. They describe this process as the shift from soft and integrative urbanisation to a tense and exclusionary urbanisation (Isik and Pinarcioglu, 2005: 127).

The biggest wave of Kurdish<sup>12</sup> population from South Eastern Anatolia came in mid-1990s as the result of forced migration due to the internal conflict in that region which resulted in the evacuation of approximately 2,500 villages between the years 1993 and 1995.<sup>13</sup> Isik and Pinarcioglu state that the process in which the new immigrants were deprived of any support or social network in urban areas was described by Erder as “traumatic migration”. They argue that this situation created hierarchy within the immigrant community, described as “poverty in turn”. These immigrants have become cheap labour in cities since the 1990s (Isik and Pinarcioglu, 2005: 172). Yilmaz argues that they had difficulties due to the demolition of their villages and the prohibition to return to their villages prevented them to establish any relations with their villages. Especially immigrant women, who could not talk Turkish, have had also cultural difficulties such as language problems (Yilmaz, 2003: 98). So, the change in the immigrant profile and the internal conflict in the South Eastern region led to the rise of politics based on Kurdish nationalism, a much-debated issue in the public opinion.

Islamic fundamentalism has also become an important social and political movement which was later transformed partially into a more moderate political party. Immigrants without

---

<sup>12</sup> Yukseker and Ayata warn that although the immigrant population could not be generalised as “Kurdish”, most of the people were of Kurdish origin (2005).

<sup>13</sup> Erhan Ustundag, <http://bianet.org/cocuk/cocuk/55012-zorunlu-goc-bir-neslin-travmasi> (22.02.2005) accessed on 12.06.2009. There are different numbers regarding the population affected by forced migration. Yilmaz explains that for Kirisci and Winrow, it was approximately 2.5 to 3 million (according to Murat Bozlak), for UNHCR it was between 500,000 to 2 million and for the official sources, it was at least 300,000 people migrated to urban areas (Yilmaz, 2003: 97).

hope found their voices in Islamic movement which later became the biggest political party supported by religious sects (different communities with their own belief system within Islam) and Islamic capital (business and companies).<sup>14</sup> “Islamic power” (radical Islamism) created tension in the political arena not between different religions but rather between the secular and religious sides of the “same religion”.

In the local elections held on March 1994, the Welfare Party, the party of radical Islamists, won Istanbul’s municipality. This was described by Bali as Istanbul’s faith being defined by the will of the “excluded” who were living in squatter areas of the city. After the 1994 local elections, the Welfare Party won the general elections on 24 December 1995 (Bali, 2004: 198). The fear of secular and Westernised elites was described by Bali as “They are coming” (Bali, 2004: 198), similar to Americans’ fear of the invasion of Communists during the Cold War. This tension was described by Keyder as the conflict in public space such as the use of headscarves<sup>15</sup> in schools, the location of mosques, the use of nudity in billboards, and the extension of cafes and pubs by the use of tables in streets and to play rock music in streets (Keyder, 2000: 36-37). One of the most important crises emerged when Islamists wanted to construct a mosque with a cultural centre in Taksim Square, which was regarded as a symbol of cosmopolitanism and secularism (Bartu, 2000: 54-55).

In this period, while cultural fragmentation was reflected on political arena with the rise of new social movements based on ethnicity and religion, everyday life has also experienced radical changes. One example is the usage of the term “arabesque” that previously described an ordinary, simple, in-between and contaminated culture of immigrants who were threatening high culture of urban dwellers (Oncu, 2000: 128). Oncu explains that arabesque was firstly

---

<sup>14</sup> In the end, interestingly the poor and the rich supported Islamism for their own benefits. This is too broad subject to discuss here but I ask “For whom?” and “For what?”

<sup>15</sup> There are different terms used to refer to the “veil” of women in Turkish public opinion such as “headscarf” and “turban”. However, while “headscarf” usually refers to a more traditional head cover, “turban” usually has a more political meaning. However, from now on, I will use “headscarf” to simplify terminology.

used to define a synthesis of Western and Egyptian music which became the voice of those “left in between” and of unseen and unheard crowds. When famous arabesque music singers took parts in movies in the late 1960s and early 1970s, it described the lifestyles and daily practices of these crowds, something beyond only a musical genre. In the 1990s, arabesque has become a general term used in other fields to describe politics, democracy, economics and politicians (Oncu, 2000: 128).

The language has also changed to reflect the differences between immigrants and urban dwellers. Since the 1980s new terms such as “maganda” and “kiro” have been used to describe people who did not know how to behave in public space. Oncu states that “maganda” was firstly used by a group of young caricaturists to represent a rude person with a never-ending sexual appetite and a hairy body polluting the cultural arena (Oncu, 2000: 136). Simsek argues that in the 1990s the new middle classes have transformed lower classes into “grotesque” bodies reflected in caricatures and advertisements which were using irony and parody. “Maganda” has become the representation of the lower classes in caricatures which explicitly means a person from lower classes and implicitly a person of Kurdish origin (Simsek, 2005:77-81).

Derived from Kurdish language which means “young Kurdish man”, “kiro” has also been a new term to be used in Turkish public opinion. When it was transferred to the Turkish public discourse, it changed its meaning into a migrant who did not know how to behave properly in public space. This shows that the changing profile of immigrant population has had negative effects on urban inhabitants who created social and symbolic exclusion towards Kurdish immigrants. As the profile of the immigrant population has changed in the 1980s, it should be easier to understand why the terms “maganda” and “kiro” have become popular with a pejorative connotation. The use of “maganda” and “kiro” also reflect the difference between those with higher cultural capital and those with lower cultural capital. In this aspect, these

terms have experienced the same transformation of the term “arabesque” which was later transformed into a more general term (Oncu, 2000: 135). So, they do not only describe the lower classes as Simsek argues, but they also describe the rich who are regarded as “lower” in terms of culture.

This situation also shows the conflict within the wealthy class. For instance, Bali explains the conflict between the old and the new wealth of Anatolian origin in the light of the economic and social changes which took place in the 1980s. In order to differentiate themselves from the new rich, the old rich tended to be integrated into the global high society (Bali, 2004: 38-40). Similarly, Erman uses the term “undeserving rich as ‘the other’” in order to define the people who became wealthy in a short time by building high apartments in squatter areas (Erman, 2001: 994). Not only the wealth but also the culture is seen backward:

...Not because of the illegal ways of becoming rich, but because of destroying the image of our rich who are not “maganda”... And moreover, the rich should give instructive messages to society. (Kozanoglu, 1993: 100)

In the mid-1990s new terms entered the urban vocabulary reflecting “cultural colours”, such as “White Turks”<sup>16</sup>, “Black Turks”<sup>17</sup> and “White Muslims”.<sup>18</sup> In a recent article Sahin (2006) argues that different social groups in Istanbul have created their own spaces rather than entering into conflict since the Islamic opposition won the elections.<sup>19</sup> Sahin explains this differentiation by the description of his visit to Kanyon (a shopping mall in Levent), which was full of “Purple Turks” a part of the “White Turks” instead of the “Blue Turks” (aristocracy) who were hanging around with other social groups such as “White”, “Grey” and “Black

---

<sup>16</sup> This term was firstly used by journalist Ufuk Guldemir and since then it has become widely used.

<sup>17</sup> According to Sekman (2003: 263), “Black Turks” are the opposite of “White Turks”. While “Black Turks” are the suppressed ones, “White Turks” have good educational backgrounds. For Sekman, “Grey Turks” are those came from “Black Turks” origins but have become “White Turks” by money, education and time.

<sup>18</sup> Used in Tempo Magazine.

<sup>19</sup> Haluk Sahin, “Kanyon’dan Istanbul’a Bakis”, <http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=202555> (25.10.2006), accessed on 16.07.2009.

Turks”, as the evidence of the continuation of cultural differentiation in Istanbul which has started with Ozal<sup>20</sup> and globalisation process (Sahin, 2006).

The term “White Turk” has become popularised since mid-1990s. It refers to a person who adopted a Western culture and way of life. This term is especially used for the upper or upper middle class people with good educational backgrounds. However, “White Turk” is different from “Turkish elite”, i.e. elites who established Turkish Republic. While Turkish elites did not have to be upper class, they were followers of a Western education and culture who brought classical music, ballet, opera, and literature or “high art” to Turkey, “White Turks” represent a different group of people who graduated from the best colleges and universities of Turkey or North America and Western Europe.<sup>21</sup>

However, the difference emerges with consumerism rather than high Western culture. So while “White Turk” refers to a consumerist lifestyle, “Turkish elite” refers to selectiveness in the cultural arena. In the Turkish media, “White Turks” and Turkish elites are used interchangeably. Some writers make fun of them such as Serdar Turgut who wrote an ironic dairy of a “White Turk”. According to him, the power of AKP in 2002 brought a radical change for “White Turks”. They became the “other” in their own country.<sup>22</sup> There are also those who take back the conflict between the “White” and “Black Turks” to the 1950s when the Democrat Party<sup>23</sup> won the elections from the Republican Party (the establishers of Turkish Republic). In this aspect The Democrat Party is regarded as the power of “Black Turks” (Ozkok, 2003):

---

<sup>20</sup> See section 2.1 “Economic Restructuring and New Labour Markets”. Ozal was the prime minister of Turkey between 1983 and 1989 and the president of Turkey between 1989 and 1993.

<sup>21</sup> Low also argues that “whiteness” is not only a racial, but also a historical and cultural construct (Low, 2003: 172). She interprets “whiteness” as “the assumed norm” (socially, physically and even politically) which dominates national public space. It provides “access to education, elite taste culture, and behaviours and allows a group to prosper within the dominant culture.”(Low, 2003: 173). However, I also consider “whiteness” in Turkey to be associated with consumerism.

<sup>22</sup> Serdar Turgut was the columnist of Hurriyet and he is now the columnist of Aksam Newspaper. Serdar Turgut, “Can Cekisen Beyaz Turkler”, Aksam Newspaper, 3 June 2004.

<sup>23</sup> Democrat Party was often regarded as the voice of the masses and the opposite of the high culture of Turkish Republican elites.

Actually the separation between “white-black” is not new for Turkey. The power of Democrat Part in Turkey in 1950 was regarded as the victory of “Black Turkey.”<sup>24</sup>

In the last years there has also been differentiation among those who prefer a more Islamic lifestyle with the introduction of “White Muslims” (used in Tempo Magazine) which integrates consumer life with Islamic belief. In this article “White Muslims” are depicted as those Muslims who go to shopping malls, wear Louis Vuitton bags, and cover their heads with Armani scarves. I think the term “White Muslim” has a dilemma in that while “Islam” has always been the voice of the repressed crowds, “White” refers to the “distinction” of elites. “White Muslim” in this aspect means an elite Muslim, with a consumerist lifestyle which furthers differentiation within the Islamic group and becomes also a rival to secular Turkish elites and “White Turks”. In another news article in the Tempo magazine about “White” and “Black Turks”, journalist Ahmet Hakan differentiates between white and black Muslims on the basis of class difference. He thinks that a rich Muslim can live a “white life” while a poorer one lives the life of a “Black Turk”.<sup>25</sup>

One of the most interesting discussions among the Islamic intelligentsia started with the wedding ceremony of the daughter of the former minister for oil of Saudi Arabia, which was held in Istanbul at the Ciragan Palace.<sup>26</sup> Some radical Muslim intellectuals complained about the scale of consumption in that wedding ceremony and argued that Islamic life should have opposed consumerism and instead, it should have reflected a modest life in which the rich should have helped the poor. Some interpreted this as the secularisation and normalisation process of radical Islamists which was represented by Muslim women wearing décolleté evening gowns. Although these examples from the media can easily be taken as exaggerations

---

<sup>24</sup> Ertugrul Ozkok, “Kardesiniz Bir Zenci Turk’tur”, <http://hurarsiv.hurriyet.com.tr/goster/haber.aspx?id=146646&yazarid=10> (14.05.2003) accessed on 16.07. 2009.

<sup>25</sup> Tutkun Akbas and Guclu Ozgan, “Turkiye’nin Zencileri”, Tempo Magazine, 23 March 2006.

<sup>26</sup> Kubilay Keskin, <http://hurarsiv.hurriyet.com.tr/goster/haber.aspx?viewid=613087> (04.08.2005) accessed on 12.06.2009.

and specific cases, they show the difference between the “real” Islamic lifestyle and the lifestyle of “White Muslims” associated with conspicuous display.

These new groups signalled the importance of differentiation which was not limited to conspicuous consumption, since upper classes tend to “underconsume” or “consume inconspicuously” to differentiate themselves from “arrivistes” (Baudrillard, 1998: 90) or old bourgeoisie tends towards “ostentatious poverty” or “aesthetic asceticism” to differentiate themselves from the “new petty bourgeoisie” (Lury, 1996: 101). Rich people who consume conspicuously might be dismissed as vulgar and tasteless by the established upper class, aristocracy and those rich in cultural capital (Featherstone, 1991: 23). So, not only the power of purchase but also “how” these commodities are being used has become important:

...Not just a question of what clothes are worn but how they are worn... (Featherstone, 1991: 20)

Sahin<sup>27</sup> (2006) describes this process as the “confederalisation of Istanbul”, in which different groups create different domination spaces in the same city and live “together” by not even “touching” each other. While, once we could not accept the idea of “another Istanbul” now we have “other Istanbuls”. This process is described by Gurbilek as “the multitude of publics” in which social groups have been separated into spaces for the rich and the poor (Gurbilek, 2001: 63). Gurbilek adds that “the cultural multitude” is a reaction to top-down formulated modern identity (Gurbilek, 2001: 103) which results in a more “de-collectivised and individualised social life” (McGuigan, 1999: 126).

By the new forms of lifestyle, people have been segregated into different colours which represent different cultural backgrounds. The emergence of new terms such as White Turks, White Muslims, and Black Turks indicates the importance of cultural background as the basis of differentiation. Once defined multiculturalism and a shared public space by different social groups, the term “multi-colour” has now had a negative meaning in order to differentiate

---

<sup>27</sup> Haluk Sahin, “Kanyon’dan Istanbul’a Bakis” Radikal, 25 October 2006.



people on the basis of cultural differences. The developments since the 1980s in Turkey show a more pluralistic society with the rise of different social groups and fragmented public space in which consumption and lifestyle have become crucial to distinguish a person. Besides the polarisation between classes, there have been newly emerging social groups such as the rise of Islamism which was the voice of the poor at first but later was transformed into Islamic capital and political parties supported by religious communities.

Class and cultural distinctions in Istanbul have led to the elimination of the “common” shared by the people living in the same city. Istanbul, once the city of seven hills as stated in Yahya Kemal Beyatli’s well-known poem, now has become an “individualised” city for those who observe Istanbul from its own hill. There is a plurality of Istanbul for each community. In the end, Istanbul has become a combination of “small America” similar to “New York” which does not sleep and of “small Anatolia”, with people coming from different parts of Turkey with their own living habits. The famous quotation of Thatcher “There is no such thing as society” was ironically realised in Turkey.

### ***2.5.1 Tensions in Istanbul: The Entrapment of Elites***

In this process, while urban space has become regarded as “invaded” by the uncivilised, barbarian, and illiterate crowds, politics have experienced the rise of new social movements based on ethnicity and religion, which created tension between uncivilised crowds and civilised elites. The “minoritisation” of Turkish elites has been similar to the elimination of “real” minorities such as Armenian, Christian and Jewish communities in Istanbul which created nostalgia towards old Istanbul which had been a cosmopolitan capital city of the Ottoman Empire, where different ethnic and religious groups had survived together for hundreds of years (Bali, 2004: 141-143).

Bali explains the conflict between those who are raised in cities with Western values coming from petty bourgeoisie background and those who live in “varos”, as the majority of

the population, composed of unqualified, covetous and conservative people who are envious of White Turks by knowing that they would never reach their status. This conflict is described as “the Revenge of Slums” by Sitki Sukurer in *Gozlem Newspaper* (Bali, 2004: 326). Urban, secular and Westernised elites now regard themselves as the “minority” (Bali, 2004: 145) and feel alienated and marginalised:

...Sense of besiegement because the modern of the elite was increasingly marginalized in the face of politics and culture characterized by the dominance of the squatter. (Keyder, 1999: 150)

Even though the idea of flight from city has been popularised since the 1970s for the upper and middle classes with the proliferation of summer houses near seaside, Istanbul has become a difficult city to live in. Bali explains that, as depicted in the brochure of Kemer Country, Istanbul has now been invaded by “black crowds” (Bali, 2004: 117). In this aspect, Oncu argues that Istanbul does not only have the splendour, but also confusion, crowd, noise and pollution which creates an inadequate quality of living for upper and middle classes who have legitimised the withdrawal from public life and have moved out of Istanbul aiming a healthy life and clean environment (Oncu, 1999: 27). In the 1990s, the idea of the flight from the city returned with the debate around an arabesque song of Ferdi Tayfur, which was about the return to the village abandoned once. The idyllic representation of the village in the middle of Taurus Mountains and nostalgia for home and mom-made meals were in contrast with city’s representation as a place without trees surrounded by brick walls where the protagonist lost his lover to someone else. This song was a cry of those who could not be integrated into urban life and wanted to return to their villages. The discussion about returning to village was initiated by upper classes, but for them the people who “should” return to their villages were the rural immigrants who destroyed urban life. Bali explains that Serdar Turgut, the columnist of *Hurriyet* and later *Aksam* newspapers, referred to this arabesque song and wrote that:

If they return, their life would be better than their present life. Also the lives of those who should remain here would be better. I can enjoy of Istanbul, but they cannot. I

know where to drink the best tea, where to eat the best meal and where to view the Bosphorus best. To tell them “I like you” is the biggest rudeness to them. Honestly, I do not like them. And I am not afraid of telling this, because I do not see any relation of subordination between them and me. I consider myself equal to them and I tell what I think. (Turgut in Bali, 2004: 325)

During this period, metaphors of Istanbul as “sick” have been used both in the academic and everyday life by depictions such as “Istanbul which grows as a cancer cell” (Uysal, 2003: 68) and “Istanbul does not grow but swells like a tumour” (Guler, 2001: 82). These metaphors are reflected on “urban diseases” associated with urban life including “Istanbul bronchitis”, “the syndrome of sick building” and “allergy of public space”. These diseases are said to emerge due to the pollution in air-conditioning systems, air pollution caused by traffic and crowd, fast food, lack of exercise because of working in front of computers and unventilated places (Kucukusta, 2006). Kucukusta argues that these problems arise from Western lifestyle contradicting natural life which gives importance to organic food, less use of drugs and less vaccination for children to get them used to microbes (Kucukusta, 2006: 136).

## **2.6 FROM A GLOBAL CITY INTO A CITY OF FEAR**

Since the mid-1990s and especially in the 2000s, Istanbul has been transformed into a “city of crime” described with terms “maganda bullet”, “urban bandits” and “black crowds” used by the media to explain increasing rates of crime, such as murders, assaults and “steal and snatch” which transformed Istanbul into a dangerous place. There is the actual and perceived importance of crime, with increasing number of murders, thefts, assaults and increasing illegal activities such as drug trade and trafficking, violence in schools which goes together with the “crimes directed to the city” such as raiding of forestry lands committed by both big developer companies for luxury housing and by immigrants for squatter housing.<sup>28</sup> According to the data of Istanbul Directorate of Security, approximately one fourth of total crimes in Turkey are

---

<sup>28</sup> The term “crimes directed to city” was used by Erbatur Cavusoglu, in Birgun newspaper, on 7 January 2006 “Istanbul Orneginde Kent ve Suc”.

conducted in Istanbul. Istanbul has been ranked first in the crime rates towards property and individuals in 2004 with a 15% of increase compared with the previous year.<sup>29</sup> Sonmez states that while Istanbul’s population is 15% of total population of Turkey, 30% of total crime in Turkey such as murder, car-theft, wounding, usurpation and abduction are conducted in Istanbul (Sonmez, 2005). In this period, “street children” have also become a popular subject of debate in the media who live or work in streets to earn livelihood for their families, known also as “selpakci cocuklar” (children who sell paper tissues in streets, polish shoes and clean car windows) as well as the increase in the number of “tinerci cocuklar” (children who sniff glue as drug), often associated with violence in cities.<sup>30</sup>

**TABLE 2.6.1 COMPARISON OF CRIME STATISTICS OF TURKEY**

	Turkey	Istanbul
Crime rates for 100,000 people	748	1309
Murder rate for 100,000 people	4.2	4.6
Average rape rate	1.8	2.9
Average theft rate	257	668
Average abduction rate	3.6	8

Source: Golbasi, 2008: 18.

<sup>29</sup> “Sayılarla İstanbul”, İstanbul, vol. 5, April, 63.

<sup>30</sup> It should be noted here that all these are very debatable especially for the experts of crime and children. For instance, an expert on street children (P54) stated that steal and snatch should be associated with the organised crime, rather than with street children. There is also difference between children who work in streets and children who live in streets. So, any child in street should not be regarded as someone without a family or home. Rather he/she might work in streets for his/her family’s livelihood. So, the sharp prejudice towards children in streets is a product of everyday life and media discourse.

These “numbers” have also had effects on how people perceive Istanbul. As an example, according to a study two thirds of respondents answered that Istanbul means crowd, stress, transportation, dirt, poverty, disgrace, torment, “an insuperable village and city”, while 4.5% of respondents answered as “nothing”.<sup>31</sup> 17% of respondents state that they like nothing about Istanbul and if someone likes Istanbul, this is because of Istanbul’s Bosphorus, sea, everything, historical places, business places, picnic areas, its size, colourful life, freedom and leisure places.<sup>32</sup>

Due to the increasing rates of crime and fear of crime in the last years, the discourse in Turkey shifted to security, leaving everyone to question if too much wealth for the minority and freedom to majority without any means would end in the need for “security”. From the politics of security to the debates of Fortress Europe, from the increasing number of private security companies to the urban legends about attacks, from the debates of neo-medievalism to the creation of artificial islands for the elites in the sea, from a crowd “never saw the Bosphorus” in Istanbul to a crowd who enjoys at night clubs near the Bosphorus, security concerns dominate the public opinion. Public space, in which people from different ethnic groups and classes once met and lived together, is being destroyed.

In order to understand how public space has been destroyed, I turn towards the relation between different concepts as diverse as “citizen”, “city”, “civilization”, “bourgeoisie” and “safety”. For instance, Uysal argues that in the Latin language “civitas” means state, city-state, citizenship and community formed of citizens while “civis” means citizen, townsman, bourgeois, and burgess (Uysal, 2001: 62). Soja explains that concepts such as politics, policy, polity and police are derived from the word “polis” from old Greek language which means “town” (Soja, 1995: 23). The term “bourgeoisie” derives from “bourg” or “burg”, which means “town” in old French language while “burgeois” means citizen of a town. “Bourg” derives from

---

<sup>31</sup> This research is carried out by the Social Texture Project conducted by The Research Centre, a branch of Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality.

<sup>32</sup> “Sayılarla İstanbul”, İstanbul, vol. 5, April, 61.

Latin language word “burgus”, which means fortress or high place of safety. “Borough” or “burg” in old English language means fortified town. Once the link between city and safety has been broken down and “burgus” is no longer felt as a safe place to live, this process has led in a neo-medieval age in which everyone is in the need of safety by creating fragments walled off from the rest.

The fragmentation of public space has resulted in the fear of the other and the fear of crime, which increased the tension in the public space. Davis argues that in this process, security has become an asset for the rich, who live in residential enclaves or restricted suburbs. Secondly, “fear proves itself”, which means that even in the absence of high crime rates security becomes mobilised by the social perception of threat (Davis, 1998: 224). Security and safety have become major concerns in everyday life in Turkey and especially for Istanbul, by giving rise to the discussions of “fortressing” and “visa for entry to Istanbul”, which has often been vocalised by politicians, seen also in the West by the debates on “neo-medievalism” (Urry, 2000: 13).

It has been argued that income polarisation and new luxury housing developments increase social fragmentation, such as residences, gentrification and gated communities which are described by Uysal, as “medieval walls arising in the city” (Uysal, 2001: 70) and by Ekinci as “modern medieval period” in which the new rich tends to live behind closed and walled houses protected by private and paid soldiers (Ekinci, 2003: 80-81). The new rich who prefer these kinds of medieval walls are described as “neo-feudal lords” who have emerged by the new ways of accumulation since the 1980s which increase class differentiation (Isik and Pinarcioglu, 2005: 141). In this process, Istanbul has been transformed into a place of danger, chaos and heterogeneity:

...According to Nan Ellin, in the late twentieth century fear generated divisive architectural policies that turned inward and backward rather than facing the actual social challenges of urban life. (Lyon, 2001: 58)

Istanbul has become a “fortress city divided between fortified cells of affluent society and places of terror” (Davis, 1998: 224). Now city space is fragmented and public space disappears (Bauman, 1998) or at least public and private spaces have been restructured, both of which did not have a very clear-cut distinction throughout history (Soja, 2000: 320). The city, once built to protect its residents from invaders, has become a dangerous place. These developments have resulted in “carceral archipelago” (Soja, 2000: 298) in which public space disappeared under privatisation. This process has also led to declining welfare state, policing of space, the imprisonment of downtown, home grown revolution such as gated communities and insular lifestyles, private and public police services and even privatised road-ways, the decline of public institutions and participatory democracy (Soja, 2000) and summarised as:

Even as the walls have come down in Eastern Europe, they are being erected all over Los Angeles. (Davis, 1998: 228)

According to the psychologist Nazim Serin, because of the increasing rates of thefts and attacks, nobody feels safe in big cities, especially in Istanbul.<sup>33</sup> The “ghetto economy” as Serin uses or the “underground economy” as in its formal use, leads to the emergence of a new sector: security with steel doors, alarms as means of protection from thieves. In a news article about the increase of private initiatives in security sector, it is stated that while there are 180,000 personnel under the General Directorate of Security, there are 190,000 private security personnel working in the private security sector. The demand for security has also led to the opening of education programmes of security at several universities.<sup>34</sup> Newspapers published special issues on security to recommend means for a safer life through CCTV cameras, iris recognition systems in business towers<sup>35</sup> and more generally, to watch public spaces through MOBESE (Mobile Electronic System Integration) observing Istanbul’s main public areas with

---

<sup>33</sup> Hurriyet Newspaper, “Kentlerde getto ekonomisi olustu” <http://webarsiv.hurriyet.com.tr/2004/11/15/553474.asp> (15.11.2004) accessed on 16.07.2009.

<sup>34</sup> Cumhuriyet Newspaper, “Guvencikte “Ozel Patlamasi”, 23 July 2005.

<sup>35</sup> Milliyet Newspaper, “Security”, Private Issue on Security, 24 December 2005.

570 cameras. MOBESE has also covered information gathered from local mayors of Istanbul, camera images, help/emergency calls to 155 and PC tablets in police automobiles.<sup>36</sup>

In this period, the language used to define the “other” has also been transformed into more exclusionary terms which shifted from “kiro” and “maganda” into “varoslu”. For Erman, “varoslu” means a socially isolated person who is engaged in criminal and underground activities (Erman, 2001: 996). Varos derives from Hungarian language which means “neighbourhoods outside the city walls”, while “varoslu” means the outlaw and illegal who invades urban space (Bozkulak, 2005: 246). It was firstly used for radical leftist demonstrators in 1995 and 1996 who celebrated 1 May in Kadikoy and Gaziosmanpasa respectively who trampled flowers in streets and raided shops and bank offices.<sup>37</sup> Bozkulak argues that “varoslu” is similar to the “underclass”, described as “insufficient consumers” who cannot consume and are not needed as a workforce. The underclass in Turkey consists of mostly immigrants from Eastern and South Eastern part of Anatolia (Bozkulak, 2005: 246-248).

### ***2.6.1 “The Moment when Time Stopped”<sup>38</sup> ...***

Fear is not only associated with crime and fear of crime in Istanbul which is thought to be invaded by crowds ready to vandalise the city. Rather, Istanbul has become a city of fear because of its geographical disposition located close to the North Anatolian Fault Zone, which produces strong earthquakes along East-West axis. In this sense, the expectation of a strong earthquake which would erase Istanbul from the maps is not an “imagined fear” if one looks at Istanbul’s long history. For instance, the earthquake in 1509 A.D. was known as “Lesser Judgement Day” due to its devastating consequences which caused more than 4,000 casualties in an Istanbul with an approximate population of 160,000. It caused severe damages to well-

---

<sup>36</sup> Interview with Harun Sahin, Esra Acikgoz, Cumhuriyet Pazar, “‘Big Brother’ Is Basinda”, 7 August 2005.

<sup>37</sup> From the web page [www.dayanismaevleri.com](http://www.dayanismaevleri.com) accessed on 14.02.2007 (This web page does not exist anymore).

<sup>38</sup> A quotation from CNN Turk’s web page which describes the earthquake on 17 August 1999.



known buildings such as the Topkapi Palace, Saint Sophia, Galata Tower and it was felt over a broad area as far as Egypt.<sup>39</sup>

Although Istanbul's history legitimises this fear, it was the date 17 August 1999 which changed everything for the inhabitants of Istanbul. On 17 August 1999, at 3.02 a.m. those who were sleeping in their beds on a very hot night were shaken, a time which was later described as "The moment when Time Stopped".<sup>40</sup> In the next few hours, there was total shock even in the mass media which was trying to understand what was going on. It was not Istanbul, but Kocaeli, an industrial city near Istanbul, which was struck with an earthquake of 7.4 – 7.8 magnitude on Richter scale according to USGS (United States Geological Survey). It affected a broad area in the Marmora Region including the towns of Golcuk, Sakarya and Yalova. Summer resorts in these smaller cities which once were places of comfort and joy were transformed into places of death only in 45 seconds. Many buildings were totally destroyed, crumbling into dust.

Istanbul was not affected too severely despite its 976 casualties<sup>41</sup> compared to more than 17,000 casualties and more than 43,000 injured, according to the official figures.<sup>42</sup> However, people who were living in Istanbul were affected psychologically not because of that earthquake but because of waiting for a stronger one. Later on, there were those who moved away from their homes or to other cities as well as those who sought professional psychological support. Another important thing was "earthquake packages", which people kept near their beds which included flashlight, water, and blanket to be used in the case of an earthquake.

---

<sup>39</sup> "1509 Big Istanbul Earthquake" wikipedia

[http://tr.wikipedia.org/wiki/1509\\_B%C3%BCy%C3%BCk\\_%C4%B0stanbul\\_Depremi](http://tr.wikipedia.org/wiki/1509_B%C3%BCy%C3%BCk_%C4%B0stanbul_Depremi) accessed on 06.07. 2008.

<sup>40</sup> [http://www.cnnturk.com/OZEL\\_DOSYALAR/ozel\\_dosyalar.asp?mainid=1101](http://www.cnnturk.com/OZEL_DOSYALAR/ozel_dosyalar.asp?mainid=1101) (15.08.2005) accessed on 06.07. 2008.

<sup>41</sup> [http://www.koeri.boun.edu.tr/depremmuh/eqspecials/kocaeli/kocaeli\\_eq.htm](http://www.koeri.boun.edu.tr/depremmuh/eqspecials/kocaeli/kocaeli_eq.htm), the web page of the Bogazici University Kandilli Observatory and Earthquake Research Institute, accessed on 16.02.2009.

<sup>42</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1999\\_%C4%B0zmit\\_earthquake](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1999_%C4%B0zmit_earthquake), accessed on 16.02.2009. However, the total loss is expected to be much higher than official numbers.

This date was a turning point for the media which since then has covered news about the potential earthquake, the number of expected casualties and damage. However, there were some winners of the “awaited” earthquake, which can be called the “catastrophe sectors”. One was construction firms and companies which have started to check buildings’ resistance to earthquakes. Related to that, it should not be a surprise that the demand for resistant buildings or with few-storeys houses has increased. So, not only social tensions but also the expectation of ecological disasters has led Istanbulites to search for safer places to live, such as residences in city centre and gated communities in suburban lands, targeting especially families with children.<sup>43</sup> Another winning sector was that of seismography, as a field within geography which has acquired prestige in the eyes of public opinion and was supported by the continuous coverage of TV, radio programmes and newspaper articles written by important seismologists.

The Marmora Sea has also become an important figure in this process which has begun to be investigated and mapped by researchers, often in cooperation with foreign scientists. Interestingly, some seismologists became popular figures such as professor Ahmet Mete Isikara, the former Head of the Bogazici University Kandilli Observatory and Earthquake Research Institute. He was named “Deprem Dede” (Earthquake Grandpa) by the media due to his campaign to make people and especially the young generation conscious of learning “to live with earthquakes”. Other important figures were Naci Gorur, Sener Usumezsoy, Celal Sengor and Aykut Barka, all academics who were in continuous competition and conflict with each other. There was an influx of reports about potential earthquakes which would affect Istanbul. However, while for some this earthquake would not be as strong as expected, others insisted on an earthquake even stronger than 8 in the Richter scale.

---

<sup>43</sup> I will explain the situation of the housing sector after the earthquake in 1999 in Chapter 3 section 3.2 “Socio-Economic Changes and the Search for Security”.

Perhaps the only winners were those who were living in Istanbul, with increased attention towards consequences of a potential earthquake, who initiated civil activities such as volunteer organisations and web sites to predict future earthquakes. AKUT (Search and Rescue Association) has become a prominent organisation which was established in 1997 primarily as a rescue team for mountaineers. However, their volunteer participation in the rescue of 1999 earthquake victims showed the importance of the civil initiatives. As time goes on, this fear gave its fruits also in visual and written arts, such as the novel written by Mine Kirikkanat “One Day, Night” (2003) which depicts the developments in the aftermath of a very strong earthquake which strikes Istanbul and causes internal political conflict. Also the recent movie directed by Taylan Biraderler “Small Apocalypse” (2006) is about the story of a family running from the earthquake in Istanbul while trying to deal with internal conflict.

## **CONCLUSION**

In this chapter I explained economic, political and social changes since the 1970s known also as the “global” period, as argued by Harvey, highlighted with a new regime of accumulation based on flexible labour markets, niche markets, decentralisation, deregulation, privatisation and the erosion of nation state (Harvey, 2001). More specifically, Turkey has been integrated into the global economy with Ozal decisions aimed at liberalisation of the economy and privatisation. Turkey has also experienced the erosion of welfare state mechanisms and the notion of “citizenship”, which once united people on common identity. However, since the 1980s, state has become a burden for the economy, aiming liberalisation to be integrated with global economic processes, and for the people aiming at being freed from national constraints, ironically turned toward premodern identities such as ethnic and religious ones. Also identities around class differences have lost their importance (not at the material but at the symbolic level), especially after the fall of the Soviet Bloc. It is not a surprise that during this period

cities have re-emerged as the new centres of global economy. This new city has been characterised by a more fragmented class structure, which consists of professionals at the top and the underclass at the bottom.

Istanbul has experienced similar changes: the rise of FIRE sectors in overall economic activity, and the transfer of heavy industry to nearby smaller cities which have made Istanbul the centre of decision making. The new professionals working in FIRE sectors have had specific educational, cultural and consumption habits, in contrast to lower classes unable to spend. The changes in the economy have also resulted in income polarisation and the emergence of underclass leading to a new urban spatial form, which was described by Marcuse as “quartered city” (2000). Also the political actors of that era aimed at creating global Istanbul, as a centre in the Balkans, Black Sea and the Middle East (Keyder, 2000) and financial centres were created to attract capital to Istanbul. At that time, urban rent has become the most important source of profit due to high inflation. Big developer companies turned their attention to Turkish housing market, not only due to high inflationary economy, but also due to the conflict in the Middle East and the political climate in Turkey which facilitated construction by abolishing central planning rules and giving independence to local political actors to allow construction. This has resulted in business towers, residences, shopping malls, exhibition halls and gentrified areas in inner city and gated communities in suburban lands.

The fragmented urban space was also the reflection of social and cultural divisions which have become more prominent due to continuous immigration to big cities and the internal conflict in South-eastern Anatolia, leading to the rise of Islamic fundamentalism and Kurdish nationalism. This chapter has also shown that how secular, urban and Westernised people in Turkey felt alienated since the Islamic parties have won general elections since the mid 1990s. Social and political tensions between groups have also created its language in everyday life with the rise of terms such as “White Turks”, “Black Turks” and lastly, “White

Muslims”. As I showed the importance of the term “White Turks” in Chapter 1 and how it is linked to the rise of gated communities in Istanbul, in this chapter I carried forward the debates on these terms, which show the importance of class and cultural differences. Elites or seculars or “White Turks” (although they refer to different groups), felt isolated and needed to withdraw themselves from public space, thought to be invaded by “black crowds”. In this period, sometimes known also as the “neo-medieval” age, due to social and political conflicts between these groups, Istanbul has become a city of crime and danger, in which security has become a major concern. At this time, flight from Istanbul was also legitimised due to the expectation of a future earthquake, when Marmora region was hit by a major earthquake in 1999.

The period since the 1980s has also changed Istanbul’s discourses from a global city into a sick city and later into a city of crime and fear. However, this change did not follow a linear progress, such that these different and conflicting discourses are used simultaneously to define Istanbul which has become a city of conflict in every sense. While in the 1980s Istanbul was seen as a global city of affluence, crystallised in the term “Profitopolis”, used by Tutengil (2001: 82) to describe a city where individual interest dominate over public interests, in the 1990s and 2000s Istanbul was described with different and often conflicting discourses such as “city of crime”, “city of fear”, “historical Istanbul” with “pavements made of gold” which were similar to her contradictory but mutually existing names throughout history. Finally, this chapter has provided the main framework and the theoretical and historical background of the thesis in which I will draw all these subjects where I will use and analyse the data from the field work.

# **CHAPTER THREE**

## **AN EXAMINATION OF THE LITERATURE ON GATED COMMUNITIES**

### **INTRODUCTION**

In this chapter, I examine the literature on gated communities around the world and in Turkey, focusing especially on Istanbul. At first, I begin with an examination of historical forms of spatial segregation and how gated communities differ from previous examples. Then I move on to the socio-economic processes which result in the search for a safe place to live. One of the factors behind gated communities has been increasing crime rates and fear of crime, which I discussed in Chapter 2. The suburban expansion in the 1980s was another important factor behind the proliferation of gated communities due to the infusion of large capital into the housing market, the availability of large lands in suburban areas and legal arrangements which facilitated construction. Gated communities are also the result of the search for status and the distinction of the new middle classes. Another promise of gated communities is in providing a sense of community, although this is achieved by a strictly controlled life through rules and restrictions. Gated communities are also regarded as part of the privatisation of public space which leads to apathy toward the outside. I also discuss different forms of gated communities in Turkey on the basis of spatial and class differences and their target groups. In the end, I criticise the literature and put forward the research questions and the methods of this thesis.

### 3.1 GATED COMMUNITIES AROUND THE WORLD

In order to understand what makes “gated community” specific in the contemporary period, I will now summarise historical examples of socio-spatial segregation. One way of looking at types of segregation is to considering whether people are segregated voluntarily or not. Miller argues that there are two forms of social segregation, i.e. enclaves and ghettos (Miller, 2001). While “enclave” connotes a positive meaning and is regarded as a place which enables its residents to live voluntarily segregated from the rest, “ghetto” is a part of a town or city where people live in isolation from the majority against their wishes (Isik and Pinarcioglu, 2005: 147; Miller, 2001: 8). For instance, the Harem in the Ottoman Palace was “an enclave” which was prohibited to be accessed by anyone except the Ottoman Sultan. Blakely and Snyder argue that in the West, manors and castles in Europe have been other historical examples of enclaves. In England kings such as Henry I, Richard II, and Charles II isolated themselves in the Tower of London to protect themselves against dangers. London did not have a police force until the 18<sup>th</sup> century, which resulted in self-protection of the powerful people from attacks (Blakely and Snyder, 1997: 4).

Fortress cities of ancient times are the first examples of gated communities walled off from the rest and built to protect inhabitants of such towns (Low, 2003: 13). Systems of segregation and class divisions were common in Europe such as the earliest gated communities were built by the Romans around 300 BC in England (Blakely and Snyder, 1997: 4). During the period between 1450 and 1600, poverty rose due to the decrease in real wages and increase in the taxes on the poor which increased the polarisation between rich and poor and put restrictions on the poor and vagabonds because of the fear of social disorder as well as the fear of disease (Low, 2003: 14). Also in the United States, early colonists erected walls around settlement of Roanoke and Jamestown and Spanish fort towns in order to protect from outside attacks (Low, 2003: 14). While fortress cities and fort towns can be regarded as “enclaves” , the

ghettos built for Jewish minority in Renaissance Venice is regarded as one of the first examples of ghettos (Miller, 2001; Sennett, 1994) which was followed by slave ghettos in ancient Rome and Athens, merchant sections in medieval cities, ghettos for Irish minority in the 19<sup>th</sup> century America, followed by the ghettos for Italians, Eastern Europeans and Chinese in the United States, and immigrant ghettos built for South Americans in North-eastern American cities (Miller, 2001: 5-7).

Since the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the meaning of city and country has changed due to the economic and social processes. While in the Enlightenment, cities were regarded as the engine for social progress as reflected in the ideas of Voltaire who stated that London was the Athens of modern Europe providing social mobility (Schorske, 1998: 38), with increasing industrialisation cities were regarded “as vice” i.e. dangerous places, alienated from Nature (Schorske, 1998). Suburbia is a more recent example of enclave, emerging as an upper class movement in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Fishman explains that “suburb” means beyond the city (Fishman, 1996: 24). Suburbia in the modern sense requires a total transformation of the meaning of the core and the periphery, a separation of work and residence and a creation of class-segregated urban structure (Fishman, 1996: 27). The meaning of “suburb” which was previously regarded as an inferior place outside the urban core has been changed into a place of protection, especially for the wealthy bourgeoisie (Fishman, 1996: 26). The word “suburb” refers both to a geographical meaning i.e. “beyond the city” (Fishman, 1996: 24) and a way of life, based on middle class, family centeredness and conformism, reflected in the word “suburbia” (King, 1984: 151).

McLaughlin and Muncie argue that suburbia started in the 19<sup>th</sup> century in Britain as an upper class phenomenon around London. In the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century people started to escape from central London which became full of danger and poverty, towards places such as Bromley. In this process London has become a model for the middle class suburbanisation (McLaughlin and



Muncie, 1999). Between 1880 and 1914 suburbs in Britain have been fuelled with “bungalows” for the masses, previously built for the middle and upper middle classes (King, 1984: 106). Between 1880 and 1930 the meaning of “rural” has also changed. The words “country” and “side” have become hyphenated, as a reaction to the city:

Like the term ‘week-end’, ‘country-side’ in the early twentieth century was hyphenated. (King, 1984: 125)

American suburbia goes back to the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, by the separation of work and residence and a move from the core to the periphery initiated by the middle class because of the increasing immigration to cities. American suburbia was firstly established with the influence of the Evangelical domestic ideology and the picturesque tradition of design as well as with an influence from British suburbia (Fishman, 1996: 47). The modelling of American suburbia on the English suburbia was crystallised in Llewellyn Park, built in New Jersey in 1857 (Fishman, 1996), followed by others such as Tuxedo Park in New York built in 1886 for resort purposes (Low, 2003: 14). Another resort was built in Brooklyn, Sea Gate, in 1899. Private streets were built in St Louis between 1867 and 1907 with English style houses for the business elite (Low, 2003: 14). During the 20<sup>th</sup> century gated communities were built in East Coast and in Hollywood, for privacy, protection and prestige and described as “uncommon places for uncommon people” (Blakely and Snyder, 1997: 4).

However, this does not mean that the American architects have always followed the British path. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century in the United States, Frederick Law Olmsted and Frank Lloyd Wright created utopian environments separated from urban areas inspired by utopian socialists’ ideas based on the effect of places over human emotions and social systems (Blakely and Snyder, 1997: 12). Frederick Law Olmsted, who developed Riverside, as an example of American suburbia and a departure from the British example, can be regarded as North America’s Haussmann, who tried to create public landscapes and parks as social-safety valves and mixing classes in common areas (Davis, 1998: 227). The names given to suburban areas

reflected the idea of escape from the city, such as “park”, “forest”, “river”, “hills”, or “valley” combined with words as “view” or “estates” (Blakely and Snyder, 1997: 14). Economic crisis in England and industrial growth of American economy made the United States the core nation of suburban living (Fishman, 1996: 32).

Fishman argues that towards the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, American suburbs became the model for the classical suburbia crystallised in Philadelphian suburbs. In the 20<sup>th</sup> century, American suburbia was extended towards the middle classes contrary to the 19<sup>th</sup> century suburbs, which were only for the upper class. By the development of highways, Los Angeles suburbs began to become separated from the urban core. By the 1920s, a more decentralised urban structure has emerged by the introduction of automobiles (Fishman, 1996: 33). However, urban segregation changed its direction in the post Second World War era by the rise of welfare state providing a more equal society based on welfare mechanisms applied by powerful states in Western countries. This era was also known as the era of mass consumption, production and suburbanisation when working class families started owning houses in suburbia with the rising standards of living. This transformed suburbs into the symbols of conformism of the middle class which Fishman called as “the end of suburbia” (Fishman, 1996: 33).

In summary, since the 19<sup>th</sup> century, firstly in Britain and then in the United States with the increasing class polarisation in cities, upper classes moved towards outside the urban core, which led to the suburbanisation, as a way of decentralisation of the city and separation of work and residence. Blakely and Snyder argue that gated communities in the United States can be interpreted as a reaction towards suburbanisation which resulted in bedroom communities in the post Second World War era and had their roots in the Leisure World and country clubs built in Rancho Bernardo and Irvine in California, Reston in Virginia and Columbia in Maryland. These developments were followed by golf courses in the 1980s with the purpose of exclusivity, prestige and leisure (Blakely and Snyder, 1997: 4).

In this aspect, gated communities are enclaves, described as “voluntary ghettoization and self-segregation” (McLaughlin and Muncie, 1999: 117). Gated communities have emerged in the process of globalisation since the mid-1970s, explained in Chapter 2, giving way to a new socio-economic and political agenda. For Blakely and Snyder gated communities are residential areas with restricted access in which public space is privatized (Blakely and Snyder, 1997: 21). Other scholars have argued that gated communities are “fortress places” (Graham and Marvin, 2001: 267), “surrounded by walls, fences or earth banks covered with bushes and shrubs, with a secured entrance” (Low, 2003: 12) restricted to public entry (Atkinson and Flint, 2004), in which public space has been privatised (McKenzie, 1994). Low adds that the protection sometimes might go beyond walls and fences such as a natural reserve, and in few cases a guarded bridge can provide protection and segregation (Low, 2003: 12). In the literature there is a variety of concepts to describe similar housing types and highlight the characteristics of the above definition:

Originating from these discussions different concepts are developed in order to bring a better/detailed analytical framework to the conceptual understanding such as fortress communities (Blakely and Synder, 1997,1999), enclave communities (Luymes, 1997), city of walls and fortified enclaves (Caldeira, 1999), enclosed communities (Massey, 1999, in Hook and Vrdoljak, 2002), fortified cells, and the like. (Dundar and Ozcan, 2003: 3)

Landman and Schonteich give different terms used in the South African literature such as “suburban enclaves” and “urban fortresses” (Lipman and Harris, 1999) “security park” (Hook and Vrdoljak, 2000; 2001) “security village” (Bremner 1999; Landman, 2000), “enclosed neighbourhoods” (Landman, 2000) while “road closures” are used in several local council policies (Landman and Schonteich, 2002). Caldeira uses “closed condominiums” to define gated communities and “fortified enclaves” as a more general term to define places in which middle and upper middle classes live, consume, work and spend their leisure time in such places as offices, shopping centres, schools, hospitals, entertainment centres, and theme parks (Caldeira, 2000: 258). Gated communities have become a worldwide phenomenon, seen in

Latin America, China, the Philippines, New Zealand, Australia, and post apartheid South Africa, Indonesia, Germany, France, Eastern European countries, Arab nations such as Egypt, Lebanon and Saudi Arabia, Spanish coastline and Cote d'Azur (Low, 2003: 16). Low adds that in every culture a different process lies behind gated communities and states that:

For example they house expatriate workers in Saudi Arabia, replicate socialist *datcha* housing in Moscow, provide a secure lifestyle in the face of extreme poverty in Southeast Asia, protect residents from urban violence in South Africa, create exclusive compounds for emerging elites in Bulgaria and China, and offer exclusive second homes or industry-sponsored housing in Western Europe. (Low, 2003: 16)

### **3.2 SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHANGES**

#### **AND THE SEARCH FOR SECURITY**

In most of the literature gated communities are regarded as the result of socio-economic changes which led to the increasing social polarisation, crime rates or fear of crime so that the perception of crime has become more important than the crime itself (Davis, 1998). The literature stresses the socio-economic changes which took place in neo-liberal economic restructuring since the 1980s and as a result of this, the search for security became a prominent feature of the contemporary urban context. For instance, Low (2003) argues that in the United States gated communities have emerged in the process of Reaganomics since the 1980s which led to worsening income polarisation and fragmentation of urban space. It is stated that in Russia and Ukraine, gated communities have appeared in the process of democratization and Glasnost policies.<sup>44</sup> While in Latin America (in Brazil and Argentina) it was neo-liberal economic policies since the 1990s (Coy and Pohler, 2002), in South Africa it was the conflict between rich white and poor blacks in the process of globalisation and liberalisation (Jurgens and Gnad, 2002). While in Indonesia gated communities have appeared since the mid-1980s for middle classes and particularly for people of Chinese origin, it was security concerns emerged

---

<sup>44</sup> In the workshop "Gated Communities as a Global Phenomenon" held in Hamburg, 1999. <http://www.gated-communities.de/>, accessed on 14.07.2009.

in the last twenty years in Spain and economic and social changes in Lisbon in the 1990s.<sup>45</sup> Graham and Marvin argue that gated communities appeared in Jakarta because of the escape of upper and middle classes from urban areas, regarded to be dangerous (Graham and Marvin, 2001: 276).

Locked doors and homes, gated and secure communities for all age and income groups, the surveillance of public spaces and security systems, all remind us that we have “enemy inside” (Bauman, 1998: 48). Blakely and Snyder argue that contemporary shopping malls, public buildings and plazas and parks with security cameras, convention centres and hotels, skyways and tunnels which allow tourists and downtown workers to pass without setting a foot on the urban space are parts of the process which led to the emergence of gated communities (Blakely and Snyder, 1997: 28). The search for security which affects almost every social group is described as:

We think of affluent people and mini-mansions in exclusive enclaves, but we don't think about the multifamily, higher density, lower-income residents also being in that type of developments.<sup>46</sup> (Sanchez, in El Nasser, 2002)

Similar to these depictions of contemporary urban space, Atkinson and Flint go beyond the gates and argue that gated communities in Britain are only one aspect of a wider application of seclusion and shielding (Atkinson and Flint, 2004). They argue that there are three elements of contemporary seclusion. The first element consists of “territories” in which people reside segregated by the new forms of protection such as CCTV. The second element consists of “objectives”, i.e. non-residential places which people visit such as work and leisure places and territories where friends and relatives live. The third element consists of “corridors” i.e. ways of travel in which people protect themselves against outside dangers such as cars, first-class

---

<sup>45</sup> In the workshop “Gated Communities as a Global Phenomenon” held in Hamburg, 1999. <http://www.gated-communities.de/>, accessed on 14.07.2009.

<sup>46</sup> Haya El Nasser, “Gated Communities More Popular, and Not Just For the Rich”, [http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2002-12-15-gated-usat\\_x.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2002-12-15-gated-usat_x.htm) (12.12.2002) accessed on 16.07.2009.

train or air travel, taxis, separate VIP airport lounges or even clothing not to attract attention (Atkinson and Flint, 2004).

Blakely and Snyder (1997) describe three kinds of gated communities in the United States which have various degrees of safety for different social classes such as the upper, middle and lower classes: lifestyle communities, prestige communities and security zone communities. Lifestyle communities provide leisure activities and are separated into three sub groups. The first is retirement community, the second is golf and leisure community and the last is suburban new town. Retirement communities are developments for middle and upper middle class retirees, primarily used as second homes. In golf and leisure communities, golf and tennis clubs are central elements. The new urban town consists of thousands of housing units with residential, commercial, industrial and retail amenities.

Prestige communities are housing developments built for distinction and they enable a secure place in social ranking. They lack the amenities of lifestyle communities and are divided into three sub groups. The first is the enclave for the rich and famous, the second is the developments for the top fifth and the last one is developments for the middle class. The rich and famous communities are the first examples of gated communities in the United States built for celebrities and the very rich, hidden and closed from the outside. The top-fifth and executive communities are built for senior executives, managers, and other successful professionals. They have homogeneous population and controlled access to provide physical and social security. They have specific architectural features such as gatehouses, artificial lakes and natural ones such as ocean and river fronts and woods. There are also communities for the middle class which grow in many places in the United States (Blakely and Snyder, 1997: 39-43).

Lastly, there are security zone communities built in either suburban or urban areas for middle or lower classes. They are also divided into three sub groups: the city perch (in the inner

city), the suburban perch (in the suburbs) and the barricade perch where instead of the whole of the neighbourhood, a few streets are closed (Blakely and Snyder, 1997). Based on Newman's defensible space in which urban crime is reduced with real and symbolic barriers (Blakely and Snyder, 1997: 119), "city perch" has become a new way of protection against dangerous urban areas in the United States and seen in other countries such as "enclosed neighbourhoods" by fences or walls in Johannesburg (Landman and Schonteich, 2002). One important difference of security zone communities is that here gates are erected by the residents of neighbourhoods due to security concerns while gated communities are built by developer companies.

Gated communities provide residents not only with a physical but also psychological protection. The feeling behind the wall is the protection from anxiety from the world beyond them (Lang and Danielsen, 1997: 870). Low argues another psychological factor named as "middle-class status anxiety", of the middle and upper middle classes who think that the living standards of their offspring would be worsening due to neoliberal policies' effects. So, walls and gates provide some sort of protection of class status or distinction and a protected psychology for the middle or upper middle classes (Low, 2003: 21). Similarly, Rivadulla (2007) explains that gated communities provide also class reproduction and its stability in terms of cultural, economic and social capital. Although people who live in gated communities have already accumulated these three forms of capital, they try to maintain their class positions:

These class strategies together with fear are oriented towards introducing certainty and control, in a changing world. The gate guarantees the stability and the security that the open city lacks. In this sense, the move is a strategy of the affluent to cope with the uncertainties and stressors of a changing world. (Rivadulla, 2007: 59)

Similar to worldwide changes, urban life has also been negatively constructed especially in larger metropolises in Turkey as I explained in Chapter 2. Urban areas are now thought to be invaded by immigrant crowds with their inferior culture. Moreover, cities have become associated with the rising levels of crime and environmental problems such as pollution. It is argued that gated communities provide privacy and an individualised life, which

stands in strong contrast to the declining urban life, often depicted as a dangerous and “dirty” place. This process is described as the “demonization of urban centre” (Alver, 2007: 120). Escape from the dangerous, crowded and polluted city has become one of the major reasons to move to gated communities (Alver, 2007; Ayata, 2002; Isik and Pinarcioglu, 2005; Oncu, 1999; Perouse and Danis, 2005; Senyapili, 2003; Tuna, 2005). In this aspect, gated communities provide a safe environment (Ayata, 2002; Bali, 2004; Oncu, 1999; Senyapili, 2003; Tuna, 2005) “for the children” (Ayata, 2002; Danis, 2001; Perouse and Danis, 2005).

One piece of research which depicts strong contradiction between urban and suburban areas is Ayata’s analysis of Koru Sitesi in Ankara (Ayata, 2002). He explains that the middle classes regard suburban areas as symbolic of escape from the city thought to be a chaotic, densely populated and disordered jungle. On the contrary, suburbia provides an ordered life for them (Ayata, 2002: 29). So, upper and middle classes can live in safety, as described in the Bulletin of Kemer Country, one of the leading gated communities in Istanbul:

...We should do everything in order to protect Kemer Country from any possibility of invasion from city. It is not enough to create a civilised neighbourhood. The real skill is to protect it. (Bartu, 2002: 86)

However, as I explained in Chapter 2, safety means something beyond crime and fear of crime for Istanbul. The fear of an earthquake that would erase Istanbul from the map is an example of “ecology of fear” (Davis, 1999). As I explained in Chapter 2, the urban myth of a future earthquake was described in one of the popular novels, titled as “One Day, Night...” Kirikkanat, the writer, describes a potential Istanbul earthquake, which would not only lead to the destruction of Turkish Republic and her invasion by the American and European powers, but also to the invasion of the rich by the poor. In the novel, the rich became invaded by the mass that had always been isolated by the rich. In the novel the rich locked themselves in order to protect from outsiders’ attack and theft (Kirikkanat, 2003: 110).



### 3.3 A SUBURBAN PHENOMENON

In Turkey and Istanbul gated communities cannot be understood without analysing suburban development since the 1980s. As explained by Perouse and Danis, there are three important sources of gated communities in Turkey: summer resorts across Marmora and Black Sea, closed housing developments built for high-ranked army officers and cooperative housing which started in the 1930s (Perouse and Danis, 2005: 95). Dundar and Ozcan also explain that gated communities in Turkey can be regarded as the continuation of summer resorts across Western and Southern Anatolian coasts walled-off from the outside (Dundar and Ozcan, 2003). For Isik and Pinarcioglu there are two previous examples of gated communities in Istanbul. Together with the cooperative housing, the first is those developments near financial centres built for a limited population (Isik and Pinarcioglu, 2005: 146). Perouse and Danis also add that besides the axis between Ulus and Etiler on the European side there were also similar examples on the Anatolian side (Perouse and Danis, 2005: 95).<sup>47</sup> The second example was that of large scale housing developments built on the hills of Bosphorus and later expanded towards suburban areas with views of forests, sea or lake (Isik and Pinarcioglu, 2005: 146).

Kurtulus (2005a) divides the suburbanisation in Istanbul into three stages. The first stage was a limited suburbanisation which took place in the 19<sup>th</sup> century for the upper classes such as elites of military or bureaucrats, rich artisans, tradesmen and farm owners, in the form of summer or holiday resorts. Kurtulus argues that suburbanisation in Istanbul during the 19<sup>th</sup> century was related to the increase in capital accumulation based on trade and commercial agricultural farms (Kurtulus, 2005a: 83). The reason for this limited suburbanisation was related to the short lived commercial capital which was not able to generate an industrial city similar to the Western examples (Kurtulus, 2005a: 84).

---

<sup>47</sup> See Chapter 1 for the map of Istanbul.

The second stage was the spontaneous suburbanisation initiated by illegal immigrants in the 1940s in the urban fringes known as “gecekondu” (squatter housing) in the Turkish literature (Kurtulus, 2005a). Although it was illegal, squatter housing was permitted by governments, because it was regarded to shelter the immigrants which became the workers of developing industrial sectors. In this respect, squatter housing was not regarded as an urban problem (Ekinci, 1995; Erman, 2001; Kongar, 1998; Kurtulus, 2005a). In this stage of suburbanisation another form of housing was summer resorts which were transformed into permanent housing over the years (Kurtulus, 2005a: 85). For instance, the Marmora seaside became full of summer resorts which later were transformed into permanent houses (Perouse and Danis, 2005: 95).

However, for Kurtulus the third stage which started in the 1980s has been different from earlier suburbanisation. She describes it as the synthesis of suburbanisation for the middle classes which took place in the United States in the post Second World War era with the construction of mass housing projects and of suburbanisation for the new upper classes with the construction of gated communities. The new form of suburbanisation can be regarded as a way of capital accumulation which reflects the differentiation within classes. There are three factors behind suburban expansion in the 1980s in Istanbul (Kurtulus, 2005a: 86). The first was the opening of privately owned farm lands for construction. The second was the economic, political and legal adjustments which provided public and private financial institutions to support large urban investment projects (Kurtulus, 2005a:86) such as the Mass Housing Administration and the Mass Housing Fund (public financial institutions) and public banks such as the Real Estate Bank of Turkish Republic (Kurtulus, 2005a: 89).

However, Isik and Pinarcioglu warn that although it aimed to provide credits to build cooperative housing for middle income groups, the credits of the Mass Housing Fund went to upper income groups. Together with increasing private car ownership, this ended in the

decentralisation of urban space, public offices, education centres and shopping malls. Another development was the proliferation of summer resorts on the seaside for middle income groups in such a way that between 1984 and 1989, one third of the mass housing fund went to the construction of such second homes. Since the mid-1980s the rush for cooperative housing furthered environmental degradation and opened urban peripheral zones for construction (Isik and Pinarcioglu, 2005: 136).

The third factor behind suburbanisation was the relation between capital and power elites which became crucial in the decision making process (Kurtulus, 2005a: 86). As explained in Chapter 2, in this period cities and local political actors acquired independence from central governments. The abolition of the “Istanbul Bureau of Housing Plan” signalled the end of large-scale urban planning which had previously protected northern forestry lands, clean water basins and the Bosphorus from construction (Ekinci, 1994; Sonmez, 1996). The reforms in local administrations led to the establishment of town municipalities in suburban areas (Inal Cekic and Gezici, 2005; Perouse and Danis, 2005). Town municipalities became important actors in urban politics, which started to operate independently from Greater Metropolitan Municipalities and facilitated the construction of new housing complexes (Inal Cekic and Gezici, 2005; Perouse and Danis, 2005: 97). They also opened suburban lands for construction especially in the regions such as Beykoz, Umraniye and Buyukcekmece far from central governments (Perouse and Danis, 2005).<sup>48</sup>

Another effect of politics over suburban developments has been to facilitate passenger transportation such as the opening of Fatih Sultan Mehmet Bridge over Bosphorus and the opening of TEM Highway in 1989 (Perouse and Danis, 2005: 97).<sup>49</sup> Developer companies prefer cheap lands in suburban areas as well as proximity to other developments and/ or to business centres, infrastructure, and accessibility to main transportation axis (Inal Cekic and

---

<sup>48</sup> See Chapter 1 for the geographical map of Istanbul.

<sup>49</sup> See Chapter 1 for the map of Istanbul.

Gezici, 2005) as well as the availability of vast lands and the proximity to natural resources such as forests (Baycan Levent and Gulumser, 2004). These legal arrangements allowed Istanbul's expansion towards Northern forestry lands, Southwest region and Umraniye and Omerli Dam region, purchased by big developer companies (Perouse and Danis, 2005; Sonmez, 1996: 78).<sup>50</sup> Perouse and Danis argue that after the introduction of large capital into the housing market in suburban lands for luxurious housing developments, smaller companies that had worked as subcontractor for big construction companies built smaller housing developments in the same region. Big and smaller companies form a local construction network against local administrations to solve problems regarding ownership of lands or bringing certain infrastructure to that region (Perouse and Danis, 2005: 102).

In the last years there has also been a growing interest towards the supply side of the housing market of gated communities. Baycan Levent and Gulumser argue that there are five main builders, such as cooperatives, Mass Housing Administration, local governments supported by the Mass Housing Administration, private developers and the Real Estate Bank of Turkish Republic (Baycan Levent and Gulumser, 2004). They also argue that there is not a clear cut differentiation between developer, investor and constructor. They explain that developer companies build gated communities to protect property values, to become brands and reliable names in the housing market and create a customer portfolio by marketing a property as more exclusive. In their research, 14 out of 22 developer companies stated to build gated communities for residential, industrial, retail and office purposes (Baycan Levent and Gulumser, 2005). According to the results, the main reason to build a gated community is demand of customers for prestige (86.4 %) while security is less important as stated by 77.3 % of companies. 50 % of companies state that they invest in the housing sector because of the

---

<sup>50</sup> See Chapter 1 for the map of Istanbul.

demand in the market, while 18.2 % state that their reputation and their initiative to take risk are other factors (Baycan Levent and Gulumser, 2005).

### **3.4 A COMMUNITY LIFE**

Blakely and Snyder (1997) argue that community depends on sharing a territory, experiences or interactions, traditions, institutions, goals or purposes and political or economic structures. There are five important elements of a community. The first is a shared territory which consists of historical names, housing type, subdivision names, walls, and gates. The second consists of shared values such as racial/ethnic background, income level/class, religion, history and traditional celebrations. The third is shared public space which consists of public parks, open space, streets and sidewalks and private subdivision facilities. The fourth consists of shared support structures such as voluntary community organisations, charitable and recreational activities, churches, and professional management. And lastly, there is shared destiny, represented by civic associations, voluntary neighbourhood groups, CC&Rs (covenants, conditions and restrictions) and homeowner associations (Blakely and Snyder, 1997: 33).

These characteristics of a community are being created in gated communities in spatial and social aspects. As example, brochures of gated communities are composed of words to create a sense of community such as “new communities in a city”, “a totally new way of life”, “an old community setting”, or “your new hometown” (Blakely and Snyder, 1997: 18). This gives residents a sense of belonging in the world otherwise full of strangers, dangers, crime and violence, or more likely, the fear of crime. In this aspect, gated communities might be regarded as “cultural enclaves” which provide a community life as in the example of gated communities in Riyadh built for Western professionals (Glasze and Alkhayyal, 2002: 324) or fellow professionals in Britain (Atkinson and Flint, 2004: 11) or similar age groups of retired people,

such as the retirement community in Scotland where residents should be over 45 years old and without children.<sup>51</sup> Rivadulla in her research in gated communities in Montevideo, Uruguay argues that participants share same “lifestyle tastes” as an important aspect of cultural capital; that they all enjoy the suburban life i.e. taste for golf and other sports:

That gives them a sense of belonging to a particular group of the upper middle classes. (Rivadulla, 2007: 53)

Dundar and Ozcan argue that the aim to construct a community life has been an important factor behind gated communities in Turkey (Dundar and Ozcan, 2003). Community characteristics of gated communities in Turkey can go back to the “cooperative housing” constructed by the partnership of people working in the same sector such as doctors, army officers and journalists. The residents in gated communities prefer to live with “culturally similar neighbours”<sup>52</sup> or with “secular and Westernised elite” (Genis, 2007: 783) or with people who share “similar values”.<sup>53</sup> Community characteristic of these developments is depicted as a “secular lifestyle” which is not only established by the homogeneity of the population (in terms of age and class) but by also possessing secular values and a group identity in opposition to the Islamist middle classes, which live in separate parts of the same city (Ayata, 2002: 30). Bali also gives the example of Kemer Country which consists of homogenous population in terms of occupation such that 33% of the residents’ occupation is textile, 17% of them are businessmen in industrial sector, and the rest 50% of them work in law, and medicine or they are foreign managers. Kemer Country has also a Jewish community such that approximately one third of homeowners are Jewish (Bali, 2004: 118).

From these examples it is understood that the community life is established by sharing similar values or cultural background, which indicates that coming from the same socio-economic group is not sufficient to create a community life. Bali states that in order to have a

---

<sup>51</sup> Julie Bindel, *Guardian Saturday: Family*, 8 April 2006.

<sup>52</sup> Enis Tayman, “En Beyaz Turkler: Kuzeyliler”, *Tempo Magazine*, March, 2004.

<sup>53</sup> Korkut Tuna, in Aysegul Akyarli, “100 Kisiden Ikisi Villada Yasiyor”, *Hurriyet Emlak*, 7 April 2005.

homogenous group, residents of the community have the right to exclude those whom they do not like (Bali, 2004: 118). Similarly in a study on Kemer Country, Genis explains that potential residents should pass a strict process of application through which their educational and occupational backgrounds as well as their cultural and social capital are evaluated besides their income level (Genis, 2007: 784). The creators of Optimum Houses in Istanbul explain the inconsistency between income and culture so that there is little in common between neighbours who pay the same amount of money (for a house) (Bali, 2004: 119). In another research study conducted in Konya, Alver finds that the residents want to put certain restrictions for those with insufficient cultural and/or symbolic capital which can be understood by social norms such as the respect towards other people and to general rules of the community as well as education level (Alver, 2007: 189). The respect towards other people is regarded as “civility” in Ayata’s research on Koru Sitesi in Ankara (2002) in which residents do have self-respect and respect for other peoples’ privacy (Ayata, 2002: 30). Ayata also argues that the community can be defined by what it excludes, such as city life, vulgar mixture of lower classes, the new rich and the Islamists (Ayata, 2002: 30). This research has a gender lens, which states that women are the bearers of cultural capital who decide on consumption habits to differentiate their households from the rest, while men are the bearers of economic capital who earn money. Similarly, Genis states that residents in Kemer Country differentiate themselves from the new Islamic middle classes and the “nouveaux rich” (Genis, 2007: 785).

The feeling of belonging which has been lost with the disappearance of old neighbourhood life in Istanbul can be re-discovered in these new settlements (Bali, 2004: 117) searching for neighbourhood life, social activities and a safe place for their children (Bartu, 2002: 85). They are sold by keywords as “neighbourhood”, “neighbourhood citizenship”, “a sense of belonging, an example of a new civil society” (Bartu, 2002: 84). For Ayata if it consists of a homogenous group, the relations within a community might be closer than the

relations with the outside which have often been described as conflicting and/or distant. Ayata also argues that in a culturally homogenous community, especially older full-time housewives can establish good neighbour relationships on the basis of community based activities ranging from tennis playing to walking, from cycling tours to cinema, from bridge parties to mutual home visits (Ayata, 2002). It is stated that relations might also be established through children as well as cultural activities (Ayata, 2002: 31; Genis, 2007: 790).

### **3.5 “MICRO-GOVERNMENTS”<sup>54</sup>**

Blakely and Snyder argue that despite being marketed to provide a sense of community, gated communities can also lead to apathy, conflict and lack of participation towards the outside due to the strictly regulated life (Blakely and Snyder, 1997: 35). Although home owner associations (HOAs) have “an institutional structure that serves as a pseudo-government and a mechanism for participation and communication”, this creates only a “commodified” community based on property ownership rather than social relations (Blakely and Snyder, 1997: 34). This structure is established through certain legal and administrative organisations such as HOAs (homeowner associations), CIDs (common interest developments), RCAs (residential community associations), and PUDs (planned unit developments) which control and regulate life in these developments. The increase in the number of HOA (homeowner association), CID (common interest development), gated communities and insular lifestyles is called “homegrown revolution” (Soja, 2000: 312).

This brings also the debate of privatisation of public space which creates “tourists in the city” who have little attention towards and less relation with the outside (Ozkan and Kozaman, 2006: 4). The apathy towards the outside such as less financial support for public space (Soja, 2000: 318) might result in an empty and worsening material quality of public space such as

---

<sup>54</sup> Lang and Danielsen, 1997: 871.



unpaved sidewalks which makes walking a difficult and unpleasant activity for pedestrians (Caldeira, 2000: 310). Also Atkinson and Flint argue that gated communities in Britain have small contact with nearby neighbourhoods and as stated by a community police officer, gated communities do not bring any social or economic benefits (Atkinson and Flint, 2004). However, although gated communities are conceived as excluded and distinct places, they do not create any hostility among neighbouring residents. Rather, Atkinson and Flint argue that neighbouring residents consider gated communities with resignation, neutrality and a lack of knowledge. The residents of gated communities are regarded to be physically and socially isolated from local area, a situation described by a planner as “lord of the manor syndrome”. Atkinson and Flint also argue that people who live in gated communities do not use local shops or leisure facilities, although there is a limited number of residents who use local shops and moreover in one case some residents visit a nearby public house used by neighbouring communities (Atkinson and Flint, 2004).

McKenzie (1994) defines gated communities as the examples of privatisation and combines the words “private” and “utopias” to define gated communities as “privatopias”. However, he adds that although gated communities go back to the Garden Cities of Ebenezer Howard, their dominant ideology is privatism, while property rights and property values of community life are based on homogeneity, exclusiveness and even exclusion (McKenzie, 1994). This also means privatisation of amenities rather than receiving public services from local governments. Examples of privatisation can range from private streets with burglar alarms, electronic gates for highly affluent groups in Buckinghamshire (Graham and Marvin, 2001) to fortress cities with walls, restricted entry points with guard posts, private and public police services, and even privatised road-ways (Soja, 2000: 313). An extreme example of segregation comes from Latin America with private cemeteries as the ultimate example of socio-spatial separation after death (Coy and Pohler, 2002: 367). Another form of privatisation

is the privatisation of former public buildings as in the example of Lambeth where an ex-school building is occupied while in another case an old public building has now been “closed to the public” (Atkinson and Flint, 2004).<sup>55</sup> Gated communities are regarded to provide basic goods and services more efficiently than governments (Low, 2003: 20) and have their own customised utility, streets, and telecommunications and even transport services (Graham and Marvin, 2001: 271). So, gated communities are described as “micro-governments” (Lang and Danielsen, 1997: 871) or “local pseudo-governments” (Blakely and Snyder, 1997: 24), which rival local governments and regarded as an institutional evolution and a new form of territorial organisation or new institutional reform (Webster, Glazse and Frantz, 2002).

Similar to the worldwide literature, gated communities in Turkey have been described as “self-sufficient small towns” (Bali, 2004: 115) which provide a “closed-circuit” life<sup>56</sup> with a variety of amenities<sup>57</sup> including fitness centres, cinemas, restaurants and clubs (Bali, 2004: 115). They are also described as “independent mini municipalities” isolated from local municipalities (Cinar, Cizmecci and Koksall, 2006: 7). Graham and Marvin also add that in the West suburban lands of Istanbul, these kinds of settlements have their own infrastructure such as telecommunication links, water, and sanitation and energy networks. They are designed as a small American village with their private buses, utilities and services, private security and surveillance systems, electronic shopping facility, sports, health and entertainment facilities and schools (Graham and Marvin, 2001: 277).

Technology has also become a crucial factor to sell these kinds of settlements called by Bali as “web-style life” (Bali, 2004: 120) to describe Alkent 2000 in Istanbul. This depiction is very similar to the “electronic cottage” which is open to the global world while closed to nearby neighbourhoods (Graham and Marvin, 2003: 222). In this aspect, Oktay describes these developments as “rich ghettos” built to meet various social and cultural services ranging from

---

<sup>55</sup> I will explain how the privatisation of suburban lands will lead to the dispossession of the locals, see Chapter 4.

<sup>56</sup> Korkut Tuna, in Aysegul Akyarli, “100 Kisiden Ikisi Villada Yasiyor”, Hurriyet Emlak, 7 April 2005.

<sup>57</sup> Enis Tayman, “En Beyaz Turkler: Kuzeyliler”, Tempo Magazine, March, 2004.

cinemas to shopping malls, from restaurants to swimming pools and to saunas. They do not leave any need to establish relations with the outside life. Oktay also includes Etiler Sarikonaklar which has underground roads for cars, the ability to watch the entrances to the community and flats by CCTVs and to connect heating, lighting and alarm systems through a computer (Oktay, 2002: 50-51).

Regarding organisational and legal framework, gated communities in Turkey can be described as “micro-governments” for providing facilities, and regarded to be the examples of private governance. They are regarded to be commodified, professional and efficiently-run ready-made communities due to strict rules of conduct and because of being built by developer companies, instead of the personal initiatives of residents, such as the cooperative housing in Turkey.<sup>58</sup> They are also run by different actors on behalf of residents, such as service provision companies, professional managers and homeowner councils. In terms of internal governance, gated communities are the reflections of privatisation of local politics and erosion of central planning. While in terms of internal governance, there are strict rules of conduct put by developer companies; ironically, gated communities are the results of a liberal period when local political actors started to act independently from central governance (nation states).<sup>59</sup>

However and interestingly, this commodified governance is the reflection of the demand of residents, as the new middle classes emerged in this liberal period, who request a more “ordered” life in contrast to “urban jungle” as stated in the research of Ayata on Koru Sitesi (2002), where the residents put strong contrast between a chaotic urban life and an ordered suburban life. To a larger extent, the internal organisational framework of gated communities in Turkey is the reflection of the demand of the upper/upper middle classes

---

<sup>58</sup> The differences between gated communities and cooperative housing in Turkey are not interest of this chapter. However, it should be noted here that there are differences in terms of property ownership (the ownership of flats/houses vs. shares of land) and in terms of internal governance (gated communities are a new form of institution with more efficient rules of conduct and professional management).

<sup>59</sup> See Chapter 2 section 2.4 “The New Urban Space” which explains how cities re-gained an important role in global economic processes and how urban and local political actors started to act independently from nation states.

aiming rules on the basis of their lifestyles.<sup>60</sup> Gated communities go back to cooperative housing started in the 1930s by the initiatives of people working in the same sector or people who live in the same city or town. As I explained in section 3.4 “A Community Life”, gated communities are also reflections of traditional communities based on common cultural, educational or professional backgrounds. In this aspect, gated communities are similar to cooperative housing. So, gated communities contain the characteristics of commodified communities (as packaged or ready-made communities) and traditional communities (cooperatives).<sup>61</sup>

### **3.6 WHO LIVES THERE?**

As I explained in the section “A Community Life”, residents’ profile of gated communities is regarded to be similar in the literature of Turkey, especially in terms of income, education, marital status and profession. As examples, gated communities target those people who have accumulated wealth since the 1980s such as business men, managers who were working in private sector, or those working in stock market (Bali, 2004: 111), and young couples which consist of high-ranked managers or self-employed people (Bali, 2004: 112), or upper middle or upper income groups which mostly consist of professionals between 35-45 years old, especially those working in finance sector (Bartu, 2002: 85) and those families between 35-45 years old with children (Perouse and Danis, 2005: 111). Since in most of the literature gated communities are regarded as a part of suburban development, family-centeredness is also mentioned in the literature (Alver, 2007; Ayata, 2002; Danis, 2001). Ayata states that the suburb represents both a home and family-centred place, based on the division

---

<sup>60</sup> See Chapter 2 sub-section 2.5.1 “Tensions in Istanbul: The Entrapment of Elites”, how urban and secular Istanbulites have withdrawn from public space, regarded to be invaded by black crowds.

<sup>61</sup> See Chapter 3 section 3.8 “Research Questions”, which explains how gated communities are purchased via traditional community ties and Chapter 5, section 5.2 “Residents and Local Populations”, which explains that both Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba, despite being run by professional companies and managers, are the reflections of communities, based on professional ties.

between home and work (Ayata, 2002: 31). Danis argues also that Bahcesehir (as well as other similar suburban developments) are suitable for rearing children. Another point which makes gated communities attractive for parents are educational institutions (Danis, 2001: 154-155). Bahcesehir has playschools and sport facilities as well as different educational institutions for almost every age (primary schools, a high school and a private university) (Danis, 2001: 155). Gated communities are generally regarded to provide safe environments for children as stated by one of the residents in Bahcesehir:

This place seems to be the studio of the Truman Show. I liked it very much because my children are small and when I go to bed they can tell me that they would go to cinema and I let them go without hesitation. (Danis, 2001: 155)

The advertisements of gated communities target families with children and ask “Where would you like to raise your biggest investment?” (An ad. of Arkeon houses) (Perouse and Danis, 2005: 111).

Although demographic characteristics of residents are homogenous, several researchers have also argued that residents’ profile might be quite heterogeneous especially in terms of cultural background of residents. For instance, Ayata points to the importance of cultural capital which affects taste in consumption, such as home decoration and clothes in order to differentiate themselves from groups who are:

With new money, the Islamist middle class and the lower middle classes, all of whom are seen as a poorly endowed with cultural capital. (Ayata, 2002: 36)

Some researchers demonstrate significant cultural differences inside the same community (Danis, 2001) and between different communities (Kurtulus, 2005b). Danis argues that while the residents’ profile in Bahcesehir is quite homogenous in terms of demographic characteristics, it can be heterogeneous in terms of the cultural background of residents (Danis, 2001). She argues that there is difference between white collar professionals coming from an Istanbul family and those who occupy with textile and work in manufacturing sector coming from Anatolia. Danis argues that these two groups differ in terms of education, social origin,

income level, housing style and lifestyle. So, despite of coming from the same socio-economic status, people might be in conflict because of different cultural backgrounds (Danis, 2001: 158). Cultural differentiation also affects the reason to choose Bahcesehir to live in. While businessmen from Anatolian origin live in Bahcesehir to show their consumer choices such as villas, automobiles and brand names, high-educated and high-waged managers from Istanbul prefer to live in Bahcesehir to escape from the deteriorating living conditions of the city (Danis, 2001).

Kurtulus argues that Bahcesehir consists of a variety of people coming from different cultural backgrounds. Residents explain disregard toward low culture of those people who engage in illegal activities by also adding that cultural differences are more important than economic ones (Kurtulus, 2005a: 107). Kurtulus states that in Bahcesehir there are differences between people on the basis of education, profession, culture, income level and the sources of income such as the difference between easy money and deserved income (Kurtulus, 2005a: 103). So, class and cultural fragmentation in Turkey since the 1980s led to a more fragmented social structure visible even inside the same gated community. An analysis of gated communities also requires consideration of these differences. In the next section I will show how people search for “distinction” by living in a gated community, each of which has become status symbol of a specific social group.

### ***3.6.1 Status and Distinction***

Webster, Glazse and Frantz (2002) argue that although socio-economic factors can explain the internationalisation of gated communities and why they emerged in a specific period, they cannot explain regional differentiation and the reasons why gated communities have expanded through non-elite housing markets. The writers explain this fact with the changing tastes and values due to the impact of Western tastes on local elites “as well as the emergence of indigenous gated housing markets with their own locally constructed rationales”

(Webster, Glazse and Frantz, 2002: 318). In Turkey, the search for status and distinction has been another factor which led people to move to gated communities, beyond socio-economic factors and increasing crime rates. Bali argues that the display of the self through body and a unique house became important as in the examples of Kemer Country, Optimum Houses, Alarko 2000 and Istanbul Istanbul in the peripheral zones of Istanbul (Bali, 2004). Gated communities provide “status” and “distinction” (Bali, 2004; Dundar and Ozcan, 2003) for the upper middle and/or upper classes (Bartu, 2002) which has a more practical meaning, rather than a symbolic one (Dundar and Ozcan, 2003), as described:

....These people have been purchasing an added value summarised as “a world of distinctions” which could not be held by hand and could not be seen by eyes. (Bali, 2004: 115)

This symbolic meaning has been crystallised in the “myth of the ideal house” which was introduced by global advertisement companies (Oncu, 1999: 29) and shaped by magazines (Ayata, 2002; Bali, 2004). Oncu explains that the “myth of the ideal house” is depicted in advertisements as “outside of Istanbul but close to it”, “reachable by car in a few minutes”, “includes a variety of comforts such as parking space, playschool, and sports facilities”. The most luxurious ones have also golf facilities and airports (Oncu, 1999: 30). This shows the change in the sign of status which was an apartment flat in the past. However, a detached house in suburban areas has replaced it (Oncu, 1999), as described in one of the interviews in Tempo Magazine:

The most definite answer comes from a resident who lives in Acarkent<sup>62</sup>: I’ve purchased a new life, instead of a home.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> I eliminated the name of the resident due to ethical concerns.

<sup>63</sup> Enis Tayman, “En Beyaz Turkler: Kuzeyliler”, Tempo Magazine, March, 2004.

### 3.7 DIFFERENT FORMS OF GATED COMMUNITIES

In the literature gated communities in Turkey are mostly categorised on the basis of spatial, unit type, land use, socio-economic/ class and status differences. An example for spatial categorisation is Cinar, Cizmeci and Koksals's research who argue that there are two kinds of gated communities. The first are residences built in the city. Residences along Buyukdere Maslak axis and Sisli Mecidiyekoy are described as "closed worlds" isolated from urban life and named as "towers of prestige". As I explained in Chapter 2, residences target mostly singles or newly-wed couples without children and businessmen. The second are large-scale gated communities built at the periphery with social and sports facilities and recreation areas accessible only to the residents of those communities (Cinar, Cizmeci and Koksals, 2006).

An example for categorisation on the basis of unit type and land use is of Baycan Levent and Gulumser's research who argue that there are four kinds of gated communities in Istanbul: firstly, vertical gated developments known as "residences", secondly, horizontal gated developments which are mostly built in peripheral zones targeting families with children and upper or upper middle classes and consisting of villas, thirdly, semi-horizontal ones in urban and suburban lands, and fourthly, mixed type gated developments (or "town gated communities") which are a type of new towns or "satellite city" built for different classes in peripheral zones consisting of more than one housing type (Baycan Levent and Gulumser, 2004).

However, most of the literature in Turkey configures gated communities as the reflection of class differentiation over urban space (Bali, 2004; Isik and Pinarcioglu, 2005; Oncu, 1999; Senyapili, 2003). As an example, Oncu argues that there are two kinds of gated communities. The first is "Garden cities" built for middle and upper middle classes, which reflects the wish of upper classes to live in a safe and clean environment. The second is "sites" built for middle and lower middle classes, which consist of apartment blocks and differentiate



on the basis of their cost, size, and interior design. The symbolic meaning to move in this kind of housing depends on the social origins of residents (Oncu, 1999: 33).

As I stated previously, gated communities have become the symbols of different social groups in Turkey. Kurtulus categorises gated communities into three on the basis of the status of residents (Kurtulus, 2005b). The first are those developments such as Bahcesehir built for the new middle classes with amenities. The second are built for “the new rich” such as Acarkent, which consists of villas and apartment blocks as a way to increase their cultural capital through safe investments and conspicuous consumption (Kurtulus, 2005b: 170). The third are more closed developments, which provide spatial belonging such as Kemer Country and Beykoz Konaklari. Instead of establishing their own education and health services, they associate with leading education and health institutions or open branches of these institutions.

However, I argue that these categories are oversimplifying the process of choosing a gated community based on mutually-exclusive factors, which excludes other factors which operate in a mutually-inclusive way. I propose a different way of examining gated communities through the interplay between different factors such as space (as distance and as the overall plan of the gated community), time, demographic characteristics (age, gender, marital status, working life, having children), plural distinctions (economic and cultural capital) and affiliations (professional, religious and ethnic ties) of residents.

### **3.8 RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

In Chapter 1, I stated that my main objective was to locate gated communities in a broader framework, instead of analysing only one case which can fail to understand gated communities because of its limited scope. Gated communities are represented with conflicting meanings in everyday life as well as in the academia. In order to understand gated communities a broader perspective should be adopted. In this research I explore social relations established

with different groups. Firstly, I examine relations established with the local people who live in nearby villages/ towns. I ask “Do gated communities really represent a situation of no-relation with the outside?” or “Are gated communities parts of the urban context?” I explore the inside and the outside of gated communities and locate them in Istanbul to question whether they are isolated developments which increase urban fragmentation or they are parts of city which cannot isolate their residents from the urban problems as argued by Kazmaoglu (2003). Related to that, one interest of this thesis is the change brought by those communities to nearby settings. In most of the literature gated communities are regarded to further urban fragmentation and have no or limited relations with the outside (Alver, 2007; Atkinson and Flint, 2004).

Secondly, I examine relations established inside these communities as well as everyday life. For instance, gated communities are purchased by already-established social networks (Alver, 2007; Bali, 2004) or by the impact of “friend group pressure” based on “face to face propaganda”, personal knowledge and group behaviour based on the opinions of relatives and friends about how life is organised in gated communities (Janoschka and Borsdorf, 2006: 105). People choose gated communities on the basis of their affiliation (religious, ethnic or professional), in order to live in the same community, without the need of much-analysed but unnecessary advertisements in this aspect, which have been regarded as the ways of marketing gated communities for the new middle classes. Developer companies design gated communities according to the niches in the housing market and they have certain social networks to attract target groups. How do residents establish relations inside gated communities? The kinds of “symbolic boundaries” (Lamont, 1992: 4) they use to become familiar with others inside the community is worth exploring. How do they perceive themselves and other residents? I also examine the differences between social relations in their previous residences and the new one. For this purpose I use Lamont’s “symbolic boundaries” (1992) and Bourdieu’s “symbolical

capital” (1984) and by establishing the missing link between the two, I argue that a symbolic boundary should be “symbolically accepted capital” to function in a social context.

Thirdly, I also explore relations established with other gated communities in the same region, in order to understand the reasons to prefer to live in a specific gated community. I will show how a community is formed in the making against the others by defending the community while “class” returns back in the form of morality. By doing this, I contribute to Lamont’s theory of “symbolic boundaries”. Related to that, another reason to conduct a comparative research study is differences between gated communities which I dwelled on too much from the beginning of the research. I ask whether gated communities really contain homogenous groups of residents as depicted in Tempo Magazine (2004) “The Whitest Turks are the Northerners” which includes “White Turks”, a very debatable cultural concept in Turkish public opinion. Although residents in gated communities were homogenous in terms of demographic characteristics, I ask whether there have been any differences and similarities between them.

Gated communities are preferred by different social groups. I will show that those who live in Istanbul Istanbul are different from those who live in Kasaba in terms of class or cultural differences. I will analyse how gated communities are the representations of different groups and locate them in a broader context by focusing on the thoroughly-analysed “distinction” of these developments across Istanbul. For instance, Oncu argues that owning an “ideal house” has become the new symbol of status (Oncu, 1999). Some gated communities are preferred because of being regarded as signs of status which provide distinction for the owner of the house (Bali, 2004; Bartu, 2002; Kurtulus, 2005b). They are the signs of distinction from the rest, a distinction not only labelled by high walls or guards and the gates, but also by the sign values (Baudrillard, 1983) carried by these houses.

However, this distinction shows also the divisions within the upper class, besides ever growing conflict on urban space between social groups. In Turkey there are writers and/or academics who analyse the increasing conflict between the old and the new wealth (Arolat, 2003; Bali, 2004, Danis, 2001; Kurtulus, 2005b; Perouse and Danis, 2005). An important contribution of gated communities' literature in Turkey is the introduction of cultural differences in order to categorise gated communities and understand the differentiation and conflict within the upper class. It is argued that the distinction is established between gated communities and the rest (Alver, 2007; Ayata, 2002; Danis, 2001; Perouse and Danis, 2005), between different gated communities (Kurtulus, 2005b) and inside the same gated community (Danis, 2001; Perouse and Danis, 2005) which shows that cultural differences have become crucial to differentiate a person from the rest.

As example, Ayata's case study on Koru Sitesi (2002) analyses a homogenous group which stands in contrast to the rising Islamist middle classes, extreme nationalists and vulgar lower classes. However, Ayata does not consider nearby gated communities or differentiation and conflict within the same community. This research does not also locate gated communities in a larger framework. As I explained in the introduction, how gated communities (although not homogenous) are located across Istanbul in terms of cultural differentiation is one of the questions which this thesis looks to answer. Also Kurtulus (2005a, b) does not conduct an ethnography based on residents' lives and does not propose a theoretical framework. Both Danis (2001) and Kurtulus (2005a, b) do not examine the differentiation with the outside world such as other communities or nearby villages. They do not locate gated communities in larger framework, i.e. in the urban context. For this purpose, I locate gated communities in Istanbul, to understand their distinction which will provide a general framework about cultural differentiation. I analyse gated communities through their physical layouts, architecture, and target groups. I do not only examine different factors to choose a specific gated community, but

also examine how residents establish relations and perceive others in different situations. I argue that “distinction” (Bourdieu, 1984) is not provided ready-made for the residents, instead, it is a process embedded in everyday life and social relations.

I explained in the sub-section “Status and Distinction” that gated communities have become status symbols for upper or upper middle classes. In order to understand how these status symbols are created, I examine spatial features of gated communities and the ways in which gated communities are rendered original in the process of design. However, while gated communities can be regarded as “simulations” which imitate other examples in foreign countries or old neighbourhoods of Istanbul, on the basis of residents’ accounts, I argue that the sign value of these houses is founded in their usefulness and exchangeability in the housing market, rather than being “signs of distinctions” as described in the literature. Against Baudrillard who argues that use value is the same for all, I will show that use-value makes a difference in a different cultural context.

Lastly, I am also interested in security aspects of gated communities, in a period of “security-obsessed urbanism” (Soja, 2000: 303). Istanbul has become a dangerous city, in social and physical aspects such as increasing crime, social tension as well as air pollution and over-population. At first, I explore how Istanbul is described by the residents in Istanbul and Kasaba with the accounts of increasing crime, the threat of a future earthquake which is now regarded as a dangerous city for children. Secondly, I explore how security is enabled spatially and socially in gated communities. One way is ready-made security provided by the community itself. However, residents also provide security by neighbourly relations, a neglected dimension in the literature. Thirdly, I also explore new insecurities to show that gated communities do not create totally safe places, but also create new dangers. I examine residents’ concerns about local populations which reflect class, religious and gender differences, how spatial layout of a gated community renders it to be protected from the gaze of the “other” and

longer commuting distance to Istanbul which makes travel more dangerous. There are also insecurities inside gated communities, a similar situation of Bauman's "enemy inside" (1998: 48).

Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba are among recent examples of gated communities which have emerged in the context of the 1980s and differ in this aspect from previous examples of socio-spatial segregation. These two examples can be regarded as "niches" in the housing market (Webster, 2002). Both communities have appeared in the interplay between the rise of the new middle classes and Istanbul's suburban expansion since the 1980s by the help of legal arrangements which have transformed villages of Gokturk and Omerli into town municipalities. They have restricted access in which public space is privatised (Blakely and Snyder, 1997) and operate like micro-governments (Lang and Danielsen, 1997) with amenities provided by the community itself. Another reason to choose these two cases is to analyse two previously not-studied examples in the Turkish literature, by contrast with popular examples such as Kemer Country, Acarkent and Beykoz Konaklari, which have often been analysed by researchers and frequently discussed in the media. I chose these two communities also because it was easier for me to get access, stated as a common problem when researching gated communities (Kurtulus, 2005b) and more generally, upper classes (Nader, 1972). To choose gated communities built by the same developer company also allowed me to include the supply side of the process to understand the operations of the developer company in Istanbul. I examine how developer companies establish networks at the managerial level and how the same developer company shapes the same region by building different gated communities.

### 3.9 METHODS

I conduct a sociological analysis of these two gated communities in Istanbul in order to complete the deficient points of the existing literature in Turkey. By doing this, I also aim to differ methodologically from the Turkish literature based on mostly single case studies or analyses of urban fragmentation focused in two cities, Istanbul (Bali, 2004; Bartu, 2002; Danis, 2001; Genis, 2007; Kurtulus 2005a, b; Oncu, 1999) and Ankara (Ayata, 2002; Dundar and Ozcan, 2003; Senyapili, 2003), respectively the biggest city and the capital city of Turkey. Gated communities in Turkey are mostly regarded as suburban developments for the new middle, upper middle or upper classes (Ayata, 2002; Bali, 2004; Bartu, 2002; Danis, 2001; Dundar and Ozcan, 2003; Kurtulus 2005a, b; Perouse and Danis, 2005; Senyapili, 2003, Simsek, 2005). Interest has started in smaller cities such as Alver's study on two gated communities in Konya (Alver, 2007) which is the first research on gated communities in smaller cities in Anatolia.<sup>64</sup> Another important focus is on the supply side in the housing market, i.e. developer companies (Inal Cekic and Gezici, 2005; Baycan Levent and Gulumser, 2004). I aim to integrate these efforts into a much-comprehensive work, by analysing gated communities' interaction with their surroundings.

There are a few studies on gated communities which examine them in a larger context. There are studies which focus on gated communities in different countries such as Glasze and Alkhayyal's research on Lebanon and Riyadh (2002), Landman and Schonteich's research on South Africa and Brazil (2002) and Blandy, Dixon, Dupuis and Parsons' research on England and New Zealand which examines the differences between two countries in terms of external regulatory environment and internal governance (2006), Wehrhahn and Raposo's study on Portugal and Spain which examines the reasons to move to gated communities (2006). Jurgens and Gnad's study on gated communities in Johannesburg is based on the analysis of two

---

<sup>64</sup> Konya is a city in Central Anatolia.

communities built by the same developer company in order to minimise the access problems (2002). However, their main aim was to find whether gated communities are built for the white population and whether they can be categorised under the main categorisation of Blakely and Snyder (1997). Also Low provides an extensive ethnography on gated communities conducted in eight years in the United States (2003) in which she also compares gated communities in Mexico and the United States and in New York and Texas where residents have different political opinions. Wilson-Doenges compares two gated and non-gated communities of high and low income levels, to analyse the sense of community, perceived personal safety, perceived comparative community safety and actual crime data (2000).

Also there are a few studies which go out of gated communities and examine their interaction with the outside world, such as the studies of Salcedo and Torres (2004) in Santiago, Chile who argue that gated communities interact with their outside, against the “LA School”. They argue that while the LA School regards gated communities negatively as isolating developments, Sabatini et al. regard them as a “positive phenomenon in the context of the city of Santiago” (Salcedo and Torres, 2004:28).<sup>65</sup> Another work is Giroir’s study on Beijing who has a wider framework to analyse gated communities as “club systems”, although this is limited for the use of the upper class which narrows the network in suburban areas. Instead of being isolated entities, Giroir (2003) argues that gated communities are parts of a larger club system in the region, which goes “beyond the scale of simple local micro-case study”.<sup>66</sup> However, Giroir examines gated communities in Beijing only associated with upper class clubs such as international schools and recreation facilities such as golf courses and horse-riding clubs. Also Le Goix argues that gated communities consist of public and private partnership, rather than being isolated and autonomous developments. He argues that when

---

<sup>65</sup> In a later article published in 2007, Sabatini and Salcedo adopt a more “nondeterministic” approach towards gated communities by adding that this benevolent view is not to be generalised to other parts. So, they have changed their “benevolent” view of gated communities towards a more non-deterministic view.

<sup>66</sup> <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/sps/cnrpapersword/gated/giroir.pdf>, accessed on 06.07.2008.



gated communities lack certain services or do not have enough money, they tend to attract public services inside the community to reduce costs (2006). He adds that this led to the increase of real estate property value and spatial segregation.

In contrast to these few worldwide efforts, comparative studies are still absent in the Turkish literature. The only example is Alver's study published in 2007 which analyses two gated communities in Konya. However, this study is far from providing a comparison of two communities, rather it seems as an ethnography conducted only in one case in a very short period of time and superficially. Although Alver argues that the anti-urban discourse is one of the leading factors behind gated communities (Alver, 2007: 199), two gated communities in Konya examined by Alver are built near the city centre. Another problem is that although Alver states that the two cases are chosen because of being "the most salient examples", he does not explain any further criteria to clarify why he chose the two communities (Alver, 2007: 139).

In this study I adopt a qualitative approach, because my research questions are exploratory, descriptive and explanatory. I want participants to talk for themselves with their own words, explanations and conceptualisations. Silverman argues that qualitative research is interested in peoples' understandings and interactions (Silverman, 2005: 9). My questions are based on the opinions and meanings of participants, their own words and language which contradicts the aim of the quantitative approach mostly based on the counting of opinions or people (Gaskell, 2000: 41) and emphasises words rather than quantification in the collection and analysis of data (Bryman, 2004: 20). Bryman also argues that the qualitative approach adopts an inductive methodology in which values and categories emerge during the research process and social reality is constructed by participants, rather than the researcher (Bryman, 2004: 20) which means that theory emerges from fieldwork experience and is grounded in the data (Patton, 1990: 85). Inductive methodology offers flexibility to the researcher to carry on the research in the light of data as stated by Miller (2001) so that he could develop a chapter in

his PhD thesis when he discovered that the impact of the media was more influential in the experience of enclave than he anticipated (Miller 2001: 67). Another advantage of the unstructured nature of qualitative enquiry is its flexibility so the researcher can change direction in the course of his/her observation more easily than in quantitative research (Bryman, 2004: 283). Therefore, for me to adopt a qualitative approach was more suitable due to the research questions and more importantly, due to the difficulty of studying gated communities because of access problems.

Since gated communities are represented in a dichotomised way in different sources as I explained in Chapter 1, I collect different forms of data from different sources which are useful to understand such a debatable concept. For this purpose, I conducted fifty-four semi-structured in-depth interviews with three groups of participants.<sup>67</sup> In order to protect the anonymity of the participants, I coded their names with the letter “P” and numbered them as “P1”, “P2” which refers to “participant one”, “participant two”.<sup>68</sup> By this way, it is also easy to follow a participant throughout different chapters. Firstly, I conducted twenty eight interviews with residents<sup>69</sup> in Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba, based on snowball sampling, due to the difficulty of obtaining access. However, during the field work I contacted different gatekeepers in order to increase the variety of participants in the research. This meant that I conducted interviews with people from different backgrounds with varied lifestyles and aspirations. Even though this research is not based on randomly selected participants, the demographic characteristics of the participants show some similarity with what I take to be the overall characteristics of Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba. According to the information I gathered from relevant officers in 2006, the population of Istanbul Istanbul is between 612 and 816 (3-4 heads per household). The

---

<sup>67</sup> For the question schedule of the research see Appendix 1.

<sup>68</sup> I use the term “participant”, which shows the importance of the participants’ role in the research rather than the term “informant” which in my view, gives a more passive role to the participant. The use of the term “participant” brings also the role of the participants into focus especially at a period when the distance between researcher and the “object” of the research is said to decrease (Barnes, 1979; Cahill, Sultana and Pain, 2007).

<sup>69</sup> For the pilot study in the summer of 2005, I also conducted 3 interviews with residents who were living in different gated communities in Istanbul.

average age is 35. While the average education level is university, income level is stated to be A+ and B+. For Kasaba, according to the information I gathered from relevant officers in 2006, the population is 1,100 (approximately). The average number in a household is 4. The average age of household is 45. Average income level is described as “high level” and the average education level is university.<sup>70</sup>

In Istanbul Istanbul, I interviewed 14 people of whom 11 were female and the rest were male who were between 35-45 years old with small children. They mostly described their household income level as “upper-middle” or “middle”. Most of them were university graduates. In Kasaba, I interviewed 14 participants all were women, except one, who was a son of a resident whom I had already interviewed. So, I talked to two people in the same household, but since he was from a younger generation he told a lot about a young person’s views about living in a gated community. The residents in Kasaba had a higher average age than those in Istanbul Istanbul and with a household income mostly described as “high”. Although they were mothers with small children, I also interviewed women whose children had already left home. Most of the participants in Kasaba were university graduates. While 25 % of houses in Kasaba were used as temporary residences, interestingly I had the chance to interview several women who were living in Kasaba on a temporary basis. The interviews in both communities took between twenty minutes to two hours depending how much time participants could give for that interview. Most of the interviews were conducted at homes. I went to the offices of two residents in Kasaba because they were working and did not have time.<sup>71</sup>

For the residents, I had 31 questions which had been altered during the pilot study in the summer of 2005. For instance, the question about the average income of household which was stated as a problem in the literature (Kurtulus, 2005a: 111) was criticised by some residents. I

---

<sup>70</sup> See Appendix 1 for an explanation of the demographic characteristics of the residents in the two communities.

<sup>71</sup> During the summer of 2005 when I was doing pilot study, I conducted one interview in Istanbul Istanbul and one in Kasaba. The questions were different from those I asked in my fieldwork in the summer of 2006. However, since they provided me valuable information I added these residents into the first group of participants.

changed this question into a more flexible one by offering residents three ranks: upper, upper middle or middle income groups in order to make them more comfortable about stating their income level. Another way to refine questions was to turn toward the literature and read similar studies. Two studies, one from the United States and the other from Turkey were influential in this respect. The first is Low's (2003) research who conducted a fieldwork of eight years in gated communities in the United States. The second is Kurtulus' research on Bahcesehir (2005a) in Istanbul.

Although I have similar question schedules with two studies, I included the personal history of the participant in the first part of the interview in order to open up the discussion. I also included questions about transportation and activities and services provided by the community. Daily shopping practices were one of my interests in order to learn about their interactions with local populations. Another interest of mine was about the nature of social relations established with the staff who were working in these communities. Since life in gated communities is generally regarded as being heavily regulated, another question I asked is whether they could intervene during the construction process or whether they ever changed the decoration or construction of the house. A very important theme I investigated was the relations with different groups, such as local populations and municipalities, inside the same community and with other gated communities.

Secondly, I conducted 15 interviews with experts such as urban planners and experts of real estate sector, architects and academics in order to have a wider perspective about gated communities in Istanbul. My main aim was to learn from them information about Istanbul's real estate sector, the future of Istanbul, who lives in gated communities, differences between them and the reasons to live in a gated community. Although I tried to keep the same schedule, questions were adapted according to the profession and interests of the participant. Thirdly, I also conducted 11 interviews with people who had first-hand knowledge about Istanbul

Istanbul and Kasaba such as managers of developer companies, local governors and the locals in Gokturk and Omerli. These interviews were completed mostly during the summer of 2006 to have detailed information about the two communities. They took between forty five minutes and one and a half hours. I used almost the same question schedule that I used for other experts; however, I changed some questions or added extra ones to gather more information on the expert's area of interest. For example, when I interviewed a member of Association of Beautification and Protection of Gokturk Province, I also included questions regarding the activities of that association.

I also collected documents such as official statistics provided by the State Institute of Statistics and documents of the two communities and other statistical information provided by relevant officers. Demographic information of Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba is provided from officers in order to have information about income, age, and occupational structure of households. To collect this information, I emailed a list of questions to the staff working in the two communities after the interviews. Besides these, I also collected the real estate supplement (Hurriyet Emlak) published by the Hurriyet newspaper between 2005 and 2007. On my visit to Omerli and Gokturk, I also investigated their histories to learn about their transformation into municipalities over time, once villages located in forestry lands in Northern Istanbul. I also used visual materials such as photographs taken during the visits in the field as well as brochures, advertisements, web sites and maps of the two communities.<sup>72</sup> I collected brochures, one of Kasaba and the other one of Istanbul Istanbul and another one about Istanbul Istanbul's MIPIM 2002 award. I have also two advertisements of Istanbul Istanbul; one was published in Art Décor magazine in its May 1999 issue and the other was published in Maison Française in its June 2002 issue. I have one advertisement of Kasaba, published in Maison Française magazine in its October 2000 issue. In order to study other housing developments constructed

---

<sup>72</sup> Unless otherwise stated, the photos in this thesis are taken by me during the fieldwork in summers of 2005, 2006 and 2007.

by Koray Construction, I also collected brochures of Evidea, Istanbul Zen, and Istanbul Bis. I also have the brochures about Omerli and Gokturk provided by the staff at municipalities.<sup>73</sup>

## CONCLUSION

In this chapter, following the theoretical framework of Istanbul's transformation since the 1980s, I reviewed the literature on gated communities with a specific focus on Turkey. I began from the historical examples of social segregation drawing on the separation between enclaves and ghettos (Miller, 2001). The rise of suburbia since the 19<sup>th</sup> century can be regarded as an enclave which has become the reflection of upper classes' wish to escape from cities, which were degraded due to industrialisation and increasing population because of the mass immigration. The first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century gave way to mass suburbanisation which continued after the Second World War. The first examples of gated communities were "Leisure World" and country clubs in the United States which were followed by golf courses in the 1980s (Blakely and Snyder, 1997). Although there are different terms and meanings to describe gated communities, they are mostly regarded as housing developments closed to the rest with their own security systems and amenities.

Gated communities in Turkey are known to have emerged since the 1980s in suburban lands for the new middle or upper middle classes especially in big metropolises like Istanbul and Ankara. The main reasons are socio-economic changes which led to the increasing income polarisation between classes and search for security. In this respect, gated communities are only one aspect of the search for a safer life, besides the general tendency of transforming the city into a safe shield by different measures of security (Blakely and Snyder, 1997: 28). Gated communities provide also psychological protection (Lang and Danielsen, 1997: 870), called as

---

<sup>73</sup> For this research I also used resources in Turkish. Starting from the first chapter, I translated quotations from academic as well as non-academic resources, such as newspapers, virtual material (web pages of Koray Group of Companies and two communities, of the municipalities of Gokturk and Omerli) and visual material (advertisements and brochures).

“middle class status anxiety” due to the effect of neoliberal policies (Low, 2003: 21). Also in Turkey, together with the increasing polarisation, middle and upper middle classes escaped from cities regarded to be full of crime and environmental problems. However, in Istanbul safety also means to escape from a future earthquake which would erase Istanbul from the maps, an idea which has become widespread after the earthquake in 1999.

Gated communities in Turkey are regarded to be the result of suburban development which goes back to cooperative housing and summer resorts (Perouse and Danis, 2005: 95). However, as Kurtulus explains, suburbanisation which took place since the 1980s led to the emergence of gated communities due to the availability of large lands, legal arrangements to facilitate construction and the introduction of big developer companies into the housing market in Turkey (Kurtulus, 2005a). Gated communities also provide “community” life with rules and regulations (Blakely and Snyder, 1997). The community life is enabled by the homogeneity of the populations which shows the importance of cultural backgrounds of residents which excludes city life, lower classes, the new rich and the Islamists (Ayata, 2002). In this respect, demographic characteristics of residents in gated communities are homogenous which mostly consist of families with children and/or upper/ upper middle classes.

Although gated communities provide a community life inside the gates, they also contribute to the fragmentation of public space and apathy towards the outside. Due to the provision of amenities, they are called “micro-governments” (Lang and Danielsen, 1997: 871) which decrease the likelihood of residents to go out and interact with their surroundings. In terms of organisational and legal framework, gated communities in Turkey go back to cooperative housing, built by the initiatives of people from the same profession or traditional communities on the basis of religious or ethnic ties. However, gated communities are also the examples of more privatised and professional housing developments than cooperative housing, which are run by strict rules of conduct put by developer companies and governed by

professional managers. Gated communities have also emerged in a different period when housing market in Turkey has become more competitive with the introduction of big developer companies. Interestingly, this highly competitive housing market which led to the emergence of gated communities also reflects traditional community ties of residents who demand an ordered life run by strict rules, contrary to a disordered urban life. In this respect, gated communities combine both commodified relations as the result of a highly competitive housing market and traditional community ties as the result of residents from similar cultural (which reflect religious, ethnic or professional ties) backgrounds who demand to live in the same place.

Although the residents' profile of gated communities in Turkey seems similar in terms of income, education, marital status and profession, as Danis (2001) and Kurtulus (2005a, b) explain, there are also cultural differentiations. In this sense, gated communities are regarded as status symbols for upper classes or upper middle classes described as the "myth of the ideal house" (Oncu, 1999: 27) created in advertisements which reflect the competition within upper classes indicating the importance of cultural differentiation between and inside gated communities. In most of the literature in Turkey, gated communities in Turkey are categorised on the basis of spatial, unit type and land use, socio-economic, class, and status differences. However, I think these categories oversimplify the process of choosing a gated community. I will provide a more mutually-inclusive categorisation based on space, time, demographic characteristics, affiliation and plural distinctions of residents.

Lastly, I also discussed main research interests of this thesis: firstly, relations and networks established inside and outside of Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba, and economic, political and cultural changes brought by gated communities to nearby towns as well as operations of developer companies which change the same suburban neighbourhood. Secondly, as the literature in Turkey shows, since gated communities show the divisions within the upper class, I am also interested in the competition between these groups and how this is reflected on



the preference for gated communities, as the term “White Turks” shows. Thirdly, the competition between “imaginary communities” created in the process of desing and “real communities” lived by the residents, which shows how developer companies build “niches” in the housing market for different target groups. Fourthly, security which has become one of the most important issues about Istanbul regarded as a city of fear. In the end of the Chapter, I explained my main methods of investigation. For this purpose I chose to conduct a research study about Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba built in different locations of Istanbul by the same developer company based on semi-structured in-depth interviews with residents and experts from various sectors.

From now on, I examine the data from the field work to explain my main interest in this thesis: firstly, economic, political and cultural changes in suburban areas due to the introduction of gated communities which also reflect a multi-dimensional change involving different local actors, secondly, boundary formation and community making in everyday life in Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba which contribute to the debates of cultural fragmentation in Turkey, thirdly, spatial features of gated communities and the competition on space which shows the difference between the “myth of the ideal house” (Oncu, 1999) created in the process of design by architects and developer companies and “real communities” lived by residents and lastly, multiplicities of security as being one of the most important themes about gated communities.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### A TALE OF TWO VILLAGES: GOKTURK AND OMERLI

#### INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, I examine the transformation of Gokturk and Omerli where Istanbul and Kasaba are located respectively, over the last few years, from villages into town municipalities due to the impact of big developer companies which shifted their attention towards suburban lands. In this chapter, I open the questions I discussed in the last section of Chapter 3 and argue that despite the claim of being isolated entities, gated communities establish relations with the outside. By analysing Gokturk and Omerli's different suburban histories, I show interdependencies between different actors, such as developer companies, local municipalities, and residents of gated communities and local populations which produce spatial, economic, political and cultural changes. Not only gated communities influence their surroundings, but as I show, also residents in gated communities have been influenced by the local people and the "rural life".

#### 4.1 A SYMBIOTIC RELATION

In this section I explain economic changes brought by the proliferation of gated communities in suburban lands in Istanbul which have experienced a transformation "from villages into town municipalities", as expressed in the web pages and brochures of Gokturk and Omerli municipalities. Gated communities have brought two kinds of population increase. The first is the increase in the population in gated communities.<sup>74</sup> The second is the increase in the population of towns/ villages nearby gated communities. A local in Gokturk explained that:

---

<sup>74</sup> One resident in Istanbul explained that there were several residents who returned to Istanbul (P8). However, a local in Gokturk added that although there were those who left Istanbul, these houses were never left empty due to the continuous demand (P47).

“Yes, I know Gokturk’s situation when it was a village of 120 units. Now it has 20,000 housing units...Yes, only the number of units. However, this is the total number of all housing units completed and uncompleted ones...No, I do not count Kemberburgaz in this number. I only count Gokturk. There are 20,000 housing units only in Gokturk, all together with completed and uncompleted projects.” (P41)

The increase in local populations is related to the economic opportunities brought by gated communities. In the literature there are few studies which explain economic impact of gated communities on local towns/villages, described as the “boom” in Osceola County (mega malls, hotels) with large convention centres (Ross, 2000: 285) or themed entertainment centre which include branches of national chain restaurants, bars, stores, and clubs attracting teenage tourist clientele (Ross, 2000: 293). This can also lead to social integration and advantages to poorer residents such as jobs, improved public services and a sense of pride among lower class residents in Santiago, Chile that might create “functional integration” in terms of power and money (Sabatini and Salcedo, 2007: 577). Economic change can lead to the arrival of new infrastructure, job opportunities and domestic jobs, as well as increased land prices (Salcedo and Torres, 2004). By that way, poor residents, called “pobladores”, have experienced a transition from a rural into a modern lifestyle (Salcedo and Torres, 2004).

In Turkey, more specifically, Esen explains that after the earthquake in 1999, Gokturk has been transformed into a boom town where big and small companies construct different gated communities. By that way, Gokturk has become a “land of opportunities” for everyone (Esen, 2007). Rieniets also explains that despite socio-economic and cultural differences between residents of gated communities and local population in Gokturk, there are beneficial relations between these two actors. While residents can have access to low-qualified workers, the local population can have the opportunity to work as gardeners and security staff (2007).

Similarly, several experts also stated that gated communities brought job opportunities to local towns. They explained that local municipalities are pleased with this situation, because gated communities brought changes to towns/villages in terms of new and

wider roads, cinemas, banks, supermarkets, shopping malls, hospitals, better infrastructure and schools. An expert in the construction sector also explained that local populations found the opportunity to sell the vegetables and fruits they grew to the residents of gated communities (P53). This was also mentioned by several residents in Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba, who regarded this as a chance or “distinction” because of being able to eat locally-grown vegetables rather than “artificially” grown ones in the city.

A member of the Gokturk Municipality explained that gated communities brought developments such as telephone, water, electricity, drainage services as well as shopping malls, bank branches and restaurant chains (P46). Omerli has also experienced an economic change. Kasaba was regarded as the pioneer development which has changed Omerli:

“The first thing which comes to mind when Omerli is mentioned is Kasaba. It has created surplus value to its surroundings including even the petrol station. As I’ve said before, it created employment here. In the construction sector... When the construction starts, it will create employment for 600 people. Hardware, grocery, tailor, painter all of them have experienced an increase in sales and profits. There are shuttle services. This means an economic activity, a surplus value in terms of economics. At least it led to the increase in housing prices, because of Kasaba.” (P32)

Residents in both communities explained that they were using local shops and big supermarkets in nearby town and Istanbul. All of the residents in Istanbul Istanbul, except one, explained that they were using large supermarkets in Gokturk and again, except one they also used the local shops. They also stated a contrast between when they first moved there and now when they could find everything in Gokturk easily. Some of them described this situation as “the development of the region” so that they did not need to go to Istanbul for shopping. Several residents explained job opportunities for men as working in construction and for women as domestic workers.

Similar to Istanbul Istanbul, all of the residents in Kasaba used both local shops and larger supermarkets in Istanbul or nearby towns. However, while in Istanbul Istanbul residents

explained little economic impact upon the local population; this was mentioned by the residents in Kasaba with a stronger emphasis. They described this situation with the comments such as:

“Lots of jobs emerged for women.” (P15)

“Profit for Omerli population...” (P16)

“Job potential since the introduction of Kasaba... Job opportunities, while women have become domestic workers, men have become gardeners and security staff.” (P19)

“The women who clean our homes live in Omerli.” (P21)

“They come for cleaning.” (P22)

“(These communities) made a contribution to the region which did not have any opportunity to be developed.” (P23)

“There are those who come to clean houses. Development... Kasaba developed Omerli very much.” (P24)

“I try to do shopping from the locals in order to develop (the local area).” (P25)

“Work force such as gardeners and cleaners.” (P26)

It can be seen that several residents mentioned that they used local shops to support the local population, which was not explained by the residents in Istanbul Istanbul. This was also explained in Alver’s study in Konya, in which one participant used local shops to support the development of the region (Alver, 2007: 166). However, gated communities do not only create new job opportunities for the locals. Locals also sold off their lands. As explained by a member of the Gokturk Municipality, those who sold their lands have become impoverished while those who kept their land built flats on their lands:

“There were lands for agriculture and there were those who were occupied with raising livestock. Of course the young generation is not interested in doing these jobs. Older generations are tired of doing these while their children pursue education. They say “I cannot do these”. They are not interested in animals or tending livestock. Why, because of being educated in Istanbul so they are more comfortable. They escape these kinds of “heavy” occupations. Because of that reason, lots of land and fields were passed into somebody else’ hands...” (P46)

In the brochure of Gokturk this situation was explained in more detail. It is written that since younger generation of the local people left, the elderly sold their land off since 1986

to private construction companies. Residents in both communities regarded themselves as “invaders” of the lands of the locals. Two residents in Istanbul Istanbul explained the difference between them and the local population as:

“The locals of Bodrum versus the outsiders...” (P2)

“There won’t be any land left for local tradesmen. We can already see that they will be shooed away towards the back. Very soon, I expect. Markets will be demolished. The school will definitely disappear from its plot. Definitely, because the land is very expensive... They will build another gated community there. I am very sure about this.” (P3)

Omerli has experienced the same transformation. One resident explained that the land of Kasaba had belonged to local villagers. However, they sold these lands to big companies and could not cultivate them. Now, they could not grow anything and they have become unemployed. She explained that the locals were complaining about this situation by saying “we sold everything”. She said that they lost their jobs, because Omerli was not an industrial town and these people were not used to work for someone else. Because of that, she added that the biggest problem in Omerli was unemployment. There were not any factories and the younger generation was looking for jobs. Working in the city was hard because of the difficulty of commuting from Omerli to Istanbul. However, she also explained that there emerged lots of job opportunities in Kasaba such as security staff, electrician, nanny and domestic worker (P15). Another resident explained that these lands were owned by the locals. She said that although there were lots of women who came to Kasaba to work as domestic workers and men as cleaners and security staff, this situation “was hurting (offending) the locals” (P19).

The situation of the local populations shows another form of capital accumulation, called by Harvey “accumulation by dispossession”.<sup>75</sup> Harvey argues that neoliberal *capitalism*<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup> Dispossession is mostly associated with the gentrification process which leads to the exclusion of certain social groups from urban space. For a detailed explanation of gentrification see Chapter 2, section 2.4 “The New Urban Space”. Also Rivadulla (2007: 60) sees a similarity between gentrification and gated communities in terms of succession, displacement or invasion. However, she writes “this has the potential to displace older poorer residents”. On the contrary, I show the actual dispossession.

has been successful in generating profit (Harvey, 2005: 164). He explains that speculative urban property markets have become the major source of capital accumulation (2005: 157).<sup>77</sup> As I explained in Chapter 2, urban rent has become the major driver behind the transformation of urban spaces which has resulted in great profits. However, Harvey by arguing “accumulation by dispossession” adds another dimension to this process: by doing this, capitalism returns to its “basics”, i.e. as Marx argued long ago, capitalism uses primitive and original accumulation practices, as it did during the rise of capitalism (Harvey, 2005: 159). By this term, Harvey means:

...Commodification and privatisation of lands and forceful expulsion of various forms of property rights which led a transfer of common, collective or state property into “exclusive” private property rights. (Harvey, 2005: 159)<sup>78</sup>

He gives the examples of the lower classes in Britain, who have experienced a displacement from their social housing due to the increase in value caused by the speculative land markets, the privatisation of “ejidos” in Mexico during the 1990s which resulted in forceful immigration of Mexican peasantry towards the big cities and the displacement of at least 350,000 families in China due to urban renewal projects and the lower and even middle income classes in New York who were displaced for upper class and commercial uses of their properties (Harvey, 2005: 164).<sup>79</sup>

---

An interesting example comes from China, where due to the effect of a socialist past, farmers act as monopolistic collective landowners and deal with developer companies to benefit from economic progress (Webster, Wu and Zhao, 2006: 165). Also Salcedo and Torres’ account of Santiago, Chile shows that land prices have increased due to the speculative land markets which are regarded as potential profits for the poor population (Salcedo and Torres, 2004). In another article, Sabatini and Salcedo (2007) explain that gated communities in Chile do not always lead to the land clearance from the hands of the poor, because land fragmentation in Chile prevents developer companies to buy these lands.

<sup>76</sup> I wrote this in italic, in order to show the link between neoliberalism and capitalism, which is not being shown in most of the contemporary academic writings. However, neoliberalism is another stage in capitalist accumulation. Nowadays, there is a new “fashion” in the media and academia: there is criticism of neoliberalism, to show this as the only responsible culprit. However, in these criticisms, there is a lack (consciously or unconsciously done) of showing the link between these two facts.

<sup>77</sup> See Chapter 2 for how urban rent has become the major driver in changing Istanbul’s spatial form.

<sup>78</sup> Besides the gentrification process and the dispossession of the local peasantry, I also add another category: establishing new “free states” under the rule of great master, The Capital, by dispossessing underdeveloped countries of the Third World.

<sup>79</sup> The greatest dispossession of all, I think is the dispossession of animals who have been taken from their “wild” lands and forests. They have become dispossessed and at the same time, possessed by the “Man”, the greatest vice

Both residents in Kasaba used the same criteria: locals lost their lands and were regretful about this situation but at the same time, they have found new job opportunities. So, local populations have experienced dispossession while at the same time they have become the new service workers in their own lands. This outcome might seem to be against the claim that gated communities have increased the availability of jobs in nearby town or villages. Rather, the dispossession might lead to the impoverishment of the locals who sold their lands so they have become dependent on the new service jobs. It also shows a psychological “defeat” of these locals who can feel as “unwanted”; as told by a resident in Kasaba this situation “was hurting (offending) them” (P19) or as explained by another resident in Kasaba that ““the locals were telling “we sold everything”” and they are not “used to work for someone else” (P15). This might also show that since these locals do not know anything other than agriculture, they have become impoverished.

However, suburban change in Gokturk and Omerli was not same for all the locals. There were also those who benefited from suburban development, as explained by a member of Gokturk municipality:

“The value of the lands of the locals has increased. It is impossible to find land for construction. This impoverishes the local population of this region. Those who sold their lands have become definitely impoverished. However, those who did not sell their lands, built flats so this has created employment. They earned money, they transformed this into earning. In Gokturk there has emerged a commercial logic in everything. So, people communicate with each other.” (P46)

A real estate expert mentioned that the locals sold their land instead of cultivating them and abandoned these lands to housing developments. She added:

“So they gain by this way. This is good in economic terms.” (P44)

---

of all time (I use “Man” as the single form of human regardless of gender, ethnicity, religious and national differences). This process has been experiencing in all over the world, without any exception. However, animals and plants the real owners and tenants of this world, are still alive in the names of these places. But if you ask animals and plants, as “are you the true owner of these lands” they might think that this is an insult. Maybe, in the language of Nature there is no ownership.



This shows that the suburban change in Gokturk and Omerli is not a one-dimensional change which leads to the overall impoverishment or dispossession of the locals, but it reflects a more heterogeneous one. This also shows that the locals do not consist of a homogenous population, but of a more diverse one which reflects class, ethnic and moreover, as stated by several residents in Istanbul Istanbul, “hemsehrilik” differences (those who come from the same city or town and in the case of Gokturk, from several cities of the Black Sea Region of Turkey). So, suburban change in Gokturk and Omerli might also reflect the existing conflicts between the locals as well as it might also alter these conflicts or carry these factions into other directions.

This also shows the importance of urban rent as one of the most important forms of accumulation since the 1980s in Turkey (Oncu, 1988; Sonmez, 1996), so that not only some locals but also some residents benefited from it, due to the increasing land or real estate prices. A local in Gokturk explained that several residents in Istanbul Istanbul also bought flats in different housing developments in Gokturk built by Koray Construction:

“I know also the construction process. Residents ask whether a third phase will be constructed or if Istanbul Istanbul will buy land to build another community. So people are happy here. They ask. There are other communities built by Istanbul Istanbul, such as Istanbul Zen and Bis in Gokturk. They bought houses in these communities. So they are glad in terms of the company.”(P34)

This shows another dimension of economic change for these residents who benefit from suburban progress. Similarly, residents also stated the importance of “rent” value of these houses. Having a house built by a big construction company provides residents exchangeability in the housing market.<sup>80</sup> A resident in Istanbul Istanbul explained that they foresaw that Gokturk would be developed to have a rent value in the future (P12). Several experts also stated that residents in Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba opened new small-scale businesses in nearby towns. A local in Gokturk explained that:

---

<sup>80</sup> See Chapter 6 section 6.2 “Real Communities” which explains that “functional distinctions” are the priority of residents in Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba.

“Since the construction of gated communities begun, lots of shopping malls have been opened. Including lots of homeowners in this community, everyone opened a shop.” (P34)

Also local municipalities benefit from this suburban change. As an example, local municipalities are dependent on gated communities for the political benefits i.e. “vote potential” coming from gated communities, which is mentioned by a real estate expert (P38). This vote potential has an indirect effect on economic benefit, in the form of “rent”. Two locals, one in Omerli and the other in Gokturk explained that:

“However, permission for construction was stopped in Omerli. A certain number of houses will be built, but no more. However, in the next elections this situation can be changed. I do not know this.” (P32)

“There is no land. In the future, further villages might gain value (and they also already have value). If the state would open this forest and these lands under the category 2B, so there would be constructions in these lands. So if we regard them as real estates, these lands would gain more value in the next five years.” (P34)

Local municipalities are also dependent on gated communities due to tax revenues. For example, a real estate expert said that gated communities would pay real estate tax, garbage tax and other fees in return for municipal services (P38). However, tax revenues are disregarded because of political benefits, as explained by a local in Gokturk so that in some districts in Istanbul, most of the houses did not have construction permits. He said that people only paid tax on the land occupied by their houses, because local municipalities did not impose any penalty because of the worry of losing votes in the next elections (P47).

However, local municipalities are not always dependent on gated communities. Gated communities are also dependent on local municipalities, as explained by an urban planner. Since town municipalities are permanent, administrations of gated communities should establish good relations with them. He added that while administrations took care of all service and maintenance inside gated communities, local municipalities collected garbage outside (P29). This shows that gated communities are dependent on local municipalities to deal with

larger issues in regional management such as traffic or infrastructural problems that I will explain in the section about political changes.

#### ***4.1.1 “Permeable Closeness”: Social and Economic Relations***

However, economic change does not only have an impact on local populations, municipalities and residents, but also on developer companies. As explained by an urban planner, gated communities require shopping malls or supermarkets, technical maintenance, security, cleaning facilities which are run by developer companies. He said that developer companies also built private schools, health institutions, sport centres, shopping malls and they were also responsible for the management of these institutions:

“So if you bring all these together by establishing this organisation to make people to live in this system, you can automatically earn money continuously. You can make this system continuous. Yes, you do a life-long investment, such as establishing fellow-companies, to provide other services or establishing a security company.” (P29)

This quotation shows how the same company establishes a “system” for the residents to live and for the companies to make profit. So, construction allows developer companies to benefit from continuous investment in the form of services related to gated communities. In this context, this urban planner said that services provided by gated communities were not only limited inside their communities, but they opened their doors for clients from nearby gated communities. He described this situation as “permeable closeness”. As a more specific example, a local in Gokturk said that the shopping mall “Neo Mall” in Neovista Houses was being used by residents of other gated communities (P47). This shows another dependency of gated communities as they need to maximise profit and attract “clients” from nearby gated communities.

In this aspect, gated communities are similar to “clubs” as argued by Giroir (2003), which act as upper class territories consisting of international schools and recreative spaces (golf courses, horse-riding clubs). Giroir calls gated communities in Beijing as “golden

ghettos” which lead to the construction of new villas and other forms of “micro-territories” for education or recreation while facilities might also attract the construction of new villa areas. Giroir categorises three different territories for the rich such as international schools and recreative spaces such as golf courses, horse riding clubs and minibus shuttle which enables cohesion of the club system.

He categorises these club systems on the basis of their integration. The first is the quasi integrated systems which consist of a combination of housing and non-housing spaces in a single community, called as “quasi autonomous cell”. Secondly, there are loose systems in which diverse functions are located relatively distant to each other. They consist of large gated communities of luxury villas or polycentric type so that lower dense gated communities appear close to other facilities which can also attract clients from urban areas due to their proximity. Thirdly, elementary systems are those gated communities which do not have any facility and are distant from other examples. Giroir’s representation is quite familiar with the literature in Turkey, in the sense that gated communities in Istanbul are also categorised on the basis of the amenities they provide to the residents (although not in terms of connectivity).<sup>81</sup> For instance, while gated communities across Bosphorus provide very enclosed settings, most of them do not have any facilities. However, gated communities in suburban lands, especially large ones provide various activities such as educational institutions.

Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba are similar to Giroir’s description in certain aspects. For example, in Gokturk there is a private school in the biggest and oldest gated community, Kemer Country which attracts children from other gated communities.<sup>82</sup> Kasaba has also a primary school (Alev Primary School), which is associated with the Association of Austrian College Alumni.

---

<sup>81</sup> See Chapter 3 section 3.5 “Micro-Governments”.

<sup>82</sup> In most of the interviews, Kemer Country was regarded as the pioneer housing development in Istanbul which has started the proliferation of gated communities in Istanbul in general and in Gokturk in particular. Kemer Country Golf Club was another factor which led to the development of Gokturk, as stated by several participants in Gokturk.

## Image Removed

**Fig 4.1.1.1:** Alev Primary School, photo taken from the brochure of Omerli Municipality.

Also a local in Gokturk described the situation in Istanbul Istanbul as:

“Yes, there is a serious demand for this, because people do not want to live in the same place. There is a social club in Istanbul Istanbul “among us”; there is a restaurant and a section which is used as a café and bar. There is also a swimming pool, which is not allowed to be used by those from other gated communities. However, restaurant and bars are used by people from other gated communities. How? Only when they come via their friends in Istanbul Istanbul... So it is not totally open to the public, because security of this place should be ensured.” (P47)

He added that there were lots of people from other communities who came to eat and talk to their friends. Also residents in both communities explained that they used amenities of other gated communities. One resident in Istanbul Istanbul explained that:

“Or different courses I attended... I had the chance to meet several people in Kemer Country due to a course that I attended in Kemer Country. So, you can meet with these people. This depends a little on your vibrations you feel with them.” (P8)

Kasaba is similar. Two residents in Kasaba explained that they were using facilities in different gated communities. One resident explained that since Kasaba was the biggest one, there were people who came to use its facilities (P16). However, being the biggest community does not mean to be self-sufficient. Another resident explained the willingness of sharing facilities with residents from different gated communities, especially when this facility was absent in Kasaba:

“There is Optimum Houses nearby us. I state its name, because they have closed tennis courts. We had the permission to use that facility last year. This year will be made the same. So a common bond would be created, so that they can also use our closed swimming pool.” (P17)

However, the situation in Istanbul in general and in Gokturk and Omerli in particular is different in certain aspects from the “clubs” proposed by Giroir. Firstly, there is the dilemma between “privacy” promised by gated communities and “openness” in order to attract more clients. As an example, a local in Omerli explained that the hairdresser and the supermarket in

Kasaba were open to people from other communities. Also residents in other communities come for tennis or swimming classes. However, he explained that:

“We do not want to be that open. However, Kasaba is open, even at a limited scale.” (P32)

These accounts show the dilemma between capitalistic drive to maximise profit and the claims of gated communities of providing “private” and “individualised” lives for their residents. In this aspect, not only the local population, but also residents of other gated communities are unwanted which can cause discomfort inside gated communities, as in the words of this local in Omerli:

“Besides, if you invite someone from the outside, residents complain: “why did I move here? I paid these fees but this is bothering my privacy.” (P32)

Secondly, while Giroir describes a closed system, gated communities in Gokturk and Omerli do not operate in such a strict manner. There are other informal ways of establishing relations in the same region which can lead to social and economic relations different from “the networks” restricted for upper classes proposed by Giroir. For example, six residents in Istanbul Istanbul explained that they established relations with the residents in other gated communities via their children who attended the same private schools in Gokturk. As in the words of a resident “the school mixes people together” (P13). Although this can be regarded as being similar to Giroir’s account of “networks of educational institutions”, two of them also mentioned that birthday parties or the nannies of their children were other ways of getting to know each other. However, the permanence of these relations is debatable, in the sense that although residents know other people in other communities, they rarely continue this friendship over longer periods. As in the words of a resident in Istanbul Istanbul:

“These people organise activities among themselves while we do the same among us. There are incredible birthday parties here, which are mostly attended by the children of this community. Like fifteen children, while five of them are from the school, ten of them are from here. And the parents of these children... So, those who blend are the same parents. And also the children who go to these schools are the children of the same milieu or this community.” (P8)

Also the relatives or friends who moved to nearby gated communities might lead to the formation of new relations, as explained by two residents. However, as one of them added, she could not find time to meet with her closest friend who was living in the other side of the road (P3). There were three residents who did not have any relations with the outside. While one of them explained that they did not have any children (and who were working as a couple), the other two were older than the average age and at the same time they were not permanent residents of Istanbul Istanbul.<sup>83</sup> One of them said that she moved to Istanbul Istanbul to be close to their grandchildren, while the other one said they escaped from the earthquake and wanted a life more independent from the city.

Residents in Kasaba mentioned similar factors which developed relations with other gated communities. The first factor was their children who attended the same private schools and birthday parties, mentioned by one resident only, due to an important difference of Kasaba from Istanbul Istanbul: since the average age of residents is higher in Kasaba, the likelihood of having children at school age is lower. The importance of “age” in establishing relations with other gated communities (in general) is also mentioned by a resident in Kasaba:

“Young people have friends, but I do not have any.” (P28)

Also their relatives or friends who moved to the same place provided the opportunity to meet and know other people, which were mentioned by six residents in Kasaba. For instance, a resident explained that he knew students who lived in other communities because of attending the same university in Istanbul. Related to this, some residents can also act as “pioneers” in establishing relations and introducing residents to each other. As in the words of a resident “I

---

<sup>83</sup> According to the information provided in 2006, 25% of 286 houses are used as a summer or weekend house in Kasaba. However, according to the information provided in 2006, 195 out of 204 units in Istanbul Istanbul are used as permanent housing while only one unit is used as a summer or weekend housing. Although to live permanently in a place affects a resident’s involvement with the outside, there are also other factors which affect the likelihood to be involved with the outside. As an example, even if Istanbul Istanbul is mostly resided as a permanent gated community, most of the residents stated that they did not establish relations with the outside, due to full-time work and children.

am a bridge here between Kasaba and the local population” (P15). These residents can also become “bridges” between residents of different gated communities. And lastly, the residents who started to run businesses in Omerli establish relations with other residents, which were mentioned by two residents in Kasaba.

## 4.2 COOPERATIVE COMPETITORS

There are also certain political consequences brought on by gated communities. Four experts explained that there was contrast between gated communities and local municipalities which were slow in progress and could not adapt to the regional development brought by gated communities and catch up with their demands. As a more specific example, a researcher described the relations between gated communities and town municipality in Gokturk as “unequal”:

“A very unequal relation... You can witness this situation in Kemberburgaz or Gokturk, where big developer companies built the town hall. There is some sort of a relation. Developer companies are much stronger than local governments. In this sense, there is an unequal relationship. Local municipalities can only effect the development of gated communities in a very marginal sense.” (P50)

Similarly, a local in Gokturk explained that:

“So, (gated communities) started not to receive services from the town municipality, because they have their own technicians, security, and landscape services. In order to meet these needs, they established management companies<sup>84</sup> or hired professional managers.... And they bring every service to their foot. By that way life is easy here. Because of these reasons, these people prefer to live in a gated community. When gated communities came together, Gokturk was formed. The duties of municipality eased off.” (P41)

Several locals and experts described gated communities in Gokturk as:

“Small Istanbul in its own terms...” (P33)

“The Republic of Monaco...” (P41)

“A small European town...” (P42)

---

<sup>84</sup> In terms of management, Istanbul Istanbul has a homeowner’s council which seeks to solve the conflicts between homeowners and executive council/manager and auditors.



“A model town which should be imitated by the rest of Istanbul, examples of local government and a part of civil society, self governing and self deciding model villages, and democratic.” (P46)

Gokturk in this sense was regarded as a “town” in itself, with strong references to the West which show its independence and isolation from the outside. I think the use of the terms “republic”, “own”, “town”, “self” show ownership, independence and isolation from the outside. This also shows a deeper dilemma of gated communities: On the one hand, they provide a regulated life for their residents which can restrict their lives. On the other hand, they are regarded as self-governing towns or villages, independent from local municipalities. The depiction of Gokturk as a “town” is similar to the classical literature in which gated communities are regarded as “micro-governments” (Lang and Danielsen, 1997: 871).

However, Omerli was never described as such. While Gokturk was described with concepts referring to Western values, in Omerli these were absent. While Gokturk as a town and municipality was described as contrasting to gated communities, Omerli was not described as such. However, instead of Omerli, it was Kasaba which was described as a town. A local in Omerli described its managing director as someone who acted as a local governor and added:

“This place is really a town. Because there are technical services, cleaning, garden maintenance, security, generators and waterworks maintenance. There are also pest control, ambulance and services; it has a perfect infrastructure.” (P32)

In this sense, another local in Omerli added that Kasaba should have developed to meet the demands of its residents:

“So, people who live here are from a certain level. They are those who work in companies with a specific institutional identity and know how to run a company. So, Kasaba should develop to meet the demands of these people.” (P49)

With these amenities and maintenance, Kasaba can be regarded as a town in physical aspects. However, Istanbul Istanbul was not described as similar to Kasaba, being a lot smaller

in terms of land and population.<sup>85</sup> Although Kasaba was described as a “town” with all its amenities, residents in Kasaba did not show any conflict with the local municipality and any sign of independence from it. Rather, they defended the local municipality against the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality. They showed an unwillingness to cooperate with the Metropolitan Municipality, due to larger social and political conflict in Turkey.<sup>86</sup> While the local municipality in Omerli is governed by ANAP (“Motherland Party”, a liberal party which was the ruling party in the 1980s)<sup>87</sup>, Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality is governed by AKP (“Justice and Development Party”, the ruling party with right-wing and neo-liberal policies supported by Islamic capital and communities). The residents in Kasaba described the local municipality as:

“The local government is very good. It seems as a good working municipality.” (P16)

“Very good... They protect their public. There is no one in Omerli who is left hungry.” (P19)

“Very good... They prevent construction of illegal housing.” (P21)

“I call municipality. The governor gives too much importance to Kasaba.” (P25)

“It protects Nature. They are against illegal construction. They prevent squatter housing. Mafia has threatened them. When the road was closed because of the snow, they cleaned it.” (P26)

Three residents in Kasaba stated their discomfort with AKP and they defended the local municipality which fought against it. One of them explained that:

“The local government is very good. My preoccupation is that AKP will take over (in the local elections), because I do not support that kind of politics, generally.” (P16)

Another resident praised the local municipality which brought service to the local population:

“ANAP in local government provides nurseries and schools. While people vote AKP for two kilos of wheat bulgur, ANAP brings continuous service.” (P19)

---

<sup>85</sup> See Chapter 6 for how the size and population of Kasaba create a sense of “town” among residents.

<sup>86</sup> See Chapter 2 section 2.5 “Fragmentation of Public Space and Conflicting Istanbul” and sub-section 2.5.1 “Tensions in Istanbul: The Entrapment of Elites”.

<sup>87</sup> At the time when fieldwork was carried, during the summer of 2006.

This points out the difference between the local government which “invests” in long term service and the ruling party (AKP) which instead of bringing service, tries to get votes by helping the poor (and illiterate) people with temporary aid. The quotation “voting for two kilos of wheat bulgur” is a popular expression in Turkey, which reminds of the conflict between the “elites” and the illiterate masses.<sup>88</sup> So, the conflict in Turkey which has shaped political agenda since the 1980s shows the reason why these residents supported local municipality against the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality. Another resident explained that there was conflict with the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality not only because of ideological differences but because of the importance of “rent”:

“However, I am not happy with the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality in general, since we are associated with this. Because there is a different political party in Omerli, so their approach is different. They try to permit mining operations, in such a lovely place. They try to establish an asphalt factory very close to us. These are not good. There are too many vacant lands, and to establish a factory in the midst of the forest seems wrong to me. They try to harass us, honestly. Politically... However, when these lands will be owned by another party, they will earn rent. These lands are so popular, and in Istanbul there are not too many places similar to Omerli. So, there is this kind of conflict, sometimes.” (P18)

By contrast, the cooperation between gated communities and local municipality was weak in Istanbul Istanbul. Residents complained about the local municipality because of the condition of the main road and the generally insufficient infrastructure although local municipality was governed by ANAP.<sup>89</sup> Residents in Istanbul Istanbul described the local municipality and the road as:

“Unsuccessful. Supporters of a Party...” (P2)

“For me local government means the road which is finished and service provided.” (P3)

---

<sup>88</sup> See Chapter 2 sub-section 2.5.1 “Tensions in Istanbul: The Entrapment of Elites”.

<sup>89</sup> However, as explained by a local in Gokturk that the condition of the road is not dependent on the local municipality. Rather, developer companies continue to build housing developments which lead to continuous digging of the road for infrastructure (P41). This result should not also show that residents in Istanbul Istanbul are glad with AKP (Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality). However, they show their strong unhappiness with the local municipality.

“When we moved here there were both water and road problems. There are potholes everywhere. Cars can be broken down. I do not see anything besides work machines. Typical Turkey... Unfinished sidewalks and roads...” (P4)

A member of the Gokturk Municipality explained that the local municipality should have found the “middle ground” between those who wanted everything too fast and those who tolerated every problem in Gokturk (local people). The friction between the two actors might lead to interesting coalitions or conflicts. For instance, a real estate expert explained that managements of gated communities in Gokturk could get in touch with Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality; even if they were unwilling to do so:

“Yes. The same thing happens in terms of local municipalities, because the local municipality cannot meet these kinds of demands and catch up with the mentality of gated communities. However, (gated communities) try to insist on their demands in order to survive. So, there are these kinds of conflicts between local municipalities and gated communities. Then, willingly or unwillingly, gated communities seek cooperation with the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality. I think this is an inevitable (process).” (P44)

Another resident explained the condition of the roads and complained about the local government:

“There was not a normal road here. Children were going to school by walking in the dust. Previously there was not even a normal road. Because of that, even this road is very good now. A good asphalt road... They can plant flowers or they can make the entrance special. We are very unlucky because of the local municipality.” (P12)

In Gokturk, residents came together as a pressure group against the local municipality. As told by a local in Gokturk, homeowners together with the local administrator visited the local mayor to state their demands. One demand is the improvement of the main road which connects gated communities to Gokturk and Istanbul. Both residents in Istanbul and experts stated that they had problems with their cars.<sup>90</sup> One way of acting together is establishing a network through email groups or the internet, as mentioned by residents in

---

<sup>90</sup> See Chapter 3 section 3.3 “A Suburban Phenomenon” in which Perouse and Danis (2005) also explain that even though there is competition between them, developer companies come together against local municipalities to solve local problems and bring infrastructure. However, as I show in this section, there are other forms of cooperation and conflict between different actors.

Istanbul Istanbul. This mail group can act as a pressure group or a communication network about the news in their neighbourhood, as in the words of a resident:

“As far as I know there is an email group. I do not want to give wrong information. Because we receive emails, there is an email group inside the community. There is an email group. It is written that “in the meeting we decided to do that or this”. So, this shows that there are meetings.” (P1)



**Fig 4.2.1:** Istanbul Avenue in Gokturk in the 2006 summer, which connects gated communities to Istanbul. As seen, the continuous road construction caused problems for the residents which led them to be actively involved with local politics through different sources.



**Fig 4.2.2:** One of the secondary roads, near Istanbul Istanbul (in 2006). There is also the construction of another gated community.

Another resident explained that besides mail groups, gated communities also were acting as a pressure group:

“Yes, there is. For example, we come together with MESA and Association of Beautification of Gokturk to solve the problem with the road. We are in coordination with Kemer. So, they communicate via emails about the things they did within their community, while we communicate within our community. By that way, there is collaboration... Of course, because of that pressure, the governor changed a little. He started to put announcements about what he did in the neighbourhood.” (P12)

As this quotation shows, the Association of Gokturk acts as a pressure group against the local government. Similarly, one local in Gokturk said that this association was transformed from a charity into an association which was acting on behalf of gated communities.<sup>91</sup> He added that when something happened, this association was used as a mediator (P41). In Kasaba only one resident mentioned a “Yahoo web page” which provided information, while no one mentioned a similar association in Omerli. I explain the reasons for this difference in terms of interaction with the locals and more generally with the local area in the sub-section “Different Relations”.



---

<sup>91</sup> In its full name, Association of Beautification and Protection of Gokturk Province is a volunteer association established with the initiatives of residents in gated communities in Gokturk as well as those who live in Gokturk (the locals).

**Fig 4.2.3:** Istanbul Avenue in Gokturk (in 2006). Pavements are in construction. As seen on the right side, there is construction of another housing development. There is also a truck on the main road, one of the reasons why residents complained about Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality.

Developer companies and more specifically gated communities have email groups to establish a network to inform each other, to exchange or give references to find new employees (it is not known whether different developer companies cooperate with each other in this respect). A local in Gokturk explained that there was an email group among gated communities which was used as a reference when there was need of employees. He added that:

“And every two months, generally every two months, there are meetings via the association, together with the executive committees and the head of executive committees. What happened? What we will do? These kinds of plans... Every two months we plan our agenda. Then we evaluate these. There is that kind of a group. We are in touch with each other in dialogue.” (P41)

Another source of information for gated communities is the people who know the locals better or gated communities built previously than others. The local person above also said that since he had lived in Gokturk longer than anyone else, he knew the milieu better, and people generally called him to ask for advice, in terms of staff. Similarly, another local in Gokturk said that since Istanbul Istanbul was the second gated community in the region, others took advice from them (P33).

However, conflicts might emerge with other actors. For example, the heavy traffic caused by trucks in Gokturk leads to new forms of cooperation between gated communities, this time against the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality. Two residents in Istanbul Istanbul stated that trucks carrying excavation materials caused traffic problems. In this case, gated communities used the Association of Beautification and Protection of Gokturk Province and sued Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality to eliminate these kinds of traffic problems and they succeeded, as in the words of a local:

“For example, all the trucks in Istanbul wanted to bring excavation materials here. And they did it. This created problems here because every day 4,000 trucks used this main road. Because of that, we sued Greater Istanbul Municipality via the Association of

Beautification. Demonstrations took place like “we do not want these trucks here and you should think of an alternative road. You should pass through alternative road.” because during weekends the road is totally blocked, because this is also a picnic and recreational area... Also the population increases here day by day, during weekends the traffic is totally blocked. This situation causes problems for us when for example ambulances cannot go through or when you have something to do in Istanbul. Because of these problems, we sued both the trucks and Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality. And we succeeded a little, to a certain extent that we eliminated trucks.” (P41)

However, there might emerge other conflicts, this time between gated communities. For example, a resident in Istanbul Istanbul stated that the same developer company built different gated communities in the same region (P7). So, not only big and small developer companies (different developer companies) build gated communities, as Perouse and Danis argue (2005), but also the same developer company constructs different gated communities in the same region which leads to interesting results. As examples, while Istanbul Istanbul, Istanbul Zen and Istanbul Bis are built by Koray Construction<sup>92</sup> with the cooperation of large banks in Gokturk, Evidea (in Cekmekoy) and Kasaba (in Omerli) are built on the Anatolian side of Istanbul.

So, conflicts might emerge in local politics due to the competition between gated communities built by different companies which can be regarded as rivals in the capitalist housing market. While they try to keep outsiders out, they might also compete with other rivals in terms of their activities, events or “quality” of the housing, to attract more clients (and residents). In the future, this might lead some gated communities to cooperate with local governments or other political forces (like Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality) against rival ones. So, even though there are differences between Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba in terms of their relations with political actors, they produce different conflicts and cooperation between local actors which I would call as “cooperative competitors” which show a symbiotic relation between them in terms of politics.

---

<sup>92</sup> See the web page of Koray Group of Companies, <http://www.koray.com>, accessed on 12.09.2008.



### 4.3 MODERNITY, BUT HOW?

I now examine the cultural interaction of Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba with their local populations. The first change is seen in the “physical” aspects of nearby towns, which is also explained in the literature (Rieniets, 2007; Ross, 2000; Sabatini and Salcedo, 2007; Salcedo and Torres, 2004). While Ross explains that Celebration has a “physical impact on the regional landscape” (Ross, 2000: 277), Salcedo and Torres explain that gated communities in Santiago can bring on improvement of physical environment (Salcedo and Torres, 2004: 40) such as making their own houses look better and improving their personal appearance (Sabatini and Salcedo, 2007: 592). The changes in the physical environment of towns were seen by several experts as “efforts” of the local population. More particularly, a local and a real estate expert respectively explained changes in Gokturk as:

“They brought changes in terms of trade, culture and environmental beauty. Lifestyle has changed. People who worked in gated communities wanted to continue the same lifestyle in their homes.” (P41)

“There has been a difference in visual texture. On the one hand, there are new developments. On the other hand, there are squatters or the old texture. So, there emerges difference in the visual texture between new housing developments and squatter/village.” (P44)

An expert in the construction sector explained that Kasaba brought radical changes to Omerli:

“Actually, these kinds of communities develop also villages and municipalities, because a model development is brought there in terms of quality, cleanliness, maintenance and infrastructure so that the municipality also makes efforts to improve. Inside municipality or village... For Kasaba, this situation is so obvious. Since construction started in Kasaba, Omerli has experienced a tremendous change. The appearance of houses was transformed into a better state. Roads have become better.” (P53)

#### **Image Removed**

**Fig 4.3.1:** The past and the present of Gokturk, photo taken from the brochure of Gokturk Municipality. In the brochure, the roads are shown as “before” and “after” due to the works and services executed by the municipality.

This change was also reflected upon the local municipalities' web pages and brochures. For example, Gokturk Municipality in its brochure uses the motto "modern cities can be created by modern efforts" and photographs of "old" Gokturk in which roads were unfinished, while "new" Gokturk consists of good, asphalt roads. Gokturk was described with the term "5<sup>th</sup> Levent", which was used by both residents and locals:

"This place will be a new Ulus or Levent." (P7)

"5<sup>th</sup> Levent. Ten years later, there will not be a need to go to the city." (P8)

"Even if it is far from the city, we foresaw that this place would be an Ulus or Levent in the near future." (P12)

"It was a small village in Istanbul but it has become a new Levent."(P33)

"They call this place as "4<sup>th</sup> Levent". "5<sup>th</sup> Levent"..." (P34)

Levent is a district on the European side of Istanbul which has expanded towards the North, which has now become one of the main business districts. Levent has been the symbol of Western, secular, urban and modern Istanbul in contrast to traditional districts. It now consists of high rises, residences, business centres and shopping malls which can be described as "the yuppie face" of Istanbul.<sup>93</sup> In time, Levent was divided into new districts of which 4<sup>th</sup> Levent has become the final stage of its development. The use of "5<sup>th</sup> Levent" refers to two meanings. At first, it reflects a further spatial suburban expansion in Istanbul towards the North. In this aspect, Gokturk has become the frontier of Istanbul and a part of Levent. Secondly, residents of gated communities in Gokturk are generally known as upper middle or middle class, secular and well-educated people.<sup>94</sup> So, the term "5<sup>th</sup> Levent" also reflects the lifestyle of these people. However, there were no terms to describe Omerli, similar to Gokturk, due to the lower density of housing developments and population in Omerli, which still keeps this place as a "rural" place in suburban lands, as stated by a resident in Kasaba (P21). Even

---

<sup>93</sup> See Chapter 2, section 2.4 "The New Urban Space", which explains how residences change the layout of Istanbul.

<sup>94</sup> See Chapter 3 section 3.6 "Who Lives There?"

though, Omerli Municipality uses similar words in its web page such as “from past to the future, from a village into a town”, which shows a linear change towards progress and modernity. In its web page, there are photographs of Omerli titled as “its past and present” which shows older times when the roads were damaged.

### **Images Removed**

**Fig 4.3.2 and 4.3.3:** The past and the present of Omerli, photo taken from the web page <http://www.omerli.bel.tr/site/omerli/dunbugun.asp>, accessed on 16.02.2009 (This web page does not exist anymore).

Another key change brought by gated communities in Gokturk is the opening of new public schools (primary and secondary) for local children. In the literature, the opening of new schools is mostly associated with private schools, regarded as one of the primary motives which lead people to move to gated communities.<sup>95</sup> However, the increase in population in nearby towns/villages also leads to the increase in the number of public schools, which was mentioned as a positive change by several experts. For instance, in the brochure of Gokturk it is explained that there are one primary and one high school built by the initiatives of businessmen. Also one local in Gokturk explained that there were three public and two private schools, at the time of the interview (2006):

“As I said previously, the educational level has increased. Because the population has increased, the number of schools has increased. There is a high school. The contractors started to build housing developments and schools. They started to invest in this region. So, the value of this region has increased.”<sup>96</sup> (P41)

### **Image Removed**

**Fig 4.3.4:** Omerli “Republic” Park, which refers to the Republic of Turkey. References to the Western values and the Republic of Turkey are seen in Omerli and Gokturk municipalities’ web pages and brochures; this photo is taken the web page of Omerli Municipality <http://www.omerli.bel.tr/site/omerli/dunbugun.asp>, accessed on 16.02.2009. (This web page does not exist anymore).

---

<sup>95</sup> See Chapter 3 section 3.7 “Different Forms of Gated Communities” and 3.6 “Who Lives There?”

<sup>96</sup> However, as told by a resident in Istanbul Istanbul the rent value of the land in Gokturk might lead to the elimination of these public schools for housing developments (P3). See the section on economic changes where I explain the dispossession of the locals.

Gated communities can also lead to acquiring new skills created by job opportunities. For instance, a local in Omerli explained that gated communities created new jobs and skills for local people, such as driving cars, which was described as a big advantage for the local people (P49). So, besides physical attributes such as the general landscape and house decoration, there are other cultural changes in nearby towns/villages. In the literature there are very few cases which examine the impact of gated communities on nearby towns. One example is Sabatini and Salcedo's study on Santiago, Chile which explains that gated communities create both functional and symbolic integration (2007: 578). While functional integration entails power and money, symbolic integration entails a sense of belonging among poorer residents such as community integration which creates social ties such as friendships, solidarity networks and familiar relations (2007: 589). Functional integration leads to political integration and state-support networks so that the poor become more considered by the officials. Symbolic integration enables for debunking territorial stigmas. The wall of gated communities has also a symbolic meaning: belonging to the territory. Community integration around religion ties people together on the basis of a common identity around religion rather than class.

However, while spatial, economic and political changes have an effect on different actors, cultural changes are regarded as a one-dimensional process which has impact only on local people, because residents in gated communities are regarded to be superior in every aspect. A similar view comes from an academic:

“There are differences. Some communities such as Kemer Country try to change the municipality in a civilising process such as “municipality that we live in should become like that”. However, the mechanisms through which this process is done should be analysed. I think they build schools or conduct reading-writing campaigns for children. It is similar to the civilising projects of CYDD (Association for Support of Civil Society). However, some are more closed. Everything is lived inside the community. So, is it possible to talk of only one thing? It should be considered for each community.” (P31)

However, she added that this “project” was very limited, because residents preferred domestic workers to be foreigners, such as from Moldavia or the Philippines, rather than hire

local population. In this aspect, gated communities are closed to nearby towns and they do not interact with local populations inside their homes. If there is a change, this is a top-down “civilising” process brought to the locals. This academic uses the term “civilising” to mean a hierarchical relation between residents and local populations who should become suitable for the needs of the residents. She uses CYDD, a well-known NGO established in 1989 which aims at education campaigns for students, with a strong emphasis on “secular” education, based on the Republican ideals.<sup>97</sup> This academic regarded the local population as those who should be “civilised” to serve residents in gated communities. At first, her use of “CYDD” and “civilising” has a negative meaning, because of this top-down process in which residents are regarded as superior than the locals. Secondly, she does not explain why gated communities do interact with the locals differently. However, she gives the example of Kemer Country, which interacts with its surrounding. Thirdly, this quotation reveals only one side of cultural change, that brought only by gated communities to “illiterate crowds”.

This description is similar to the “modernisation” project in Turkey, which is regarded as a form of “social engineering” by the state (Mardin, 2005: 55). Kandiyoti argues that this process has begun in the 19<sup>th</sup> century as an upper class male phenomenon which aimed at creating a new life in contrast to the “oppressive conventions of traditional Ottoman life”. However, this process had a big boost with Kemalist modernisation which brought in a secular state and laws while it abolished the Sheri’ a (Kandiyoti, 1995: 311). In this sense, this academic shows a top-down and hierarchical relation between the two actors, in which “modernising elite” transforms the mass through external image, cleanliness of streets, the institutions and their quality (Kasaba, 2005).

The “modernisation” project of Early Republican ideals was described by Robins and Aksoy (2000) in the example of Esenyurt which experienced changes due to the construction of

---

<sup>97</sup> CYDD aims at bringing “civilising” education to reach the level of civil society and modern civilisation <http://www.cydd.org.tr/default.asp?sayfa=biz> accessed on 11.02.2009. There is also emphasis on Ataturk revolution and ideals.

satellite towns of Esenkent and Bogazkoy in the 1990s in Istanbul by the initiatives of Gurbuz Capan, the mayor of Esenyurt. However, as writers explain, this “project” was unsuccessful to integrate the rich and the poor and led to the transformation of Esenyurt “from a city into a satellite” as a reflection of spatial fragmentation of Istanbul (Robins and Aksoy, 2000: 347). Robins and Aksoy describe a classical top-down modernising project which failed due to the unwillingness of the poor and migrant populations to move to new districts; instead, the middle class did (Robins and Aksoy, 2000: 350). Writers argue that the “universal and inclusive aspirations” of modern ideals lead to “self-contained, self-sufficient and self-regarding community” (Robins and Aksoy, 2000: 351).

The difference between local people and residents of gated communities reminds of the West’s “White man’s burden” by bringing modernity and civilisation to the rest of the world by its technology, science and vision which became the basis of Eurocentric view. The difference between the two actors is also explained in the interviews. A researcher explained that while there were several attempts to establish a social network such as raising awareness against the earthquake, the difference between gated communities and local population put limit on creating a more stable and continuous cooperation between these actors (P50). There are several challenging results in this prejudiced view of gated communities. The gap between residents and the local people can result in a “mission” owned by the residents. However, as stated by the academic who explained that gated communities brought a “civilising project”, firstly, this is not carried on equally by all gated communities for different factors. Secondly, the effect of this mission is not spread equally among local people. Thirdly, cultural change does not only mean a “modernisation” effect on “illiterate crowds”, but it also entails other forms of cultural changes which can be seen in residents’ lives.

### ***4.3.1 Different Relations***

I will now explain why Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba engage in different relations with the local people. Residents in Istanbul Istanbul mentioned strong income and educational differences between them and the local population. However, they did not mention any effort to decrease this difference. Moreover, some of them explained a lack of relations with the local population. Two residents said that:

“They do not think well of us. There is no reason which can make the locals like us.” (P2)

“There are no relations with the public. This is sad.” (P3)

In sum, in Istanbul Istanbul residents mentioned little social interaction and social change due to the economic and cultural differences between them and the local population. However, one way of establishing relations is via associations. Several residents in Istanbul Istanbul and experts mentioned Association of Beautification and Protection of Gokturk Province which has become an important source for raising money and bringing help. A local in Gokturk added that:

“A bridge was established to provide employees to gated communities and jobs to town. So, the importance of Association of Beautification has emerged. The members of Association of Beautification are already the residents of these developments in general. Events were organised by the Association such as circumcision parties, aid campaigns during Ramadan, cultural activities, and helping schools to meet the needs of children. These kinds of activities were held. And since ‘95 it has been actively working.” (P41)

However, a real estate expert added that Gokturk has experienced a more conflicting interaction between different actors:

“In cultural terms, of course there are things which can disturb or offend the locals. When residents of gated communities firstly arrived in the region, they looked for opportunities of mixing together with the locals. There are several efforts. Also there are several efforts in our region, such as establishing Association of Beautification Gokturk and helping the poor. These efforts still continue. However, this situation should be eliminated, I think. So, someone will come and the others will follow them until they reach a convenient situation.” (P44)

However, she also added that this duality might be eliminated due to the economic benefits.

By contrast, in Kasaba residents did not state any strong cultural or economic differences resulting from the introduction of gated communities in the region. Although some of them explained economic difference, this was used when residents in Kasaba explained their contribution to the village or local people's lives. A resident explained that:

“The vision of people in Omerli was changed because of these new developments. Omerli of today is different from Omerli when I firstly moved here.” (P20)

In Kasaba no one mentioned an association similar to that mentioned in Gokturk. However, several residents stated that there was a committee which aimed at helping local people. A local in Omerli explained material help was given as:

“And we continuously collect toys, clothe and books.” (P49)

She also explained that eighty students from the Omerli region were supported by families in Kasaba. Similarly, a resident explained:

“There was a campaign “Everyone prepares a child to school”. There were 50 children, of whom 20 were from Kocoglu village and 30 were from Omerli.” (P15)

Also another form of educational or cultural help targeting younger generations is to take them to theatre or places like Miniaturk (a theme park in Istanbul), as explained by a resident. She added that “they went to theatre for the first time in their lives”. She also explained that:

“A child had hip dysplasia, in Kocoglu village. There was an orthopaedist in Kasaba who did the operation. Then we collected money to provide an artificial eye for another person.” (P15)

In sum, in Kasaba residents explained greater social change and interaction with the locals and a stronger support of local municipality. There was no negative consideration of economic or cultural difference as in Istanbul Istanbul. Rather, they mentioned good relations established by shopping in Omerli and helping the locals (especially social help). They made a



stronger effort towards Omerli and local population which was absent or weak in Istanbul Istanbul. There are several factors which affect Kasaba's better relations with the locals. At first, Kasaba is the biggest community in Omerli, which makes it the pioneer gated community of the Omerli region, similar to Kemer Country in Gokturk, (given by an academic as an example which establishes relations with the outside). Being the pioneer community makes the residents in Kasaba responsible or forced to feel responsible towards the locals. Secondly, the average income in Kasaba is higher than in Istanbul Istanbul which can make residents two-times "responsible" to their surroundings. This can be called "volunteer tax" which is paid to the nearby towns and populations.

Thirdly, demographic characteristics of residents in the two cases are different.<sup>98</sup> In Kasaba the average age of residents is higher, which means that having children at school age is less likely. Most of residents (all of them are female except one male, a university student) are in their 40s or early 50s. Most of them said that they had children, but they were less dependent on parents than the children in Istanbul Istanbul. However, the residents of Istanbul Istanbul consist of people at the beginning of their careers. In Istanbul Istanbul while eight residents said that they were working, six of them did not work (or were retired). While seven residents in Kasaba said that they did not work (three of them were "retired"), one of them was working at home and one was working part-time. This was best summarised by a female resident in Kasaba:

"After I retired, I became a member of the "Education Volunteers" when I was living in the city. Then I left this group. However, when I came here, since I was competent in using computers, I began to give computer courses."<sup>99</sup> (P18)

---

<sup>98</sup> The demographic characteristics of the participants in my research are similar to the demographic characteristics of the populations of Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba. See Chapter 3 section 3.9 "Methods" as to the demographic characteristics of Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba provided by relevant officials. See also Appendix 1 as to how residents describe themselves and their families in terms of age, marital status, education level, occupation, income level, residential status and home ownership.

<sup>99</sup> See the web page of this association <http://www.tegv.org/v4/> accessed on 27.02.2009.

So, the exclusion from full-time working life with less dependent children allows residents in Kasaba the opportunity to be involved with volunteer work. Fourthly, as this quotation shows there are residents who have already been actively involved in such volunteer activities. Fifthly, “pioneer” people act as “bridges” between residents and local people. When one of them talked about her activities in Omerli, she also added that she was not sure if anyone in Kasaba would be willing to help, if she did not encourage them to do so (P15). So, relatively higher average income and age and the efforts of “pioneer” residents make Kasaba, a pioneer gated community more willing to pay “volunteer tax” towards the locals.

#### ***4.3.2 In-between Modernity: A Gendered Dimension***

There are other cultural changes brought by gated communities. However, these are not received equally well among local people, bringing a gender dimension into focus in Kasaba, as explained by a resident as:

“Especially young female children are encouraged to pursue education, due to the impact of educated and working women. The introduction of gated communities created job opportunities for women. They have become free and earn money. They have become more self confident. Their dressing style has changed. Previously they wore “yeldirme”. Now they do not wear this. They have headscarves but are not veiled (not turban). Alev School gave a teacher, so they have two teachers in total. (The municipality) chose three children, all of them were female. Even their physical attributes changed. However, in Omerli there is a big alcoholism problem. Truck drivers, unemployed... Unemployed and alcohol problem... Male children imitate their fathers.” (P15)

This quotation shows that local women have regarded the women in Kasaba as their role models. So, the female children in Omerli were inspired by “educated and working women” living in Kasaba. The change in physical appearance was also mentioned in an article in Tempo magazine, the style of the local women who were working as domestic workers in gated communities in Istanbul (in Northern lands) had changed:

They entered with the headscarf, and left the community in low-waist blue jean. (Tempo magazine, 03.03.2004)

### Image Removed

**Fig 4.3.2.1:** Local women with traditional clothes, “yeldirme”, photo taken from the brochure of Omerli municipality. (The quality of this photo is due to the brochure’s publication quality).

This shows that the women in Kasaba inspire female students in Omerli to be “free and independent woman”. Since several women established a group to provide financial and cultural help to local people, their attempt to modernise the locals could lead to the relative independence of local women.<sup>100</sup> The relative independence and education of local women shows a challenging situation to the mainstream views about modernity and gender in Turkey. In the literature, modernisation was regarded as a top-down and male process aiming at “modernisation” or “civilising” of the mass (Kasaba, 2005; Kandiyoti, 2005). Kandiyoti argues that modern bourgeoisie family needed its “other” to transform and criticise it, which was mostly regarded as the “woman” suppressed by feudal hierarchical traditional society and Islamic law (Kandiyoti, 2005). In this process, rural women were regarded as the most suppressed of all (Kandiyoti, 2005: 104). And more generally, in nationalistic discourse, women were considered within the political discourse and created by men for men, to serve men (Kandiyoti, 2007: 169).

However, since the 1980s, modernisation of women by the state, called “Kemalist feminism” by Gole (2005), was criticised by feminist thinkers because of rendering women “stuck” into the family life and rendering them as the carrier of Kemalist values. Kandiyoti also argues that modernisation in Turkey is very different from the West where a feminist movement aimed at gaining rights from the bottom up (Kandiyoti, 2007: 76). In this sense, feminist thinkers have tended to isolate themselves from the classical Kemalist vision and statist/secularist ideals. Arat argues that the young generation of feminists went against

---

<sup>100</sup> Although not related to the education of female population, in an article in Tempo Magazine it was also stated that when women started to work as domestic workers, this led to an increase in the status of women inside their households (Tempo Magazine, 03.03.2004). See also Ozyegin’s ethnography on female domestic workers in Ankara, Turkey, which shows that they gain self confidence through their work. However, men in the households control the money earned by these women in order not to lose their dominance (2005).

Kemalist feminism and criticised the “artificial freedom” created within this framework (Arat, 2005: 91). Kandiyoti questions the relations between “gaining rights and freedom”, because at least until the 1980s, there was not any feminist movement in Turkey with a political aim (Kandiyoti, 2007: 78). This criticism can be summarised in the famous quotation used in demonstrations “State, take off your hands from my body!”, which focuses on a body, freed from the intervention of state, seen as a dominant, male, secular and statist actor. This also summarises a separation from the “father state” in every aspect, which takes care of its citizens, in economic, social and cultural terms.<sup>101</sup>

In certain aspects, the help of residents in Kasaba is similar to the aid campaigns of CYDD and similar associations, which make a strong emphasis on the education of “female children”, who have less chance of education than male students. To help the female locals is also similar to the early Republican ideals that rural women were regarded as the most suppressed (Kandiyoti, 2005). As stated by a resident in Kasaba, they also cooperate with similar associations:

“On 19 May we took food and clothes to the young with the cooperation of “Community Volunteers.”<sup>102</sup> (P15)

However, female residents in Kasaba show a challenge to both the “top-down and male” modernisation and “bottom up and female” criticisms of it. They are neither “modern male subjects” nor “feminist post-modern subjects”. Rather, they are positioned in between: they are married women with children. In this aspect, they can be regarded as “Kemalist” women rather than the new generation of feminist thinkers. Moreover, these residents are also out of full-time working life, being retired or part-time workers. However, residents in Kasaba are those who bring an opportunity to local female children. Although this change is a top-

---

<sup>101</sup> See Chapter 2 section 2.5 “Fragmentation of Public Space and Conflicting Istanbul” how “post age” became the dominant view on politics and academia.

<sup>102</sup> 19 May is Commemoration of Atatürk, Youth and Sports Day and it is a public holiday in Turkey. See the web page of this association <http://www.tog.org.tr/index.asp> accessed on 27.02.2009.

down process in its classical terms, it is brought by actors regarded to be less powerful than men and excluded from feminist movements.

This change is also not carried through strong hierarchical relations between residents of gated communities and local female population. Rather, this change is carried by face-to-face interaction between two actors without a return in material terms such as making the locals better and appropriate for the “actor” of this “modernisation process”. Helping the local population by giving courses becomes a source of honour for the residents. As explained by a resident in Kasaba, these kinds of relations create a sense of belonging which cannot be found in the “alienated” city:

“I give computer courses at first to the children and then to the women at the Cultural Centre of the local municipality via the help of someone else who lives in Kasaba. Without a wage... In order to help them, only... I established relations via this way. So, the number of people who knows me in the village has increased. I go regularly (to the village)... So, the families or those to whom I give courses... This is a nice thing, of course. It is nice when you go to the village there are those who ask “How are you, teacher?” or when you do your shopping from the grocery you can ask “How is your wife?” It is very friendly; there is no alienation similar to the city.” (P18)

These results challenge the “unsuccessful modernising” project explained by Robins and Aksoy (2000) because in Kasaba residents themselves are engaged with the local population. They also challenge the general situation of female population in Turkey due to the fact that traditional families are more likely to send their sons to the university rather than their daughters (Kandiyoti, 2007: 77). Not only in terms of university education, but also in terms of literacy rates, women in Turkey are in much less advantaged position than men. Kandiyoti explains that while education is supposed to be available to all, not each gender benefits from it equally (Kandiyoti, 2007). So, modernity and openness were brought to the locals by women and received by local women rather than men. The actor in this situation is women, not men. The women who live in gated communities, because they have more time (retirees or part time workers, or full time mothers) can give their time to do volunteer work in Omerli. So, a woman

who lives in a gated community who is excluded from full time working career can open new opportunities for women in local towns, by encouraging them to have proper education.

#### ***4.3.3 Honest Villagers and Natural Village Life***

Lastly, local people and mythical rural life have also an influence on the residents' symbolic and material lives. While residents in both communities criticised the mentality of the locals, they, this time without any difference showed an admiration towards the material lives of the locals. They explained that they did their shopping from local shops, groceries and fields where they could have the chance to buy fruits and vegetables not to be found in the city. "Urban" in this sense was rejected while rural life was regarded as the total opposite of urban life. Another interesting result was residents' relations with the local population. Several experts stated that although residents have also established relations with the local people, these relations were superficial, as a result of being limited to shopping from local shops or markets. Moreover, some of them explained that residents also used "mediators" who did their shopping from nearby towns and shops. A real estate expert described this situation as "everyone owns one Ahmet Efendi" (P30), which meant that everyone had someone to work for them. An architect stated that besides purchasing bread or olive oil, residents did not have any relations with the local people (P36).

However, for residents these mediators are not "buffers" or "servants" who eliminate relations with the locals, but they provide a form of distinction and sense of belonging. Residents in both communities explained that they knew a local man who brought fruits, vegetables or flowers, described as "different" or "undiscovered" by other residents. One resident in Istanbul Istanbul explained that a local person brought different flowers for her garden as:

"One of them comes and plants different flowers and does different things. Sometimes I give money to him. He asks "I go to my village, is there anything you want from there?" I give him travel allowance." (P5)

Another resident also explained that there was a person who brought vegetables and fruits<sup>103</sup> and he recommended her not to tell anyone that he brought unprocessed milk to make yogurt:

“This man brings unprocessed milk and asks me if I want it. However, he said to me not to tell my neighbours because they would flock to take it. Then I made fresh yogurt with cow milk. Can you think how such an important thing is here?”(P14)

She explained that she could not find these kinds of fruits and vegetables in Nisantasi:

“...There are tomatoes and cucumbers. When I hear the voice of the youngster I go to tell him to bring me some vegetables from the field. He picks them up from the garden. There are incredible beautiful green beans. Frankly, I could not eat these in Istanbul. In Nisantasi... When I went to Silivri, a beautiful place, because (fruits and vegetables) were fresh... (The seller) was telling that these were picked up from gardens. We were going to the street market. In Bahcesehir... Now I know a youngster here.  
... He grows (vegetables). All these fields are planted. Corn, green bean, tomatoes, cucumbers... There are also lettuce, fresh onion, and chard. When I hear his voice I see him from the upper flat. I buy lots of things. Very nice...” (P14)

A resident in Istanbul Istanbul said that she gave fresh vegetables as gifts to her friend:

“There are fields where we can pick fruits and vegetables. Next to us (...) yesterday I visited my friend, my childhood friend. Instead of buying a cake from the bakery shop, I took tomatoes from the field and gave them. Imagine of tomatoes you can never eat in your life. We experience pleasures like these.” (P12)

Also for residents in Kasaba vegetables and fruits were to be consumed “fresh”:

“If it is needed, we pick these up with our hands. Tomatoes... For example I bought twenty or thirty kilos of tomatoes to make canned food since yesterday. I picked chard and cucumbers. We can eat these fresh, eat anything God gives to us. We pick these vegetables.” (P28)

Another resident in Kasaba explained that her husband picked the fruits and vegetables up from the field which was a pleasure for him. She also added that “village life” was attractive for them:

“...No. you pick these up from the field. My husband goes and picks these up. He brings all these with great pleasure and enthusiasm. Think of it. There are these kinds of

---

<sup>103</sup> See Chapter 5 section 5.2 “Residents and Local Populations” which explains how residents in both communities reject eating locally produced meat which shows the illiteracy of local populations.

pleasures. Why? This place can still be regarded as a village, even it is a town. Omerli village... Village life is attractive for us.” (P21)

Another resident also added that:

“The most pleasing thing here is greenery, we have grown cucumbers. I liked that very much. Then we planted tomatoes. They were small. Then there is the joy of watching them grow. We like these things. Then we have trees, we check them. We wait for our mandarins to ripen. There are small mandarins on trees. We like these.” (P25)

As these quotations show, residents stressed the importance of “freshness” of vegetables and the tactile relations they established with the place, i.e. to be able to pick them up from trees or open fields. In this context, they overlook the illiteracy of the local people who are regarded close to Nature and less corrupted than city dwellers. This is a reaction to the city where everything seems more real than the original. The freshness of vegetables in local towns is the opposite of the simulations (fruits and vegetables sold in the city) (Baudrillard, 1983).<sup>104</sup> Baudrillard argues that with the introduction of simulations there is also an inclination towards the myths of origin and signs of reality (Baudrillard, 1983). However, as Oncu refers to Barthes, mythology is about the “mythological characteristics” of a commodity rather than the commodity itself (Oncu, 1999: 28). Oncu gives the example of a detergent which connotes “cleanliness” or “white which is whiter than the white” (Oncu, 1999: 28). I think a fruit sold in the city is a simulation which also includes a “mythological” characteristic in Barthes’ sense. The mythological characteristic of a commodity is now obtained through simulations which have become more “real” than the real. In this context, simulations or mythological commodities are harmful to health. Residents who buy locally grown fresh vegetables and fruits are against simulations and mythological commodities sold in the city.

---

<sup>104</sup>In Hurriyet newspaper, it is stated that foods we consume are mixed with chemicals (colours) in order to make them appear to look better (11.04.2008). In this news article it is explained that breads are made whiter with carbonate while cheeses are made whiter with lime. The reaction towards vegetables grown with hormones or coloured fruits is the reaction of those who live in gated communities towards the city life which has often been described in the interviews as dangerous, dirty, and corrupted.



The rejection of eating artificial fruits and vegetables sold in the city shows the importance of health which I explained in Chapter 2.<sup>105</sup> It is now thought that the city (in this context Istanbul) has become an unhealthy place with air pollution, traffic congestion, overpopulation and dense housing. On the basis of these interviews, it can be concluded that a new form of healthy life is emerging which is different from the fitness-centred life which was also mentioned by residents and experts. This new form of healthy life focuses on the consumption of organic products and natural foods. For residents consuming “natural” and “local” products produced by local people is a way of differentiating themselves as people who give importance to healthy products. Another dimension of the impact of healthy and rural life is that residents themselves try to make or produce instead of buying ready-made foods from supermarkets which connotes unhealthy ways of consuming. As I mentioned before, several residents explained that they made breads or yogurt or they picked up fruits or vegetables as gifts for their friends.<sup>106</sup> This shows both a reaction to artificial urban life and an expression of self-creativity reflected by self-made products.

The rural life was also regarded as being more honest than urban life. A resident explained that there were good shopping opportunities in Gokturk contrary to the expensive prices in Istanbul:

“Of course... Tailor. There is a tailor in the basement, in Akmerkez. Or you go to a tailor in your neighbourhood to hem the lower part of the trouser leg. They ask for 10 or 15 Turkish lira. We have a tailor here. He says “you can give whatever you want to give”. The joy of this is different. When my son’s watch breaks down, I bring this to Akmerkez. Where do I bring this? To a clock repairer...Now they sell watches and at the same time they provide luxurious services. Their rent is not low. Who is paying this rent? We pay their rent. Clients...They do not repair a watch for less than 10 or 20 Turkish liras. Recently, the glass of my son’s watch was broken. I asked whether they could fix this. There is a clock repairer here, an old one who cannot find anything in his drawers in the shop. Very old-style repairer, as someone from our childhood...He fixed

---

<sup>105</sup> See Chapter 2 sub-section 2.5.1 “Tensions in Istanbul: The Entrapment of Elites” which explains that urban life is regarded as “unhealthy”.

<sup>106</sup> Also Ayata (2002) states that the new middle classes reject ready-made home decoration while they prefer to decorate their homes by their preferences and choices. In this aspect, my results are similar to Ayata’s accounts such that people put more value on their preferences or products rather than ready-made things which show the difference between personal taste and labour and ready-made taste or product.

this glass for 6 Turkish liras. I cannot find anyone in Akmerkez who would do the same less than 50 Turkish liras.” (P12)

In this quotation there is a strong contrast between the city (Istanbul) where she can only find higher prices (tailor or repairer of clocks) and Gokturk. She added that “we are getting cheated while becoming urbanised”. On the contrary, the clock repairer has an unchanging and unspoilt nature which reminds her childhood. A resident in Kasaba explained that they used the local cemetery in Omerli described as “natural village cemetery” which was an indicator that they have become a part of this “rural” life:

“I hope no one will need it but, we used even the cemetery of Omerli. Last year we lost my father. In the city, it is impossible to find a place in cemeteries. I saw that there was a very natural village cemetery, as if he would be lying next to me... So, we internalise this place, in the end.” (P28)

One way of internalising the place and creating an attachment to the locals is to do shopping from the locals, as in the words of another resident in Kasaba:

“Omerli can be regarded as a village. The village life seemed attractive to us. We go to their coffeehouse and barber. We know the local administrator. There might be local tradesmen that we go to do business. For instance, we found someone who did the iron fence in the garden. When we want to buy wood, we know them.” (P21)

Interestingly, residents did not escape from the city “invaded” by illiterate crowds, but they escaped from its greed and fake life based on cheating and higher prices.<sup>107</sup> Another change is seen in their dresses which have become more “casual” and comfortable contrary to “urban way of dressing”. For residents, dressing in gated communities brings another kind of freedom: freedom of exemption from urban rules. For example, a female resident in Kasaba explained that “I dress less here. You know, there is a way of urban dressing” (P23). She made a separation between dressing less and dressing on the basis of urban rules which require certain behaviours related to modernity, rationalisation and ordering of everyday life, which might put restrictions.

---

<sup>107</sup> See Chapter 6, section 6.2 “Real Communities” how a resident in Istanbul Istanbul explains that her husband has “daily therapy” in his garden, while the city seems “greedy” for him.

Another resident in Istanbul Istanbul compared her life in Nisantasi (Istanbul) with that in Istanbul Istanbul. She stressed her comfort about wearing what she liked in Istanbul Istanbul while in Nisantasi she should have dressed according to the expectations:

“This is my home clothes. So I can go out of home with a blouse and with a pair of flip-flops. I see in Gima people shopping with their flip flops. This is very great comfort. Think for a while, I go out in Tesvikiye with flaps flops. God forbid!! People would look at me as if I come from another planet. I would dress in a more formal style, like trousers and blouses. In this aspect, this place is comfortable. Secondly, I realise this. When I get bored, I go out to feed ducks. I walk a little so I eliminate the need of going out. I do not want to do shopping. When I was going out in Nisantasi, I was telling myself that I was bored because of staying at home all the day. I was at home during the last two days. When I wanted to go out, I went to the shops like sheep. You go, whether you want or do not want to go, because there is nothing to do. You cannot go to a park. You spend all your day in these shops. You buy clothes even they do not fit you. This was more tiring for me. The tranquillity here gives me calmness. I tell myself, “I already went out.” (P14)

This shows a strong contrast between city (Tevikiye) and gated community life. This resident feels the “urban pressure” to dress regularly, which is supported by the duty to go to shopping. However, life in a gated community erases these urban duties and pressures in dresses/shoes while it also eliminates aimless shopping “like sheep”.

## CONCLUSION

In this Chapter I explored economic, political and cultural changes in Gokturk and Omerli brought by gated communities. In terms of economic changes, there are not important differences between Gokturk and Omerli, although there were differences between Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba. While residents in Kasaba told of a greater economic change brought to the local population, this was weakly stated by the residents in Istanbul Istanbul. I showed that gated communities do not always influence the local town/villages in terms of economic benefits, such as more job opportunities. However, the locals lost their lands by dispossession and have become the new service workers of gated communities. There are other actors which obtain economic benefit, such as developer companies, because of providing continuous

investment such as amenities, maintenance and related service-providing sectors for gated communities. Residents also gain economic benefits by starting businesses in nearby towns or by buying extra flats/houses as investment in the same region.

An economic dilemma of gated communities emerges when they try to preserve their “privatised” lives, while at the same time they seek to attract “clients” from nearby ones by the provision of amenities. This is “economic” benefit for gated communities, while it can also be regarded as “social” benefit for residents. In this sense, residents establish relations with others by schools or courses, similar to Giroir’s account of “clubs for upper classes”. However, there are other informal ways of establishing relations through nannies, children, relatives, friends or “bridge” people which might later lead to more formal and economic relations. Local municipalities have a dilemma. On the one hand, as stated by the mainstream literature, they are regarded as inefficient to answer the demands of gated communities. On the other hand, local municipalities are not always in conflict with gated communities. Rather, the two sides are interdependent. While gated communities are dependent on local municipalities to deal with larger issues in regional management, local municipalities are dependent on gated communities for votes and tax revenues coming from gated communities.

Politically, as I showed in the section about economic changes, there is a symbiotic relation between gated communities and political actors. The difference between Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba in terms of the relations with local municipalities represents larger social and political conflict in Turkey. At first, there is cooperation between gated communities against the local municipality as stated by residents in Istanbul Istanbul, which is regarded to be insufficient to meet their demands. This led to the cooperation between gated communities and Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality. However, gated communities in Gokturk sued the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality to solve another problem in Gokturk; which shows that these actors change sides on the basis of their interests. However, Kasaba was more consistent in terms of

its relations with the local municipality, because of the ideological conflict in Turkey between seculars and Islamists. While local municipality in Omerli represents secular and civilised way of governing, the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality, governed by AKP, the ruling party in Turkey, represents Islamists which tries to “harass” those who live in Omerli and Kasaba. These results also show an interesting and contrasting fact against the general prejudice about gated communities which are mostly regarded as “indifferent to local politics”. However, residents in gated communities are interested in these issues.

There are also cultural changes. This rarely studied subject is generally seen as a top-down process coming from residents in gated communities to the locals. On the basis of interviews, there are several challenging points to this. Firstly, not each gated community brings the same change, which shows the difference of gated communities in providing “volunteer tax” towards the locals. The two cases established different relations with their outside. Istanbul Istanbul establishes little relations with the nearby town. While residents stated little cultural interaction and change, they explained greater economic difference in Gokturk. Residents also mentioned that they did not bring too much help to the locals. However, things were different in Kasaba, where residents mentioned stronger social and cultural impact due to the deeper social interaction between residents and the locals. This difference lies in being the pioneer gated community in Omerli which might render Kasaba “responsible” towards the locals. Also there is a different profile of residents in Kasaba, due to the higher average age, income level and more flexible working life which make them more willing to be involved with the outside world. Another reason is the people who act as bridges between different sides. In both cases, the likelihood of living in a place permanently makes residents to be involved with their surroundings. The age of residents is another important factor in both communities such that older people tend to socialise less frequently or are involved with only a narrow social milieu (with their grandchildren).

Secondly, not everyone in the region receives this change equally, which I explained via gender differences. While more female students pursue education due to the impact of female residents in Kasaba, the young male local population is not influenced by this. The change which took place in Gokturk and Omerli is not a simple suburban expansion, but it also leads to cultural change, which provides the expansion of cultural values across Istanbul crystallised in the terms “5<sup>th</sup> Levent” which reflects the yuppie and civilised face of Istanbul and “educated and working woman” which reflects the contrast between modern and traditional woman. Thirdly, gated communities do not only affect local people’s culture, but local people and rural life have an effect upon residents’ lives. The relations with the locals stand in contrast to the mainstream literature and the accounts of experts who stated that residents did not establish relations and instead, they only hire someone. Residents acquire some sort of distinction and sense of belonging to the region by knowing the locals and the place. Another aspect of this larger and deeper impact is seen in the values of residents who admire life in a small, honest and “unspoilt” town/village which stands in contrast to the expensive, cheating and unnatural city. Another change is seen in their material lives such as their clothing which have become “more casual” and comfortable in contrast to urban way of dressing.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **PLURAL DISTINCTIONS IN A SINGLE SPACE**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

In this chapter I examine how residents in Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba make communities inside and outside by looking at how they establish relations with different groups which provide an insight to the formation of identity and boundaries (Lamont, 1992). This chapter will explain the differences and competition between gated communities, which will complete the discussions made in Chapters 2 and 3 about class and cultural differences. By analysing plural distinctions in two gated communities, I aim to contribute to the literature in Turkey, which is regarded as insufficient especially in analysing the culture of wealth, as the title of Bora and Erdogan's article (2005: 3) as "Wealth: a rich research agenda but a poor literature". I also aim to propose a new theoretical framework and further questions as to identity formation.

For this purpose, in the first section, I discuss theories of social closure and distinction which provide an understanding of the formation of identity in gated communities. Then I explore economic, cultural and moral boundaries established with three groups. Firstly, I explain how residents differentiate themselves from local populations by using economic and cultural boundaries such as education level, illiteracy and "narrow-mindedness". Secondly, I explain how they differentiate themselves inside the same community by using economic and cultural boundaries as well as boundaries of "moral capitalism" which shows the importance of earning money by labour and formal ways. Thirdly, I explain how they establish boundaries with other gated communities. However, there is difference between the two cases in that while residents in Istanbul Istanbul compared themselves with Kemer Country regarded to have

higher income level, this was absent in Kasaba. I show how residents defend their community while “class” returns back in the form of morality. Until now, lower class’ identity was the interest of study. However, I will show how even the most “invisible” (upper and/or middle classes) groups rely on income/class differences in order to establish boundaries. By proposing “multiple socially situated distinctions” and “socially situated symbolic capitals” I contribute to Bourdieu’s “symbolic capital” (1984), Lamont’s theory of “symbolic boundaries” (1992) and Hall’s alternative “socially situated distinctions” (1992).

### **5.1 SOCIAL CLOSURE AND PLURAL DISTINCTIONS**

In the interviews, it is clear that gated communities provide social status or distinction for the owner. Several experts stated that the people preferred to live in gated communities because of distinction or differentiation. For instance, a local in Omerli said that:

“First of all, to live in a community like that means the wish to differentiate among them. First of all by rejecting the interaction with the people outside they live in a different place. The wish to be different...” (P49)

Also an academic-researcher stated that:

“I think this is the search for distinction. I use distinction in Bourdieu sense, such as the effect created by the house, car and address.” (P45)

This view is also supported by several residents when, for instance, a resident in Kasaba suggested that if the household income was taken as the measure to define the income level of the household, this could result in a misleading understanding. She said that people wanted to own a house in Kasaba by forcing their (economic) conditions and added that there should be other criteria in order to define these people rather than the income level (P23). This was also described by a resident in Istanbul Istanbul:

“A social marker... I do not like social markers, frankly. Like Etiler. Of course a gated community is a nice thing. A green community is a nice thing. Why does a person move here? I am wondering why someone moves so far. You might like a garden. It is rational. You want to deal with the green yourself. You have a child who plays there. I can understand all these reasons, but if you pay more than 3 or 4 times of its actual



value for a flat in order to live in a similar place to a stylish Istanbul flat and moreover if you also tolerate a travel of 45 minutes, there is only one meaning. Social marker... A lot of people move here in order to tell that they live in Kemerburgaz. This is the reason of these other housing developments. Very pitiful..." (P3)

This resident explained that to live in Istanbul Istanbul enabled residents to have a social marker which was beyond functional and rational reasons to move there. This social marker has a sign meaning attached to it, which ensures residents a symbol of status. In this aspect, gated communities have become the symbols of status and distinction for those who look for them. As I explained in Chapter 3, they are regarded as signs of distinction from the rest, a distinction not only labelled by high walls or fences, but also by the sign values of these houses. Some gated communities are preferred because they are regarded as signs of high status which provide distinction for the owner of the house.

However, these quotations establish a link between distinction and status in a negative sense, used only by "rich" or "elite" people. Instead, I examine the relation between distinction and identity and the link between symbolic boundaries and symbolic capital by analysing the relations between different groups. What kinds of strategies are used by a group or an individual to define the self and others is the subject of this chapter. By doing this, I show that "distinction" is not homogenous and ready-made for the residents, but it is a multiple process in the making. Although "distinction" in these quotations is used as a brand concept to explain a static and upper class phenomenon, I argue that distinction is a multiple process established in everyday life which changes in different situations.

To answer these questions, I will discuss the literature on social closure to compare various theories. The linkages and ruptures between these theories will open new doors to explain "multiple" distinctions. I now turn to the theory of social closure developed by Weber who introduces the concepts of status and lifestyle to understand social stratification on the basis of other factors rather than class and economic relationship. Weber explains how people

create lifestyle to be distinguished from other groups in society. He develops a different framework of social stratification in which “status” and “party” are other categories along “class”, contrary to Marx who argued that the ownership of economic sources was the basis of power, while class conflict was the basis of social change (Weber, 1963: 13).

Rather than taking these variables separately, Weber argues that economic, social and political standing are connected. He also argues that economic condition is not the only way to determine a person’s standing. Money and entrepreneurial position do not always result in higher status (although they might provide it), while lack of property does not result in a lack of status (although it might provide it) (Weber, 1978: 306). There are three factors to protect status. The first is style of life, the second is restriction on social intercourse and the third is submission to fashion (Weber, 1963: 50):

Classes are stratified according to their relations to the production and acquisition of goods, whereas status groups are stratified according to the principles of their consumption of goods as represented by special styles of life. (Weber, 1963: 56)

Status groups are protected by conventions, laws and rituals in which physical contact with a lower caste is rejected (Weber, 1963: 51). There are certain ways of representing status honour such as distance and exclusiveness, privilege of wearing certain costumes and eating special dishes taboo to others, carrying arms (Weber, 1963: 53). For instance an officer, a civil servant or a student with different class positions on the basis of their wealth, can share a similar status acquired through upbringing and education which creates a common style of life (Weber, 1978: 306). Weber argues that people establish status groups with their own lifestyle in order to be differentiated from other groups which have become the basis of “social closure”.

Similar to social stratification, also social closure does not only derive from class relations, but from the interplay between different factors such as class, status and party. Weber explains social closure on the basis of competition for livelihood which determines economic relations. When the number of competitors increases, people establish exclusion on the basis of

certain concepts such as race, language, residence, local or social origin by giving way to interest groups towards the outsiders. This leads to the establishment of closure by legally privileged groups and members (Weber, 1978: 342). He also adds that there might be hierarchy within the same closure group which results in the monopolistic advantage of a small community, called as “smallest possible circle” who benefits from opportunities more than other members of the group (Weber, 1978: 343).

Although classes do still matter, people establish closure on the basis of lifestyle and status distinctions which is one of the main foci of this chapter. As I previously explained in Chapter 2, since the 1980s class structure has become more fragmented with the rise of the new middle classes. In this period, the conflict between and within classes has emerged which shows differentiation on the basis of cultural background. This process has also resulted in the erosion of welfare state and class-based politics which led to the emergence of traditional community ties (ethnicity, religion, and race).<sup>108</sup> This situation confirms Weber’s ideas that the relations between class, status and party have become important in the newly industrialising countries since old forms of society and stratification mingle with the new ones (Weber, 1963: 15). For instance, religion has become very crucial to define identity and social relations especially in countries like Turkey which has dramatically experienced neoliberal restructuring and reduction of welfare state and social policies. Class conflict and economic relations still shape socio-economic framework while relations based on traditional community ties (such as religion in Turkey) have filled in the space vacated by class-based politics and relations.

---

<sup>108</sup> See Chapter 2 section 2.1 “Economic Restructuring and New Labour Markets” and 2.5 “Fragmentation of Public Space and Conflicting Istanbul”.

While theories of Weber are based on cultural aspects of social life by taking social groups instead of social class as the unit of analysis, Bourdieu analyses the class structure of France by developing the theory of distinction. Bourdieu (1984) argues that cultural capital defines a person's taste and differentiates the person from the rest. Habitus is a system of dispositions which organises a person's attitudes, manners and mindsets. Although habitus can be regarded as subconsciously formed, for Bourdieu social standing of a person lies in the interplay between different forms of capital, economic, cultural, social and lastly, symbolic. Janes and Mooney summarise that economic capital is composed of income, wealth, inheritance and financial assets. Social capital is the relationships with others and links with influential groups (Janes and Mooney, 2002: 37). As Featherstone argues cultural capital is composed of three forms: the first is "embodied state" which covers style of presentation, mode of speech, the second is "objectified state" which covers cultural goods, paintings, books and buildings and the last is "institutionalised state" which covers educational qualifications (Featherstone, 1991: 106). Lastly, symbolic capital is legitimate forms of capital (economic, social or cultural) which should be socially recognised (Janes and Mooney, 2002: 37).

Bourdieu, by analysing cultural consumption in France, argues that cultural practices (opinions) are related to educational capital (educational qualifications) and to social origin (father's occupation). In case of equality of educational level, social origins would make the difference (Bourdieu, 1980: 226). Bourdieu argues that taste is socially constructed which leads to distinction and expression of identity. There are three kinds of taste. The first is "legitimate taste" which increases with educational level and belongs to the dominant class. The second is the middle brow taste of lower middle classes and the last is the popular taste of the working class (Bourdieu, 1980: 229). Upper classes put their taste as the standard of "high culture" to differentiate themselves from lower classes, i.e. from vulgar and uncivilised people. Bourdieu

also argues that people with high cultural capital establish social norms which create “symbolic violence” over those with low cultural capital.

Bourdieu’s ideas have been criticised in several aspects. One of the criticisms is made upon Bourdieu’s focus on class structure and especially that of France (Lamont, 1992; Hall, 1992). Lamont also adds that Bourdieu focused on Parisian attitudes rather than adopting a more general approach.<sup>109</sup> Lamont proposes a more comprehensive framework by extending the limitations of cultural capital. Lamont and Fournier argue that social life has always been marked by boundaries and differences through the symbols to separate the self from others (Lamont and Fournier, 1992: 1). Lamont also criticises Bourdieu who ignored the importance of morality while overemphasising the importance of cultural and socio-economic resources (Lamont, 1992: 5). Lamont mentions the importance of “symbolic boundaries” that extend the limitations of cultural capital developed by Bourdieu. Contrary to the rational choice, Marxist and structuralist theories, Lamont argues that besides economic necessity, cultural factors are important to construct values (Lamont, 1992: 180). She also contributes to Bourdieu’s theory in several aspects. At first, she argues that differences do not directly lead to hierarchy, because differences do not generate a zero-sum game. She explains that differences might create tolerance instead of hierarchy. Secondly, moral signals are also important besides socio-economic and cultural factors. While Bourdieu focused on Parisian life and upper classes, Lamont argues that other contexts should be considered (Lamont, 1992: 186).

She compares upper middle classes in France and in the United States and proposes the concept of “symbolic boundary” which includes all characteristics of high status in different times and societies instead of “cultural capital” which is a more limited concept in a predefined context (Lamont, 1992: 128). Symbolic boundaries are conceptual distinctions to categorise

---

<sup>109</sup>Thornton’s work “Club Culture” is another interesting contribution to Bourdieu’s theory. She proposes “subcultural capital” in club scenes and argues that not only high culture creates cultural hierarchy, but also sub-cultures create their own hierarchies (1995).

objects, people, practices and even time and space (Lamont, 1992: 9). By referring to Weber, Lamont explains how boundaries are created in order to exclude the self from the others. Boundaries provide order within communities through reinforcing collective norms (Lamont, 1992: 11). Lamont is interested in common vocabulary and symbols to create a shared identity.

She argues that there are three kinds of symbolic boundaries. The first is moral boundaries such as honesty, work ethic, personal integrity and consideration for others. Secondly, there are socio-economic boundaries such as wealth, power and professional success. Thirdly, there are cultural boundaries such as education, intelligence, manners, taste and command of high culture (Lamont, 1992: 4). High status groups exclude the disadvantaged ones through three kinds of excluders in order to close boundaries. The first is “socio-economic excluders” such as financial standing, class background or power. The second is “cultural excluders” such as high level of education. The third is “moral excluders” such as while lower classes tend to be less trustful and show a weaker work ethic, upper classes tend to give more reliance on these moral traits. Lower classes tend to give more importance to physical toughness, emotional resiliency, quick wittedness, masculinity, loyalty and group solidarity (Lamont, 1992: 176).

Despite these criticisms, Bourdieu’s ideas have influenced social sciences especially in the areas of consumption, identity and taste. These ideas are still relevant to my topic in order to understand the importance of “cultural” and “symbolic” capital to distinguish a person’s taste. Moreover, although “distinction” was brought by Bourdieu to analyse class structure in France, it was also Bourdieu who argued that social identity was defined by difference and asserted through difference (Bourdieu, 1994). This might give the opportunity to extend the “distinction” to other social groups, rather than class. Bourdieu’s cultural capital is compared with social honour of Weber where status should be recognised in order to be legitimate, but cultural capital can be misrecognised but still have impact (Savage, 2002: 79). In most of the

literature, “symbolic capital” of Bourdieu has been underestimated, while almost all criticisms are focused on cultural capital by not taking into account the importance of “symbolic capital”. In the Turkish literature, the importance of symbolic capital is highlighted by Oncu (1999: 28) who argues that in contemporary period symbolic capital has become crucial to differentiate a person’s standing. Oncu explains that symbolic capital is established in the family and in the education process which creates the hierarchy of symbols. However, she neither explains nor develops her argument for further analysis by giving examples.<sup>110</sup>

Lamont uses the term “symbolic boundaries” in order to extend the meaning of “cultural capital” and argues that cultural capital is too narrow to define social standing in other social contexts. While Lamont challenges cultural capital she underestimates the importance of symbolic capital. She only highlights symbolic capital in a note in her book in page 277, where she explains that Bourdieu did not give importance to morality in itself, but regarded symbolic capital as dependent on economic and cultural capital. However, Lamont overestimates morality as something independent of any socio-economic context. By contrast, I will show that the moral character of a person is related to the economic position in the section 5.4 “Which one is the Best?” I will also show that Lamont confuses two different kinds of morality, i.e. religious one and that of “moral capitalism”.

In Turkey there are status symbols (Weber) by which people establish social closure (Weber) or symbolic boundaries (Lamont).<sup>111</sup> So, I draw a parallel between Weber’s social closure and Lamont’s symbolic boundaries, in the sense that people define others and themselves on the basis of these boundaries.<sup>112</sup> Similar to Weber’s social closure, upper middle classes in Lamont’s work define their “closure” on the basis of symbolic boundaries. However, I should also add that in a society divided into different groups there is not a single form of

---

<sup>110</sup> Maggonul also highlights the importance of symbolic capital when she refers to Oncu who explains symbolic hierarchy of preferences and tastes (Maggonul, 2005: 122).

<sup>111</sup> Lamont argues that symbolic boundaries are equal to Bourdieu’s “taste” (Lamont, 1992:187).

<sup>112</sup> Maggonul also mentions a similarity between symbolic boundaries of Lamont and social closure of Weber, based on Parkin’s work (Maggonul, 2005: 124 and 205).

symbolic capital which is agreed to be the highest and the best, but there are multiple forms of distinction and symbolic capitals which are relevant in specific context for different groups. In a society which has experienced radical social changes since the 1980s, new forms of distinction have emerged in opposition to each other. There is not “the best” but there are “bests” in an Istanbul fragmented into separate spaces for different communities. For instance, Bora and Erdogan state that different groups within the wealthy class such as Muslims, Alevis or other religious minorities might have different lifestyles:

...What kinds of differences and similarities are there between “Istanbul bourgeoisie” and “Anatolian bourgeoisie”, between “the old” and “the new” rich, between “secular”, “national”, Kurdish” and “Muslim” bourgeoisie? (Bora and Erdogan, 2005: 7)

Rather than taking certain economic, cultural and moral boundaries as given similar to Lamont and Bourdieu, I examine how residents in Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba establish boundaries with different groups. By that way, I show how these boundaries change in different situations and how they are in conflict with each other. Firstly, they establish boundaries with the local populations, on the basis of economic and cultural differences. Economic difference is based on income level, while cultural differences include the elimination of certain behaviours, and the illiteracy and conservatism of local people. Secondly, residents establish boundaries inside the same community on the basis of economic and cultural criteria such as attitude towards the staff. Another aspect of this differentiation is how long and what it takes to achieve the wealth. Thirdly, they also establish boundaries with those who live in other gated communities on the basis of economic difference, the source of wealth and the characteristics of social relations.



## 5.2 RESIDENTS AND LOCAL POPULATIONS

I now examine how residents distinguish themselves from the local populations. One way of differentiating them from local populations is using economic criteria. Most of the residents in both communities described their previous residences as an example of apartment life where middle class or people from a similar background were living. No one in Istanbul and Kasaba mentioned prominent economic and cultural differences in their previous residences:

“Apartment life...” (P3)

“Consisting of a variety of people such as single, old, professor...” (P4)

“Apartment... With high quality of people...” (P7)

“A cooperative development where more normal people were living...” (P8)

“Not somewhere like this place, most of the houses were near the Bosphorus.” (P11)

“Comfortable and good...” (P12)

“Apartment life...” (P15)

“Middle standard, educated, those with whom we can deal.” (P19)

“Cooperative development, with retired teachers, middle standard, and neither very rich nor very poor...” (P21)

“High block, “apartment life...” (P22)

“Very good...” (P26)

“Those with similar income levels like us.” (P28)

However, economic differences with nearby towns/villages were more prominent. Residents in both communities mentioned economic differences with the nearby town/village with a feeling of commiseration towards local populations. The difference of perception between their previous residences and current ones is related to two reasons. The first is that

their previous residences are known as middle or even upper class districts of Istanbul with more homogenous income distribution. Although both communities are found in different locations of Istanbul, previous residences show a similarity in terms of income level and can be placed under four main districts of Istanbul as Kadikoy, Besiktas, Sariyer and Bakirkoy.<sup>113</sup>

Although published years ago, Sonmez's work (1994) "Statistical Guide to Istanbul in the 1990s" still explains income distribution in Istanbul. Sonmez states that the richest districts in Istanbul are Besiktas, Kadikoy and Sariyer, followed by Sisli and Eyup districts. Another recent research conducted by Rea Real Estate in 2008<sup>114</sup> states that there are big differences in income level between neighbourhoods or even within the same neighbourhood. According to this research, the highest annual income belongs to the Kadikoy district, while Icerenkoy has the highest consumption potential among other neighbourhoods. On the basis of these studies it can be concluded that previous residences are among the wealthiest neighbourhoods in Istanbul. However, gated communities are surrounded by a town/village which has a lower economic condition than their previous residences.

Secondly, economic difference with the current nearby town/village might be more prominent if the family has had an increase in the total household income when they bought or moved to the new community. Residents in Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba, respectively, explained class differences with local towns/villages as:

"I can see this gap in their eyes... Sometimes you can feel the ambition in their eyes."  
(P6)

"A life like this... I do not find it correct. It is not for me. And I find it wrong. In the future everyone is afraid if there would be an uprising." (P8)

"There is a big difference between the village and Kasaba." (P15)

"The difference of wealth and poverty..." (P19)

---

<sup>113</sup> See Appendix 2.

<sup>114</sup> Esen Evran, "Iste Istanbul'un en Zengin 50 Mahallesi"  
<http://www.sabah.com.tr/2008/05/19/haber,5084DB031DE4479B8DC976C0F13C7688.html>  
(19.05.2008) accessed on 08.07.2008.

However, as I will explain in Chapter 7, spatial features of the community can produce different perceptions of the local town. In this aspect, there is also a notable difference between Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba.<sup>115</sup>

Economic difference between gated communities and nearby towns/ villages is also supported by most of the experts. An architect explained that people who lived in gated communities were different from the rest of Istanbul in terms of economic background. However, he also added that besides economic differences, there were also cultural differences. He said that residents guaranteed their positions in the society on the basis of “behaviour norms”:

“They associate cooking meat with a “mangal” with the villager mentality. They do not want those who use “mangal.” So by closing off, residents eliminate the potentiality to see a “mangal” in their communities.” (P40)

### **Image Removed**

**Fig 5.2.1:** A mangal set, photo taken from a company’s web page <http://www.durali.com/tr/index.htm>, accessed on 06.08.2009. This is a classical example which is often depicted in the media used by immigrants which damages the image of the city.

In this context, the description of mangal is very similar to the conflict between “elites” and “barbarians” which I explained in Chapter 2. Mangal is traditional equipment in Turkey to cook meat, often associated with villagers or “barbarians” in the city, although it is used in a similar way to barbeque. It is the symbol of “uncivil” masses who cook meat in cities which causes bad smells, described by Tuncer as:

...Someone also complains about people having picnics with mangals near the roads. These people are bothered by the smell and dirt dispersed around.<sup>116</sup> (Tuncer, 2005)

---

<sup>115</sup> See Chapter 7, how the spatial layout of Kasaba allows residents a more comfortable attitude towards the locals.

<sup>116</sup> Baran Tuncer, “Kentte Yasamanin Kurali Var mi?” Radikal, 21 December 2005.

## Image Removed

**Fig 5.2.2:** A barbeque, photo taken from the web page <http://www.cheappoolproducts.com/images/docs/specsb.jpg>, accessed on 06.08.2009. Barbeque is mostly associated with a Western way of life and used in a private setting.

The origins of these words are also different. While “barbeque” reflects Western (American) way of life and originates from French language, “mangal” reflects Middle Eastern (Turkish) way of life and originates from Turkish language. While mangal is used in public spaces in family gatherings such as picnics, barbeque is used in family gatherings but in more private spaces. Mangal recalls traditional way of life also because it is placed on the floor which reminds the “floor table”, a traditional table which is still being used in rural areas in Turkey (or non-Westernised and non-urbanised parts). In this aspect mangal also reminds of rural life. On the contrary, barbeque is raised from the floor. Interestingly, not the foods cooked but the context and the way of using these objects make a difference.<sup>117</sup>

Another example of such rejected behaviour is explained by a resident in Kasaba:

“Every part of the house belongs to me. Its garden... There is no one above who can shake carpets. We suffered too much from our previous neighbours. We had to install insulation on the ceiling.” (P15)

Another important factor to distinguish themselves from local populations is their low education level. The negative impact of illiteracy is described around the concept of “meat” when I asked them whether they were using local shops. The residents in both communities stated that although they were using local shops, they did not use the meat sold in local butchers. Three residents in Istanbul Istanbul and one resident in Kasaba rejected to use the local meat:

“We use the butcher in the city.” (P3)

“I do not prefer local butcher, it is a sensitive subject.” (P4)

---

<sup>117</sup> Similar to this participant’s explanation, residents also distanced themselves from the villager mentality, which I will explain later in this chapter.

“(In my old neighbourhood) the butcher and market would never sell anything bad. We do not shop from local shops. They might not be hygienic.” (P7)

“I do not shop at the local butcher, because of distrust. Rather it is because of the illiteracy, they do not know the meaning of hygiene. The butcher is like that. I use the local grocery, but, in terms of fruits and vegetables there would not be a problem. However, when meat is involved, there are diseases like mad cow and bird flu, recently. Because of that, I do not use local shops. However, our butcher in Levent moved here, so I buy meat from there.” (P11)

“I hesitate to use the local butcher, because of the hesitation of having lived in the city. Because of the market and butcher we were used to (in the city), however, we use market and bakery shop here.” (P16)

In this context, meat is regarded as dirty and they pointed out the “right knowledge” of food which lacked in the locals. In this sense, residents show that they “know” how to find the best food. This shows one dimension of multiple distinctions which operates around buying fresh vegetables and fruits (as I showed in Chapter 4) and rejecting the consumption of meat purchased from local people. A resident in Istanbul Istanbul explained that they were “selective” in the food they ate:

“...It is a matter of preference. Some people go to certain places to do shopping immediately. We are selective in this aspect. We are selective in food. We can also buy whatever we want from Kemerburgaz.”<sup>118</sup> (P6)

Residents in both communities also rejected the conservatism and “narrow mindedness” of the local people. As an example, residents in Istanbul Istanbul defined their lifestyle as very different from that of the local people:

“Very low level of income and education...” (P8)

“So, most of the locals are not educated. Closed and conservative people... You can think as if there are two separate worlds. I know this because of the women who come as domestic workers. There is a big gap between us and them, because of education and culture level... So, it is impossible to mix together. Black and white...” (P11)

“A new group of people arrived with gated communities, more intellectual.” (P13)

Moreover, a resident in Istanbul Istanbul complained about the patronage relations among the locals in local politics:

---

<sup>118</sup> Kemerburgaz is the name of the neighbourhood next to Gokturk, where Istanbul Istanbul is located.

“I think we have great irresponsibility about the local government. Because in this place mostly people from Kastamonu live, this means that the governor gives special concessions, you know, the mentality of villagers. The relatives of local governor elected him for the second time. We, as those who can have power in the future did not make an effort to make our voice heard in the local politics. This is a great irresponsibility, which I also include myself.” (P12)

As I explained in Chapter 4, this quotation shows that a certain mentality was rejected by the residents in Istanbul Istanbul. This can especially be seen in the quotation “the mentality of villagers” which shows disappointment with the local municipality, which cannot bring services to Gokturk. This shows also a disregard of “elections by relatives” or “people from Kastamonu” which means a rejection of patronage relations, which has dominated Turkish political and social life. Similarly, another resident explained that even in Gokturk there are factions between different groups of immigrants coming from Kastamonu, Rize and Giresun (cities in the Black Sea region) (P7).<sup>119</sup>

The rejection of “mentality of villagers” shows cultural differences of the residents from the local people. Although these can also show the disregard towards “community” relations, Istanbul Istanbul and to a certain degree Kasaba consist of a company-based community. In this aspect, an academic explained that there are several reasons which led people to prefer specific gated communities:

“There is also the economic side, I think. If someone works in a group of company like Is Bank, they can obtain credit from this bank and so they can buy a house there. There are these kinds of connections that I know. The other one, is when a group of friends come together to buy houses from the same gated community. However, why they buy a house in a specific community and why they decide so, I do not have any answer.” (P31)

In this sense, gated communities are the reflections of social networks of different groups of people coming together in the same community. So, if this is regarded as a community, it should be asked what kinds of community relations exist? While “community” in the village is that of people from the city of Kastamonu, which reflects patronage relations

---

<sup>119</sup> Also Esen explains that since the end of the 1970s, due to increasing industry in other parts of Istanbul, Gokturk has started to receive immigration from Eastern Black Sea region and from the city of Kastamonu (Esen, 2007).

and a “villager mentality”, company-based community in Istanbul Istanbul consists of people with high education which reflects a “Western” mentality. The clash of different communities in the same region shows a deeper cultural and social conflict which has shaped Turkey. However, the rejection of villager mentality in Istanbul Istanbul and the fear of AKP in Kasaba (as I explained in Chapter 4) are not similar. Because, while AKP would symbolise a radical change in the public space which might lead to conflict because of ideological differences, the villager mentality was admired by the same residents as something absent in Istanbul, who at the same time criticised the mentality of the locals, which I explained in Chapter 4 in the section “Honest Villagers and Natural Village Life”.

One way of avoiding relations with the locals is rejecting to send their children to the local school. Another resident in Istanbul Istanbul explained that she rejected the heterogeneous aspect of the local village where people from different backgrounds were living together. She also added that she did not want her children to go to the local primary school with village children “from the lowest level”. She also compared her childhood when everyone knew each other with that of her children when they could not predict with whom they went to the school. While she rejected the heterogeneity of the local village, she also explained the residents of Istanbul Istanbul:

“...All of these people have certain degree of education and they have been abroad. These are very important things, since a person becomes more aware when he/she travels abroad and sees. Reading books is sufficient to a certain degree. It is very different when you see, when you see with your own eyes.” (P14)

However, the difference between residents and the locals took another direction when several female residents in Kasaba explained that they were uncomfortable to walk in the streets of Omerli. So, this time religion and the ways in which a female body was interpreted in Islam in the public space have become crucial. This was explained by a resident in terms of her

fear to walk without a headscarf<sup>120</sup> in Omerli. However, she added that she did not have any problem in town when she went out (P16). Another one said that she could not wear shorts in Omerli. However, she also stated that the physical characteristics of Kasaba prevented to see the locals. She added that:

“Here, the most attractive aspect of this place is the fact that the villagers and we do not see each other. So of course, our lifestyles are so different. Neither they should adapt to us nor should we do the same.” (P28)

Related to clothes, another woman explained the other side of the situation. She explained that several residents in Kasaba stated discomfort and disrespectful behaviour towards the local women who were wearing traditional clothes (P18). While she supported local women and criticised residents of Kasaba<sup>121</sup>, she also differentiated local and traditional clothes from “carsaf” (usually a black cloth which covers female body and which is strongly connected to the Sheri’ a). This cultural difference was not regarded as a negative one, because while “carsaf” was connected to the Islamic law, the traditional clothing was associated with the “folk” i.e. being the local/ rural. This also shows how this resident sees Islamic clothes (law) as a threat, while she does not regard the folk (locals) as a threat even if they are illiterate or uneducated.

On the basis of this difference of lifestyle<sup>122</sup>, I now return to my criticism of Lamont from the first section. Lamont criticises Bourdieu who argues that symbolic capital improves social position of a person, and instead, she argues that morality is rather a goal in itself (Lamont, 1992: 184). She argues that the moral character of a person is relatively independent from socio-economic status (Lamont, 1992: 33). However, she adds that moral humanism in France is a part of French cultural standards, so here she links one moral trait in France to the

---

<sup>120</sup> This issue has become one of the most debated issues in Turkish public opinion since the mid-1980s. See Chapter 2 section 2.5 “Fragmentation of Public Space and Conflicting Istanbul”. I will explain this in more detail in Chapter 7 related to safety issues.

<sup>121</sup> See the section 5.3 “Differences Inside the Same Community”, which explains “respect” as a form of distinction.

<sup>122</sup> The rejection of “narrow-mindedness” can be associated with religion. Religion here is Islam, but with a more conservative and fundamentalist meaning.



cultural background of French society (Lamont, 1992: 94). Also she makes a similar judgement when she explains that morality of certain religious communities in France and in the United States derives from religion. By doing this, she associates morality with religion, rather than taking morality as something in itself.

While Lamont argues that upper middle classes have a morality independent of religion and argues that her participants rarely referred to religion, I criticise Lamont for the way she tries to put two different forms of morality into one category. The first is religious morality of Catholic upper middle classes who create exclusion on the basis of religious moral boundaries. This contradicts also Lamont's argument when she criticises Bourdieu and argues that symbolic boundaries do not always lead to hierarchy and/or inequality but differentiation (Lamont, 1992: 178). Here however, upper middle classes create a strong hierarchy on the basis of religious morality.<sup>123</sup> Lamont also argues that there are some individuals who establish strong moral boundaries arguing that only Christians and morally clean folks are acceptable (Lamont, 1992: 179). As example, French traditional Catholic bourgeoisie and fundamentalist Christians in the United States consider themselves superior to the "New Class" (Lamont, 1992:55- 56). However, Lamont thinks that in most of the cases, moral excluders do not lead to hierarchy but to diversity (Lamont, 1992:179).

The second is the morality which consists of the legitimate rules of capitalism. This morality is different from the morality of religious communities (used by Catholics, in Lamont's research) and in contrast to Lamont, it is associated with socio-economic status and capitalism. Lamont argues that not only lower classes have morality, which refers to religion, but also upper classes do. She examines the moral character in American and French workplaces. While in the American workplace, friendliness, conflict avoidance, teamwork, competition, ambition and competitiveness and moral purity are important, in the French

---

<sup>123</sup> See section 5.1 "Social Closure and Plural Distinctions".

workplace work ethics, competition, competence and brilliance as well as teamwork, sociability, conflict avoidance and pragmatism are important (Lamont, 1992: 60-61). So, by providing examples of moral traits of upper middle class in workplace, Lamont gives a framework of attitudes, behaviours and ideas of upper middle classes in a capitalist world which operates through legitimate rules.<sup>124</sup> This legitimacy is independent of religion; instead it is dependent on the rules of capitalist working life. So, while there is a religious morality, there is also morality based on the legitimate rules of capitalism which can be summarised as playing the game according to the rules.<sup>125</sup>

As I show in this section, while residents in Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba reject a religious way of life, their morality lies in other factors. This morality is also similar to Doguc's research (2005) in which there is a difference between the individualism of the new middle classes and the logic of the poor based on traditional values and a belief in destiny. In this vein, Ayata (2002) writes that the new middle classes differentiate themselves from the logic of the new rich but especially from the Islamist middle classes. I will explain in more detail in section 5.4 "Which one is the Best?" how residents in Istanbul Istanbul use morality of a legitimate capitalism (moral capitalism) which will complete the discussion made here.

I now discuss here another aspect of morality related to religion. Although it can be concluded that the relationship between Protestantism and capitalism has been dissolved (or at

---

<sup>124</sup> However, Lamont was not the first one who introduced morality into capitalist world. Rather, it is Weber in "Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism" who connects Protestant values and the industrial capitalism of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. However, in Lamont's work those who associate themselves with capitalism instead of an ascetic religious life are the upper middle classes who abstract themselves from religion and create a work ethic legitimate in the capitalist world.

<sup>125</sup> In the last years another kind of morality has received significant attention in public discourse, by the introduction of new forms of lifestyle, regarding animal rights, ethical consumption, fair-trade, environmental concerns which encourage consuming bio-degradable, recyclable and cruelty-free products. All these efforts are moral rules in a capitalist system which can be called as "moral capitalism". These new forms of consumption lead to new forms of distinction on the basis of "Who is the most moral of all?" This idea came into my mind when I read an article by Barnett, Cloke, Clarke and Malpass published in 2005 in *Antipode* "Consuming Ethics: Articulating the Subjected and Spaces of Ethical Consumption", who argue that ethical consumption lead to political behaviours which can create a challenge. However, I argue that these efforts are one way to reproduce capitalism in a different shape and instead of being a challenge to the existing system; they continue the existing one by hiding behind a moral and green mask.

least decreased over time) as argued by Lamont (1992), the link between religious morality and economic structure should be discussed more in the future especially in societies like Turkey where religion both rises and integrates with the rules of capitalism in a global world. Although the relationship between Protestantism and capitalism has been eroded, other religious communities have survived with capitalism.<sup>126</sup> A point of interest is the integration of other religious groups into the capitalist system and their acceptance of this system as part of their everyday life and religious practices. As Ghandi separated the life of an ascetic Jesus with the lifestyles of the capitalist Westerners:

I like your Christ; I do not like you Christians. You Christians are so unlike your Christ.

Turkey's recent changes indicate a more pluralistic cultural capital and moreover, pluralistic morality due to the rise of Islamism and Islamic capital. Another interesting subject is Islam's relation with capitalism due to its nature. Firstly, in the emergence of Islam, trade played a crucial role. Secondly, Islam is based on strong hierarchies and inequalities between master and servant and men and women, which can easily be transferred into the unequal character of capitalism. Thirdly, Islam is also based on the domination of human beings over Nature, which also reproduces capitalism to dominate and exploit Nature. Fourthly, Islam is based on the expectation of an afterlife, which can provide the capitalist class with a "believing" mass who wait for Heaven, even if they cannot find it on Earth. All these make Islam a good playground for capitalism.

One alternative way to explain differentiation in morality and culture is Hall's (1992) pluralistic account of cultural capital. He proposes a heterologous understanding of cultural capital and ethics instead of a holistic approach as Bourdieu who regarded social class as the basis of cultural capital. Hall analyses the interrelations between class, gender and ethnicity and

---

<sup>126</sup> In an interesting debate about the relation between religion and the "display of wealth", Bora and Erdogan argue that old religions had condemned the display of wealth (2005), without giving details about the relation between morality and capitalism. However, they do not draw attention to the integration of inequality and (capitalism) into religious life.

argues that there are multiple economic and cultural markets of distinction. He argues that instead of the upper class as analysed by Bourdieu, upper middle class is influential in the United States' cultural framework. For Hall, value is not always imposed upon classes without dominant power from the outside, such as the case of Italian American community of manual workers who develop craft abilities as a form of distinction (Hall, 1992: 264). Therefore, distinction does not only depend on social class, rather social class is only one form of distinction among others.

While Hall (1992) does not include religion as a factor of distinction and morality, the rise of Islam in Turkey is an example of a different symbolic capital which is relevant for those who prefer an Islamic lifestyle. The recent rise of Islam in Turkey also brings the relation between religion and morality into focus. While Islamists are criticised by seculars for integrating religious ideology into everyday life, for Islamists this is the right way of living. So while there is a relation between morality and religion, this is not always a "legitimate" way of living in a capitalist world. In this context, Hall's alternative argument of cultural capital should be re-evaluated by taking also into account the importance of religion as a form of distinction. In these days, while capitalism regenerates itself in Turkey with the rise of Islam, in the West it regenerates itself with the rise of "moral capitalism" by the consumption of "ethical products". I would add religion as a form of differentiation which would lead to "socially situated symbolic capitals" to contribute to Hall's theory and Lamont's theory in which she does not separate the morality of Catholics from that of secular upper middle classes who establish moral boundaries on the basis of a moral capitalism.

### **5.3 DIFFERENCES INSIDE THE SAME COMMUNITY**

Residents also establish boundaries inside the same community. The first way is using economic criteria. As an example, a resident in Kasaba stated that:

“We can be regarded among the upper group by Turkey’s standards. Even if our household income is dependent only on a single wage earner; we can be regarded among the upper group. However, of course we can be regarded as one of the lowest for Kasaba. We are salaried earners. Because, most of the people have their own businesses...” (P18)

Two residents in Kasaba explained the importance of the process of selection to find similar people, when as an example one resident explained the importance of “selection” in social relations (P19). Another one added that:

“Of course the income level is not the same. Kasaba mostly consists of high ranked managers of a company. Then there are small industrialists, there are also “bigger” names. However, people can find people similar to themselves. So, people from the same level can find each other.” (P28)

This resident uses different words “high ranked managers”, “small industrialists”, and “bigger” to describe income level as an important factor which leads people to come together.

However, in Istanbul Istanbul residents did not use economic criteria to differentiate each other, which had a more homogenous population in terms of income level. However, not economic criteria but “how” to obtain the wealth was important to distinguish from others. Three residents in Istanbul Istanbul stated that they obtained their wealth by their own labour when they were asked “the average household income”. One of them described their household income level as “upper middle” and added that her husband achieved this wealth by his labour (P10). Another one explained that they acquired their wealth with their own labour and differentiated themselves from rich people who “owned factories or whatever else” (P12). This resident did not give a specific definition of “richer people” who obtained wealth by doing “whatever else”. Another resident stated that:

“Thank god, not very low, but I consider (us) as middle level in terms of income. I do not have a daily domestic worker. I do every kind of housework myself. I only have a domestic worker once a week. There are those who send their two children to private schools and have domestic workers. I do not know how they do this.” (P14)

She tried to create mythical speculations about those with higher income levels. Another resident described the residents in Istanbul Istanbul as people who obtained this place

with their labour (P9). So, these residents relied on deserved wealth obtained by labour. However, this explanation was absent among the residents in Kasaba, which I will explain in more detail later in the sub-section 5.4.1 “We are not as Snobbish as Kemer Country” the reason why they did not need to legitimise their wealth against their neighbours or others.

Another way of differentiation in Istanbul Istanbul was using cultural factors:

“School... They were graduated from more or less the same schools. However, I was expecting more homogeneity in terms of intellect. I was disappointed because of that.” (P3)

Related to culture, the same resident showed the inconsistency between the education and behaviour of residents:

“...I do not know... I was not expecting fighting in a place like this. I know that I say a very snobbish thing. You might think that these are unrelated to these issues. But... if you look at people who live here, then the expectations become like this. I was thinking that these people should have reached a certain intellectual level. So I would not expect definitely these things here. People still have difficulties to say “good morning”. It seems strange to me. I should not know someone to say good morning, however, people whom I know here have difficulty to say good morning. This seems strange to me.” (P3)

One resident in Istanbul Istanbul explained that he was not interested in the activities in the community while other residents gathered to drink and talk. He also explained that as a couple their social life was based on concerts, theatres and movies. He also explained that they chose to live in this community where they would not expect to find a neighbour who was listening to Ibrahim Tatlis<sup>127</sup> and shouting from the balcony (P2). Also another resident in Istanbul Istanbul verifies the ideas of Elias in an opposite direction who explained the conflict between the established and the outsiders. This resident described people who were living in Istanbul Istanbul as being “rootless” and “parvenu” who had become wealthy later in their lives:

---

<sup>127</sup> Ibrahim Tatlis is an arabesque music singer who has become a celebrity because of his private life. His music and lifestyle have often been disdained by the public opinion. This resident represents this attitude which I explained in Chapter 2. Differences of residents on the basis of their cultural backgrounds in Turkey is best crystallised in a popular debate on Ibrahim Tatlis. According to the media, when he wanted to purchase a house in Kemer Country, which had a more aristocratic image over other gated communities, the managers of this gated community did not want to sell the house to him, thought to be humiliating for their gated community’s image.

“People here are without background. We are like Turks in Germany. There are people who deal in suspicious activities. It is impossible for them to establish a friendly life. These people are outsiders...It is impossible to become like this, one should be born like this... A person is “parvenu” if this person has earned his wealth after 40 years old.” (P7)

This reminds of being rootless and in-between in a negative sense. He gave the examples of Turkish immigrants in Germany who were regarded as neither Western nor Eastern. He did not only describe gated communities as artificial, but also social relations as “disgraceful and artificial”. By doing this, he does not only point at the lower culture of residents but also their way of earning money which has an effect on their relations. He also added that:

“I belong to Nisantasi, born and bred.” (P7)

This is similar to the residents of Nisantasi in Maggonul’s study who described themselves as someone who belonged to Nisantasi born and bred (Maggonul, 2005: 77). This shows that this resident finds his identity in the neighbourhood he previously lived (Nisantasi), in an old and prestigious neighbourhood if compared with gated communities. He also said that he had been the one who put the rules while he now had difficulty to adapt to the rules of the community. While most of the residents stated their comfort about the rules in the community and established their boundaries on the basis of adapting to the rules, this person felt contrary to other residents. As a member of the “established” group, this resident finds difficulty to adapt to the rules of the community which are contradictory to his identity, as a person who established rules.<sup>128</sup> In this aspect, adaptation to rules means “being influenced”. However, rejecting the rules does not mean anarchy brought by the rural immigrants which has

---

<sup>128</sup> Elias’ explanation of the relationship between “established” and “outsiders” can be useful to explain this situation (2000). I think the problem for Elias is not how to change the world, but is about who will rule. The outsiders do not try to change the system but they try to get power by keeping the system as it is. Although Elias does not see any seeds of change deriving from the conflict between established and outsiders, he contributes to the studies of social exclusion and power relations in the society. However, the position of this resident verifies Elias’ views in an opposite way by being an “established as an outsider” in Istanbul Istanbul.

transformed the city into a dangerous place<sup>129</sup> but I think it is the way to explain his individuality and independence. Barbarians who are from rural origins are mostly regarded as those who cannot adapt to urban life. While residents in both communities established selectivity around the rules to be obeyed, this resident established his selectivity by complaining about the rules. Since he regarded himself as the outsider of Istanbul Istanbul, he did not find any common ground with the residents and differentiated himself from residents, regarded as having lower culture and morality.

Another factor to distinguish is the behaviour towards and relations with the staff who works in the two communities. Residents in both communities mentioned those who did not behave properly toward the staff, such as to castigating or not even saying “good morning” to them, as stated by a resident in Istanbul Istanbul (P3). This improper behaviour is seen as a form of disrespect towards the working class as in the words of another resident in Istanbul Istanbul:

“We take the side of the working class.” (P2)

A resident in Istanbul Istanbul explained that other residents regarded volunteer residents as someone who was working and serving for them:

“For instance, they were treating me in this manner: “Hey, member of the committee. Why is this so?” I told them that I was not their salaried employee. I was working there as a volunteer. I should not answer all of their demands or I was not responsible for all the things. For instance, there was a party held by someone. They asked me “Why did not this person pay?” As an example. This is not related to me. As if I and the other volunteers were earning money from this. And such a scorn.” (P8)

Another resident in Istanbul Istanbul explained that:

“...Honestly, here people are from an economically high level, but this does not mean that money equals culture. Sometimes there might be attitudes towards the staff from the people you would never expect. Sometimes you do not expect it, but things happen.” (P11)

---

<sup>129</sup> See Chapter 2 section 2.5 “Fragmentation of Public Space and Conflicting Istanbul” and sub-section 2.5.1 “Tensions in Istanbul: The Entrapment of Elites” and section 2.6 “From a Global City into a City of Fear”.



Also in Kasaba residents mentioned the inconsistency between money and culture such as “High income but low education” (P20).<sup>130</sup> A resident explained how she rejected both illegal ways of earning money and lack of culture. She explained different sources of wealth such as inheritance and “surprise” which could provide money but not culture:

“I cannot tell the same thing for culture. Because people in Turkey earn money by inheritance, or some earn money by working. Some of them experience surprises. So a person can be saturated with money. So, I do not consider people in the same level in terms of culture.”<sup>131</sup> (P18)

This quotation shows that different sources of wealth are used by residents against other residents. Sometimes, as in this example, they use this factor to show the inconsistency between wealth (money) and culture. Some of them use this factor to legitimise their lower income level, as I will show later.

Behaviour habits were also other factors of differentiation. As an example, the same resident in Kasaba stated the attitude towards the local women who were working as domestic workers and wearing local clothing:

“It is similar to trench coat. They were criticised here because of wearing this. “Do not come with this”. At that time, we did not have a shuttle, they were walking to Kasaba. There was a spoilt attitude towards them: “Do not walk with this”. This is wrong for me.” (P18)

She said that this was a spoilt attitude brought by money. However, she added that this kind of “spoilt” attitude towards the local people or staff was not only seen in gated communities, but it could also be seen in the city. By doing this, she shows the inconsistency between money and culture which is not sufficient to digest the wealth.

---

<sup>130</sup> Low also mentions a similar inconsistency between money and culture when a resident in Mexico City describes some residents as “the new rich with inferior cultural background...They have money but no education and this can cause problems with those that may not have a lot of money but are educated”, which affects the likelihood of participation in the community (Low, 2003: 193).

<sup>131</sup> This resident is the one who describes her household income among the lowest in Kasaba and so she states the importance of source of income and how she differentiates herself from those people. This resident in Kasaba, similar to the residents in Istanbul Istanbul used the moral criteria to legitimise her lower income level.

Another way of showing the inconsistency between money and culture is to explain temporal dimension to achieve something, which was described by two residents:

“In the 30’s, 40’s and 50’s apartment life emerged in Turkey. Not only people in Istanbul but also people in Turkey could not adapt to the apartment life. (A person) still shakes down the carpet from the window, as in the garden. People get used to apartment life slowly. They will get used to this life, like here. However, we need time for this. Time and tolerance...” (P2, Istanbul Istanbul)

“Not in stages, it is obtained early. (He/she) could digest something. Money talks in certain aspects.”(P19, Kasaba)

I think both residents relied on the importance of “time” to be used to live in the city or “stages” to earn money. For them, to do something in stages is in contrast to do something fast. Also Doguc in her research about the new middle classes in Istanbul argues that the temporal dimension to obtain cultural capital is an important factor, such as family and institutions from early childhood (Doguc, 2005: 83).

However, time does not affect cultural capital, but it also affects modernisation and globalisation processes experienced in Turkey. As I explained in Chapter 2, Turkey has experienced radical changes since the 1980s which have resulted in a new socio-economic structure by the emergence of the new classes, social groups and conflicts in urban space. The account of “stages” is similar to the Turkey’s modernisation and urbanisation processes which have been compared with the Western modernisation. For instance, Isik argues that underdeveloped countries have experienced changes since the Second World War in only several decades, which were experienced by developer countries in 150 years (Isik, 1995: 782). As an example, since the 1950s urbanisation was encouraged by government authorities in Turkey, which was regarded as a way to modernise the country (Danielson and Keles, 1985) [The sentence was corrected]. However, as argued by Danielson and Keles, cities in Turkey did not develop parallel to the economic development which resulted in “rapid urbanisation” (1985: 28) or “over-urbanisation” (Danielson and Keles, 1985: 39). Similarly, since the 1980s

it has usually been agreed that while Turkey has experienced radical changes within a few years, the rest of the world (West) has experienced this process in a longer period.

As two residents mentioned the importance of “stages”, Turkey’s recent changes since the 1980s have often been regarded as “undigested” changes in a society often thought to be transformed into the post-industrial age without being fully industrialised and fully modernised. Previously in Chapter 2, I explained how consumption and display have become crucial while welfare state mechanisms had been abandoned which increased the polarisation between the rich and the poor.<sup>132</sup> As I will show in the next section, “how” and “how long” it takes to obtain wealth can also be related to the socio-economic changes in Turkey since the 1980s. These findings show that even in the same community there is differentiation on the basis of different factors.

Although there are differences between Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba, the sources of income and the relation between “money” and “culture” are their common characteristics. The residents indicated this relation with such quotations as “suspicious things and money obtained later”, the inconsistency between “money and culture”, “spoilt attitude brought by money”, “indigestion of wealth and money talks”, “saturation of money, inheritance and earning money by labour”. I argue that when the income level is similar, cultural differences become more important in order to differentiate. Interestingly, even in Kasaba with a more heterogeneous income level, residents referred to cultural factors to distinguish inside the same community, which shows that generally “culture” is regarded to be more important, valued and achieved with more difficulty than material wealth.

#### **5.4 “WHICH ONE IS THE BEST?”**

---

<sup>132</sup> See Chapter 2, section 2.1 “Economic Restructuring and New Labour Markets”.

This is a quotation of an architect who explained the competition between gated communities and asked:

“...Also these communities are in competition with each other. Is it better to live in Kemer Country or somewhere in Omerli?” (P40)

The answer to this question was in front of me when I asked residents why they chose this community instead of other ones. The answers given to this question showed how residents establish boundaries with other gated communities. However, residents who compared their communities with other ones were the residents of Istanbul Istanbul, instead of Kasaba, even when they were not asked to do so.

One way of doing this is using economic difference. For instance, a resident compared Istanbul Istanbul with Kemer Country saying that while high ranked managers were living in Istanbul Istanbul, owner of companies preferred Kemer Country (P1). However, the main difference was introduced with “how” and “how long” it took to achieve the wealth. Several residents in Istanbul Istanbul defended their communities by legitimising their wealth as something “deserved” and/or achieved and justified by their labour. For instance, one resident described the residents of Istanbul Istanbul as:

“As far as I can see, people who work or live here are either working as a couple or a family in which the wife does not work, even if she worked in the past. This is very different from other communities such as people here do not inherit wealth. I say this because here there is a group of people who are not spoilt or less spoilt with money.” (P3)

Although this resident did not mention the name of a specific gated community, she defended the residents in Istanbul Istanbul to be free of inherited wealth and spoilt behaviour, which shows the rejection of earning money without labour. She was the one who referred to cultural differences between residents in the previous section. However, she now defended her community by stating that there was no inherited wealth here, instead residents earned money with their labour.

There were several residents who distanced Istanbul Istanbul explicitly from other gated communities and specifically from Kemer Country. For instance, one resident in Istanbul Istanbul explained that the situation of the residents in Istanbul Istanbul reminded her of their situation ten years ago, when they did not have anything. They accumulated wealth by beginning from zero, without an inheritance from parents. She also explained the reason why she did not choose a house in Kemer Country:

“However, there was another house in Kemer Country with the same price. I thought to buy that house but I was afraid of the pigsty life in Kemer Country. It is told that there are odd people. I mean, the source of income is unknown. These are not nice things. We are all one family. So, family life is quite different. The taste of earning by working is very different.” (P14)

This resident although previously explained that she did not know how richer people in Istanbul Istanbul achieved their wealth, now defended Istanbul Istanbul against Kemer Country in terms of their wealth obtained by their labour. She also explicitly used a strong notion of community and described Istanbul Istanbul as “one family” which was in contrast to the “odd” people in Kemer Country. So, the same person used different criteria in a different situation to defend the community where she lived. So, distinction does not only depend on different social groups but also on different situations. On the basis of this data, besides “socially situated symbolic capitals” which vary on each social group, I also argue that there are “multiple socially situated distinctions” which do not only depend on different social groups but also on different situations. This can give several answers to the empty arena in Turkish literature about identity formation and boundary work and also open new questions.

Another resident stated that in Istanbul Istanbul most of the people were working in the finance sector if compared with Kemer Country:

“Generally (they) consist of a group between 40 and 50 years old, between 35 and 50. I think this is a place where most people work in the finance sector. But, here I take Kemer Country as an example. So, I mean those who obtained their wealth by working and are aware of the things they obtained.” (P11)

This resident explicitly distances the residents in Istanbul Istanbul from those in Kemer Country in terms of their labour and “awareness” of their wealth which means that residents of Istanbul Istanbul appreciate their wealth. Several residents in Istanbul Istanbul did the same comparison with the residents in their previous residences. One of them explained this difference as:

“Who are those people? High-ranked bank managers. Finance or managers of companies... They are not similar to the people who were living in Zekeriyakoy. Who were these people? Those who work in textile sector or in illegal activities or are parvenus... Parvenus, those who have become rich but are uneducated... Here everyone is graduated from university and they are a young group of people.” (P8)

This resident differentiates the residents in Istanbul Istanbul from the people in her previous residence who were dealing in “textile”, “illegal activities” and who were “parvenu”. “Parvenu” does not only refer to someone who earns money easily (without labour) but also to someone with lower educational and cultural level.

Also another resident stated that she did not have too many relationships in her previous neighbourhood, since it was consisting of mostly “yalis”:

“The previous residence was not similar to my house here, because people here are from the same age group and profession. Most of them....They are similar in terms of age group. And so, children are also from the same age group. This makes relations closer here. Our relations in Ulus were not bad, but for example there were yalis<sup>133</sup> in our neighbourhood. In this sense there was no one to meet frequently.” (P11)

Both residents dissociated themselves either by the source of income or the characteristics of social relations from those with higher income level. So, morality here is used as an excuse to justify their lower economic condition as in previous examples. At least, here contrary to Lamont, morality is associated with socio-economic position. By doing this, residents in Istanbul Istanbul create a mythical speculation about the source of wealth of residents in other richer communities.<sup>134</sup> As these quotations show, residents in Istanbul Istanbul legitimised their wealth achieved by their labour against other communities’ wealth

---

<sup>133</sup> Expensive houses on the waterfront in Bosphorus in Istanbul.

<sup>134</sup> See the section “Social Closure and Plural Distinctions”.

which was regarded to be obtained by unknown or illegal ways or inheritance. In this aspect, they erased cultural differences inside their communities and defended themselves against the outside. Different ways of earning money such as “textile”, “illegal activities”, “inheritance” are important to affect their understanding of themselves and residents of other communities.<sup>135</sup>

For instance, Doguc (2005) by using Bourdieu’s and Lamont’s theories argues that the new middle classes in Istanbul consider themselves among upper class, while at the same time separate themselves from other wealthy groups in terms of their source of wealth, lifestyle and cultural practices. They stress their becoming wealthy through education and their hard work rather than chance or trade. Similarly, also Danis (2001) and Kurtulus (2005a) analysed Bahcesehir in terms of cultural differences and professions of residents such as the difference between easy money and deserved income (Kurtulus, 2005a: 103). However, in Istanbul Istanbul these factors are used to differentiate themselves from other gated communities, especially from Kemer Country. I argue that these factors form the basis of moral capitalism which I explained in the previous section. The criteria used to define the morally acceptable in a capitalist society require different moral traits from these of religion. These are “symbolically accepted moral boundaries” which shows the missing link between Bourdieu’s symbolic capital and Lamont’s moral boundaries. The moral criteria used by the residents in Istanbul Istanbul are similar to moral boundaries of Lamont, but the moral criteria are not independent; rather they are embedded in the capitalist system. Moreover, the moral criteria are used by residents to differentiate themselves only from people thought to have higher income level.

Similar to the studies of Danis, Doguc and Kurtulus, the residents in Istanbul Istanbul described their wealth as something deserved and achieved by their labour, contrary to being inherited or undeserved (illegal) wealth. By that way, residents establish the boundaries of

---

<sup>135</sup> Also Pamuk in his novel “Istanbul: Hatiralar ve Sehir” explains different kinds of wealth and separates the wealth obtained by creativity or invention from that obtained by chance or bribery. He explains that those who do not have an intellectual activity behind their wealth are not interested in reading or playing chess (Pamuk 2008: 179).

moral capitalism, which requires earning money through legitimate ways. While Lamont underestimates the importance of symbolic capital of Bourdieu, she argues that in order to create exclusion, there should be a consensus about the hierarchy and deviance on the basis of symbolic boundaries (Lamont, 1992: 178). I think here she refers to “symbolic capital” as something legitimate in a society which creates exclusion and hierarchy. I also think the term “symbolic boundaries” is useful to include different factors of stratification which extends the idea of cultural capital, but it lacks the connection to symbolic capital of Bourdieu.

Lamont’s moral boundaries (even if she does not mention them) are similar to Bourdieu’s symbolic capital in the sense that for Lamont, disregard of phonies, dishonest people, social climbers and the praise of the right behaviour in the workplace (work ethic, team work) are among moral boundaries. Bourdieu also regards symbolic capital as something “legitimate” and “agreed” in society, such as how money is earned. He explains that symbolic capital is achieved through reputation for competence, respectability and honourability which can lead to a political position (Bourdieu, 1984: 291). This does not mean that something legitimate and agreed on is always moral, but something which is regarded as illegitimate and disagreed by a society is never regarded as moral.

At a more general level, I also make a connection between symbolic capital and symbolic boundaries in such way that symbolic capital is a comprehensive term showing what kinds of boundaries (economic, cultural and moral) are accepted as legitimate in order to establish hierarchies between people. A person’s symbolic capital (which has a moral dimension, by referring to legitimacy) can also be discussed in relation to other socio-economic contexts and temporalities. So, symbolic boundaries should also be symbolically accepted capital to function in a society. However, in a society fragmented along class, religious and ethnic divisions, there is not a single set of morality and distinctions. This indicates a plurality of symbolic capitals, which I would call “socially situated symbolic capitals”, only accepted by



certain social groups rather than being accepted by the whole. As I showed in section 5.2 how religion creates plurality of distinctions and its hierarchy, here I show how residents in Istanbul Istanbul create distinction around class differences by using the criteria of moral capitalism.

Weber's social honour can also be regarded to be similar to Lamont's moral boundaries. He gives the example of the "nouveau rich", a group within the wealthy class without honour and prestige, and also adds that Marx ignored this dimension of social stratification (Weber, 1963: 15, 54). Weber separates economic power and social honour and argues that economically determined power is not identical to power. For instance, having money does not always lead to social honour (Weber, 1963: 42). Status honour is not only linked to class situation; rather it might be in opposition to wealth such as people might belong to the same status group without having the same amount of wealth (Weber, 1963: 49). Therefore, I draw a parallel between Lamont's moral boundaries, Bourdieu's symbolic capital and Weber's social honour and I argue that Lamont underestimates the importance of Bourdieu's symbolic capital.

In this context, residents in Istanbul Istanbul create a moral boundary (Lamont) or symbolic capital (Bourdieu), and acquire social honour (Weber) by earning money through legitimate ways. These kinds of distinctions lie in the difference between the old capitalism which was dominated by industrial production in a modern and urbanised state and the new one which is dominated by service sectors instead of production. In this period, regarded as the post-industrial age, new forms of income have emerged such as finance and service sectors. This period has also brought about the increase in informal and illegal sectors in Turkey, as I explained in Chapter 2. In this period people need to legitimise their wealth to distance

themselves from these “illegal” and “easy” ways of becoming wealthy. Every kind of rent, especially urban rent has acquired the meaning of easy and dirty money.<sup>136</sup>

#### 5.4.1 “*We Are Not as Snobbish as Kemer Country*”

Residents in Istanbul explained that their community was also different in terms of social relations, such as:

“The most social one. In some developments people do not know their neighbours. They live in villas but do not know their neighbours. For instance, there are 200 housing units here and everyone knows each other. This is very comfortable for children. I know at least with whom my children play, where they go, what they do and with whom they make friends. So in this sense this is a very safe place.”(P13)

This resident makes a connection between “living in a villa” and “not having neighbourly relations”. In Istanbul, residents do not live in villas and they have neighbourly relations which make their lives more comfortable especially for children. While this resident makes a connection between having money (villas) and having no neighbourly relations, she does not give the name of a specific gated community. She describes Istanbul as a more moderate place for income level but with better social relations.

The same thing was mentioned by another resident who described the people in Kemer Country as “cold” and “with inhumane standards” and Kemer Country as a place where there were pools and villas but no neighbourliness:

“I have always known Kemer Country. It seems very cold to me. Not humane. Yes they build swimming pools, flats and buildings and they live there. However, there is no neighbourliness, nothing. But, when you go out here you have your neighbour. You might get everything you need from your neighbour.” (P14)

---

<sup>136</sup> For an explanation how “rent” is considered see Boratav’s book “Social Classes and Distribution in Turkey in the 1980s” (2005). Interestingly, the same criteria were used even by several experts (academics and architects) who criticised gated communities as “artificial” places and residents as “parvenu” or as those who did not have proper cultural background. So, the same criteria such as the inconsistency between money and culture, “lack of manners” as well as “illegal” or “easy” ways of earning money are common for experts who criticised residents in gated communities and for residents who distinguished themselves inside the same community or from other gated communities. Even at the level of discourse, the criteria of “moral capitalism” are common for most of the participants in this research, despite coming from different cultural backgrounds.

This resident separates material affluence (swimming pools and flats) and social relations with neighbours which are absent in Kemer Country. Again she shows the difference between high income levels and low social interaction and friendships. “Need” shows the interdependence between the residents of Istanbul Istanbul and as a positive feature. Another resident explained that when they first moved to Gokturk, the only community different from Istanbul Istanbul was Kemer Country:

“...When we moved here, there were few (communities)... There was nothing, except Kemer Country and only Istanbul Istanbul. So I would never think to live in Kemer Country. This is due to the reasons I explained previously. It seems a much more isolated life. And I did not want my child to grow in a place like that. So I consider that place to be outside of Turkey. I do not support that children would grow behind much closed doors like that.” (P11)

This resident rejects Kemer Country because of having an isolated life not suitable for children. In this aspect, Kemer Country is outside of Turkey, as outside of the realities of Turkey. She also added that she would not want her child to be grown up there. Similarly, another resident stated that while Kemer Country was a very different place with vast lands which consisted of “people in extremes”, Istanbul Istanbul consisted of more similar people (P9). This shows the link between the size of the community and its residents i.e. the link between space and income levels. The isolation in Kemer Country was also mentioned by another resident who described Kemer Country as “the hidden paradise”, where there was extreme isolation (P7). In this context, a local in Gokturk explained that:

“Here people are warmer and closer because of attached houses... Residents can also ask their needs to their neighbours. They become surprised because they do not know this kind of neighbourly relations. When they move in an attached house from a detached house like Kemer Country, there are warmer neighbourly relations. We have very strong social relations between groups.” (P34)

This quotation shows how Kemer Country is thought to have less social interaction due to its spatial design.<sup>137</sup> Although this quotation shows the link between space and social

---

<sup>137</sup> In the next chapter, I will analyse in more detail how physical characteristics of a gated community leads to better relations.

relations, residents of Istanbul Istanbul made this comparison only with Kemer Country because of income differences. Moreover, this does not mean that the spatial layout of Istanbul Istanbul would definitely lead to better relations. It also does not mean that Kasaba does not have good social relations. As example, there were also several residents which were not quite happy or uninterested with the social relations in Istanbul Istanbul due to their cultural or age differences. While one of them said she preferred to live there because of being close to their grandchildren and did not have any interest in the activities because of her age, another one explained that their cultural and age differences led them to have a more isolated life in Istanbul Istanbul. Another resident explained that due to their status they did not establish very intimate relations. She added that they visited their friends from the same company every fifteen days or so due to the expectations of the business life:

“We think that private life of people should be kept more “private”. If there are too frequent visits, our private life would turn into a common one. So we should protect this. We protect this distance. Everyone here is like us. There is no slushy social relation here.” (P5)

As this quotation shows, neighbourly relations in Istanbul Istanbul are debatable. This resident shows a clear importance of “privacy” of the family life, which should be protected from outsiders. This also shows that a person tries to put distance among equals.

I explain four factors which affect social relations inside a gated community. The first is the difference between the residents in their previous neighbourhoods (mostly apartments) and those in their present communities, having a more homogeneous population, which might allow residents to feel more comfortable to establish relations. They can also think that gated communities consist of people “worthy” of establishing relations, which shows the importance of common economic and cultural backgrounds. The second is the difference between the working life of residents in their new homes and that in previous ones. Being retired and/or having children might lead residents to establish better relations. Several residents in both

communities explained that they did not have close social relations in their previous residences because they were working.

However, there were also working residents in both communities who mentioned better relations in the new community. So, the third factor is the difference between an apartment flat and a house, which is related to space. This was more prominent in Kasaba. Residents in Kasaba explained their previous residences as:

“It was an apartment, not a neighbourhood. Apartment life... There were neighbours whom I did not know.” (P15)

“Nothing in terms of social relations...” (P18)

However, they explained life in Kasaba with spatial descriptions such as “the difference between horizontal and vertical lives” (P18), “eye contact” (P23), “a typical village life. Our doors are open.” (P28).

Moreover, despite these differences between the two cases and Istanbul Istanbul’s insistence on “better social relations”, it was residents in Kasaba who explained the importance of neighbourliness because of the distance from the city which rendered them dependent on their new milieu. So, the fourth factor is to move to a new house which is far from their social ties in Istanbul. Once they are far from their friends in the city, these people need new people to interact with. They could be isolated and feel lonely if they do not establish friendships. Residents in Kasaba explained that:

“Neighbourliness is very pleasant. I think people might be limited inside this community, and so it is easier to make friendship. Everyone needs others more. So, it is very pleasant.” (P16)

“Now neighbourliness becomes important inside Kasaba, because we are so lonely. Think of a house, there is no one. It is so silent and quiet that you can even hear the voice of the leaf falling down. This comes from the need out of loneliness.” (P21)

“We need each other because of being far from the city.” (P22)

Distance from their networks (from the city or municipality or other gated communities) can enhance the feeling of isolation and loneliness. While in Kasaba several

residents stated their dependence on new and better social relations, in Istanbul Istanbul only one woman mentioned the importance of establishing relations. She added also that she had organised a lot of meetings and spent a lot of effort to establish friendships, because of the distance to Istanbul. She added that the number of visitors has decreased (P4).<sup>138</sup> So, residents in Kasaba because of the distance from the city and the loneliness of an isolated house look for friendship and socialisation. Although they do not have common characteristics such as school age children like the residents in Istanbul Istanbul, they still establish relations because of the circumstances. Five residents mentioned the “need” to socialise or form friendships. However, residents in Istanbul Istanbul, whether living in a specifically designed place<sup>139</sup> to make them to socialise or not, tend to establish relations because of common traits they have such as school age children, same age, profession and education level, as in the words of a resident in Istanbul Istanbul:

“Since we don’t have any small children, we do not have any close relations with our neighbours. Although children fight with each other, their families mix and introduce them each other. We do not have such a chance.” (P2)

So, the likelihood of a more homogenous population inside Istanbul Istanbul leads to better interaction. This is important for residents when several of them mentioned that both children and residents were from the same age group.

Also when someone moves to a new place, this person seeks to know others. However, once they start to get involved and know others, they might not need more people to know later. As explained by two residents in Istanbul Istanbul, while previously there were more activities which residents were participating, the interest for these activities has decreased. These quotations complete the discussion in Chapter 4 when I explained how demographic characteristics influence involvement with the outside world. While residents in

---

<sup>138</sup> Also Ayata in his research on Koru Sitesi in Ankara mentions a similar theme among the residents who stated “weakening social relations due to the increased physical distance” (Ipek, 1998 in Ayata, 2002: 31). All of them stated that “dropping in” was replaced with “pre-arranged visits” (Ayata, 2002: 31).

<sup>139</sup> See Chapter 6 how Istanbul Istanbul is specifically designed to make residents to socialise more.

Kasaba have less common ground due to their higher average age and less dependent children, this does not make them less likely to be involved with the outside or establish relations. They can be interested with their surroundings through different ways.<sup>140</sup>

So, although the design of Istanbul Istanbul and its homogenous population might lead to better social relations, it is significant when and against whom they explained their better social relations. They only made comparisons with Kemer Country, although there were other gated communities in Gokturk. The reason behind this perception of Kemer Country is the difference in income levels. So at least for this comparison, material conditions of wealth (income levels) make a real difference rather than spatial proximity or design. It leads residents to accept their lower economic conditions with better social relations and a moral way of earning money.

The same kind of comparison was made in Kasaba, even if not to a similar degree as in Istanbul Istanbul. For instance, even it was far from Kemer Country, one resident in Kasaba compared Kasaba with Kemer Country: She said that Kasaba was more cosmopolitan and modest and not as snobbish as Kemer Country (P27). Another resident stated that Kasaba was not as “ultra” as Beykoz Konaklari lived in by foremost politicians, businessmen and celebrities:

“People here are not very different from each other. This is not an ultra place, such as Beykoz Konaklari in which there are well known businessmen, celebrities, although the income level is not the same.” (P28)

This resident uses “ultra” which shows the modesty of Kasaba rather than legitimisation of sources of income. However, no one in Kasaba tried to legitimise their wealth as it was done in Istanbul Istanbul. The reason for these clear differences also lies in their different history of construction. While Istanbul Istanbul was built as the second gated community after Kemer Country in Gokturk, Kasaba was the first, biggest and the most expensive community in

---

<sup>140</sup> See Chapter 4 section 4.3 “Modernity, But How?”

Omerli. Another reason is the difference in income level between the two communities. Kasaba has a more varied income level, higher than Istanbul Istanbul as also stated by several experts. While in Istanbul Istanbul most of the population is stated to consist of salaried workers in the service sector resulting in a more homogenous income distribution, in Kasaba the variation of the source of income is larger, such as people who own their own businesses might give them a more independent mind-set so that they do not need to compare their wealth with that of anyone else.

Another reason is the isolated layout of Kasaba which protects it from outsiders and also lead residents to have a more independent mind-set. So, to live in a more isolated gated community gives residents a more independent mind-set, which I think completes the discussion I made in the second section “Residents and Local Populations”. In sum, spatial characteristics allow residents in Istanbul Istanbul to compare themselves only with the residents of other gated communities, with higher income level. However, they found a way to deal with their lower economic condition by trying to minimize the distance between Kemer Country with their higher moral and social characteristics.

## **CONCLUSION**

In this chapter I showed that rather than being ready-made for residents, distinction is a process in the making of everyday life. Based on my findings, I showed how residents make communities themselves by establishing boundaries with different groups. For this purpose, I used the literature on “social closure” (Weber, 1978), “distinction” (Bourdieu, 1984) and “symbolic boundaries” (Lamont, 1992). I used Lamont’s “symbolic boundaries” which consist of economic, cultural and moral boundaries, seeming relevant in a period when not only class, but also cultural differences play an important role to define identity, as I showed in Chapter 2. My difference from Bourdieu and Lamont is that while they used boundaries as given, I looked



at different boundaries used by residents as strategies of inclusion and exclusion, to examine also the conflicts between groups. This way of analysing boundaries has provided me a broader understanding of relations and how communities are made by residents. Another reason to stick with Lamont's theory was her "moral boundaries", which were used by the residents in Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba when to define the self, their communities and the outside.

On the basis of this background, firstly, residents establish boundaries with the local populations by using economic and cultural differences such as income level and rejection of certain behaviours, illiteracy, world view and religion. Secondly, residents establish boundaries also inside the same gated community on the basis of income levels and cultural differences seen in behaviour towards staff, and conforming to rules which show the importance of temporal dimension in obtaining something. Thirdly, residents also establish boundaries with other gated communities on the basis of income levels as well as sources of income which is mostly apparent in Istanbul Istanbul. They described social relations in Kemer Country such as "cold", "snobbish" and "with no neighbourly relations". This shows that residents in Istanbul Istanbul regard richer communities as "snobbish" and "inhumane" by creating mythical speculations about their social relations and sources of income, in order to justify their lower economic condition.

However, in Kasaba this was rarely seen. This is related to the different construction histories. While Istanbul Istanbul was the second community constructed in Gokturk after Kemer Country, Kasaba was the first, biggest and the most expensive one in Omerli. The second reason lies in more varied and higher income level of Kasaba. The difference in income distributions is also affected by Istanbul Istanbul's more closed marketing strategies which targeted people from the same company. Also the physical isolation of Kasaba does not allow residents to make comparisons. However, I would argue that spatial layout is not the most important factor, as seen in Istanbul Istanbul when residents compared themselves with only

those people with higher income level (in previous neighbourhoods or Kemer Country). So income difference is more important than any other factor.

I concluded that although Lamont can provide a challenge to Bourdieu's theory, it has certain problems. Firstly, she takes morality independent of social class. I showed that morality at least in some aspects depends on class position, when several residents in Istanbul Istanbul used moral excuses to legitimise their lower economic conditions. While Lamont takes two kinds of morality (religious and that of moral capitalism) as one, I showed that residents (especially) in Istanbul Istanbul use moral boundaries to distinguish their communities from Kemer Country to justify their lower economic condition. Moreover, this morality is heavily dependent on "moral capitalism". By "moral capitalism" I mean the legitimate and agreed forms of earning money, which shows a strong contrast to illegal wealth such as "black money" or undeserved wealth achieved without labour such as inheritance or "rent". The legitimate sources of wealth or income frame the legal boundaries of capitalism, which renders it "moral" for the residents in Istanbul Istanbul. These distinctions show also that gated communities influence each other rather than being isolated entities. Secondly, Lamont cannot link moral boundaries to symbolic capital of Bourdieu. However, I argue that a moral boundary should also be "symbolically accepted moral boundary" (in Bourdieu sense) to function in a particular society or group.

The boundaries used by the residents in Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba to differentiate themselves from the rest indicate a plurality of distinctions and morality. Here, Hall's plural understanding of distinction is helpful. However, Hall does not take religion as a form of distinction. By adopting Hall's alternative "socially situated distinction" (1992: 265) and adding religion as a form of differentiation by the rise of Islam in Turkey which has brought new discussions about the relation between morality, religion and capitalism, I analysed how residents in Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba established boundaries and defined themselves and

the local populations, regarded to be consisted of “narrow-minded”, “illiterate”, “conservative” people. Residents in both communities showed their distance from a religious mind-set. By carrying forward Hall’s theory which argues a multiple understanding of distinction, I proposed “socially situated symbolic capitals” to explain the divided structure of society in terms of morality. I showed the difference between the morality based on religion and morality based on “this-worldly” criteria of “moral capitalism” justified by the residents. I showed that how cultural (in this sense, religious) and economic differences lead to different forms of social differentiation.

There is another interesting result that although there is differentiation inside the same community based on moral boundaries in terms of “how” to obtain wealth or cultural boundaries such as “unwanted behaviour”, “cultural activities”, “parvenu”, “respect towards the staff”, “the inconsistency between money and culture”, several residents in Istanbul Istanbul defended their communities against Kemer Country and described Istanbul Istanbul as “one family”. So, again by carrying forward Hall’s argument, I propose “multiple socially situated distinctions” used by the same person in different situations which sometimes are contradictory to each other.

On the basis of these findings, I argue that there are certain status symbols for those who live in Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba: To graduate from certain schools, to send their children to certain private colleges instead of local schools, the actual experience of travel (beyond reading books), to reside in certain neighbourhoods (such as Kemerburgaz and Omerli), to have good and respectful relations with the staff, a world view which rejects illiteracy, conservatism and narrow mindedness. However, these symbols would be different in a different social group, in a society which has experienced radical changes. Therefore, there is not a single set of symbols common to the whole. The above mentioned status symbols which include cultural, economic and moral boundaries provide an overall framework of symbolic

capital in the two communities. In this context, a symbolic boundary as I previously explained includes a symbolic dimension in Bourdieu's sense, by being an agreed and legitimate form of distinction. All these economic, cultural and moral boundaries show what is regarded as "symbolic capital" ("moral" and "right" as well as "legitimate") for the residents in Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba.

## **CHAPTER SIX**

# **THE COMPETITION BETWEEN IMAGINARY AND REAL COMMUNITIES**

### **INTRODUCTION**

In this Chapter, I analyse spatial characteristics of Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba. As I opened the discussion of social fragmentation reflected on urban space in Chapter 2 and explained this fragmentation by community characteristics of gated communities in Chapter 4 and how different groups prefer to live in different gated communities in Chapter 5, I now

examine how these differences are reflected upon space. In the first section, I explore how developer companies build gated communities which target different income and social groups. In this respect, gated communities are the examples of “niche markets” (Webster, 2002) or “packaging” which include various amenities created by developer companies. I call gated communities as “imaginary communities” built with “stylistic distinctions” which render them “original”: the use of natural or artificial views in the plan, an original and eclectic architectural style, aged and individualised details and diversified façade, the involvement of foreign architects which create competition and conflict with local architects and lastly, advertisements and names of these communities reflecting the values of their target groups.

In the second section, I examine how gated communities are perceived, materialised and challenged by residents. I argue that “functional distinctions” become the priority for them, such as the size of the land and a green environment, the quality of construction and the name of the developer company. While in the literature in Turkey it is argued that advertisements create the “myth of the ideal house” (Oncu, 1999: 27), residents do not idealise these houses. Rather, they challenge and change the plan of their houses. The competition between imaginary and real communities shows the importance of different cultural contexts and how it changes the experience of space. Finally, I argue that functional distinctions of a house, i.e. its usefulness and exchangeability in the housing market, lead to re-evaluating the meaning of “sign value” (Baudrillard, 1998: 90).<sup>141</sup>

## **6.1 IMAGINARY COMMUNITIES**

### ***6.1.1 Different Niches in the Same Neighbourhood***

In this section I explain how developer companies build gated communities for target groups which reflect class and cultural differences. As I showed in Chapter 4, developer

---

<sup>141</sup> This chapter is previously submitted to the Workshop 1 at the Conference “Home and Urbanity: Cultural Perspectives of Housing and Everyday Life” in Denmark, Copenhagen, October 27-29 2008 and was published as a conference proceeding.

companies transform suburban villages into town municipalities. The initial change in suburban lands in Istanbul is similar to Lang and Danielsen's description of "suburbia with a logo" (1997: 870), which reminds an upper class phenomenon in suburban lands. Similarly, several experts explained that previously there were only luxurious gated communities targeting upper income groups. In these interviews, Kemer Country was regarded as the pioneer gated community in Istanbul which has not only started the proliferation of gated communities in Istanbul but also in Gokturk. Kemer Country Golf Club was another factor which led to the development of Gokturk, as stated by a local which was previously targeting the alumni of Robert College:

"And after the land was transformed into a golf arena, (the person who bought the land) built a few villas near this land. The alumni of Robert College gathered in this land, which was later transformed in Kemer Country of 1700 villas. Kemer Country now consists of 1700 houses. There are also 500 to 600 uncompleted houses." (P41)

However, gated communities do not only target upper income groups. Several experts explained that while previously gated communities were targeting higher income groups, now there are also gated communities built for other income groups or classes.<sup>142</sup> One reason which decides the size and the quality of a housing development is the legal permission of construction as stated by an expert in the construction sector. He added that the likelihood of targeting a higher income group depended on the size of the land. As an example, if the land was large enough to construct villas, then the development targeted a higher income group rather than a development which consisted of apartment flats (P53). He explained that Koray Group of Companies built developments in and out of Turkey. While it started to build developments in Fenerbahce (on the Anatolian side of Istanbul) in the 1980s, it has later

---

<sup>142</sup> This process is similar to the transformation of upper class suburbia in England and the United States into "mass suburbia" since the Second World War (Fishman, 1996).

expanded towards suburban lands due to the availability of large lands which allowed them to build their own infrastructure such as drainage and lighting systems (P53).<sup>143</sup>

The initiatives of Koray Construction in Istanbul can be regarded as the reflection of the housing market in Istanbul, which covers diverse projects such as the renovation in gentrified areas, housing developments in city centre, shopping centres, residences and lastly, gated communities in suburban Istanbul. As examples, Kalamis Koru Sitesi (a housing development on the Anatolian side) and Elit Residence Project (a residence on the European side) are different housing developments in the Istanbul city centre built by Koray Construction. There are also housing projects in suburban lands such Istanbul Istanbul, Istanbul Zen and Istanbul Bis in Gokturk on the European side and Evidea and Kasaba on the Anatolian side.<sup>144</sup>

Also several experts used different concepts to explain that gated communities were targeting residents from different income groups. For instance, a real estate expert said that while previously gated communities were targeting “company bosses”, now there were also gated communities for “young professionals, or general managers or high-income salaried employees who were working for these bosses”. She explained that:

“Istanbul Istanbul is a more modest (community). It does not have a large land which the company bosses want to own.” (P44)

This quotation shows the link between the size of the land and the income group of residents.<sup>145</sup> A local in Gokturk explained differences between gated communities in Gokturk as “while company owners live in Istanbul Istanbul, high-ranked managers, those who work for them prefer to live in Aytek Houses” (P47).

---

<sup>143</sup> In the web page of Koray Group of Companies, it is stated that in the future the company will focus on three projects. The first is Narmanlı Han (an old building in Beyoglu, which will be transformed into a shopping mall and art centre), the second is the Riva Project (in the North of Istanbul near Black Sea) and the third is the Eskişehir Project (a shopping mall in Eskişehir, a city in the mid-West Anatolia).

<sup>144</sup> See the web page of Koray Group of Companies, <http://www.koray.com> accessed on 12.09.2008.

<sup>145</sup> See Chapter 5 section 4 “Which one is the Best?” Interestingly, also residents in Istanbul Istanbul compared their community with Kemer Country which was regarded as “bigger”, “richer” or “extreme”. I argue that this comparison was made due to the differences in income levels.

However, gated communities also reflect cultural differences. For instance, a real estate expert explained that:

“Residents are not very different from each other. They have same social status with different colour. Same yeast same bread. Some of them are made in a triangle shape. In some communities residents are more conservative. In some there are those who work in communication sector.” (P30)

He takes “social status” as the common denominator of residents. Here I think “social status” is not used in the same meaning of Weber’s “status”, but as class or income level. He uses “different colours” and “different shapes” to explain differences of profession (communication) and cultural background (more conservative). Another architect explained that developer companies decided on the target group before the construction began:

“...Someone who can sell their apartment flat in Bagdat Avenue and buy a house with a garden in this new community. (A house) with the same price but far from their previous residences... Someone who works as the manager of a factory in Gebze...” (P39)

Apart of class or income level differences, this quotation shows that there are certain cultural factors which decide on the “right” group of residents before the construction begins. So, gated communities reflect both economic and cultural differences. The same thing was mentioned by an architect:

“In Istanbul Istanbul there are also flats for those who would like to be part of this project; even if they do not have a high economic power.” (P37)

This quotation shows the importance of “status” and similar cultural backgrounds which leads people to live in a gated community regardless of class differences. More specifically, in its brochures and advertisements, it is explained that there are different opportunities in Istanbul Istanbul ranging from apartments of 79 metre squares to attached villa-styled houses. Kasaba also consists of various housing units, as stated in its brochure. They range from studios with single bedroom of 142 metre squares to villas with five bedrooms of 456 metre squares, from independent houses to row houses. These results show that the same developer company builds different housing units to target different income groups inside the same gated



community. In this sense, gated communities are “niches” in the housing market (Webster, 2002: 397) created by developers regarded as “trend followers” which clarify “product differentiation” and “clear identity” (Blakely and Snyder, 1997: 15). Webster argues that developers build gated communities for various niche markets such as security-by-design, prestige living and lifestyle community living (Webster, 2002: 397). Gated communities are examples of “packaging” in the housing market, each of which is built with features targeting a specific socio-income group. It could be said that developer companies do not only consider income (class) but also cultural differences when to build gated communities.

From now on, I explore how these “niches” or “packages” are made in the design process and transformed into “imaginary communities”. Oncu explains that the “myth of the ideal house” in Istanbul has started with the introduction of colour TV in the 1980s. The advertising sector is one of the first sectors, which has become integrated with international markets. Local advertising companies have started to cooperate with global ones such as Saatchi and Saatchi, Young and Rubicam, Lowe, McCann-Eriksson and Lintas.<sup>146</sup> By the 1990s, 80% of the advertising sector was dominated by 15 companies which were joint-ventures of global and local companies. The transformation in the advertising sector has introduced international advertising campaigns into Turkey which have been adapted to Turkish language or consumer. Oncu argues that in this process the “myth of the ideal house” has been created by the introduction of global advertising companies into the Turkish market (Oncu, 1999: 29). However, instead of “ideal house”, I use the concept “imaginary communities” and expand my analysis beyond advertisements. Gated communities in Istanbul do not only consist of housing units, but they also include various features which render them original. I consider gated communities as something imagined in the minds of designers which

---

<sup>146</sup> See Chapter 3, sub-section 3.6.1 “Status and Distinction”.

can neglect residents' lifestyles in the process of construction and might lead to interesting conflicts over the design and architecture.

### **6.1.2 A House "with a Soul"**

I now explain how the individuality and originality of a gated community are created. In order to attract people and create belonging to gated communities, architects use distinctive features as stated by an architect who designed similar housing developments in Istanbul:

"We create originality so that people can feel belonging to that place." (P48)

This architect added that if a project consisted of only villas and apartments it ended up as a place "without a soul". Instead, he explained that there was always something special which rendered the project original such as a golf course, an old mansion or a social club. Similarly, Perouse and Danis argue that "physical distinction" is not only provided by distance and separation from the city, but also by being near to natural beauties such as the hills of Bosphorus or forestry lands. When there are no natural beauties, companies build artificial ones such as the artificial lake in Bahcesehir (a housing development in Istanbul) (Perouse and Danis, 2005: 107). Artificial lakes are a popular feature of gated communities which have been used in every part of Istanbul as an alternative to the sea as stated also in a newspaper.<sup>147</sup>

The use of artificial views also explains the unavailability of land in the city centre. As I stated in Chapters 2 and 3, legal arrangements allowed construction near the Bosphorus. However, due to the unavailability of large lands in city centre and Bosphorus, developer companies tended towards suburban areas.<sup>148</sup> Similarly, an architect explained that for the first time in Istanbul people abandoned "water" (Bosphorus) to live and moved towards suburban lands. He also explained that yalis (houses on the Bosphorus) were similar to Venice which

---

<sup>147</sup> Aysegul Akyarli, "Sandalla Komsu Keyfi", Hurriyet Emlak, 1 September 2005.

<sup>148</sup> See Chapter 2 section 2.4 "The New Urban Space" and Chapter 3 section 3.3 "A Suburban Phenomenon".

also had an “other side” (like Istanbul) (P40). In this context, developer companies build houses with an “other side” in suburban Istanbul. Similarly, a local in Gokturk explained that:

“Yes, housing developments are different from each other in terms of the housing style. For instance, there is horse riding opportunity in Kemer Country, Kemer Country Kemer Golf and Country Club. In Istanbul Istanbul there is a social club building with the concept of “among us”. In Kemer Rose, there is a more comfortable living space. So, each housing development has a particularity.” (P41)

As this quotation shows, Istanbul Istanbul’s physical and social distinctiveness is created around the concept of “among us” similar to the accounts of residents in the previous chapter who mentioned the importance of neighbourliness. The concept of “among us”, which gives originality to Istanbul Istanbul, is explained in its web page as facilities provided by the community such as “just in time service”, “home service”, “a nice life”, and “about your home”.<sup>149</sup> Also in the brochure of Istanbul Istanbul, the concept of “among us” is explained with the facilities provided such as home cleaning, technical support, child care, invitation organisation, sports facilities and private security. Besides the concept, also the overall plan of the development enables residents to materialise this neighbourly attitude by encouraging them to go out of their homes to interact with their neighbours, as explained by an architect:

“People go out of their homes. This architecture provides neighbourliness.... The most important characteristic is its plan which makes people to interact with each other. In the past there were times when people brought soups when someone became ill. They were looking after children when their parents were shopping or anywhere else. This project achieved this. Because of that, it is very successful.” (P37)

### **Image Removed**

**Fig 6.1.2.1:** The plan of Istanbul Istanbul (from the brochure). See the artificial lake at the centre of Istanbul Istanbul. There are also two bridges over the lake. The social club building is at the West-end of the development.

So, the neighbourly attitude in Istanbul Istanbul is created physically and socially similar to old times when there was more interaction among people. This architect also added that people who lived there did not want a private life:

---

<sup>149</sup>The web page of Istanbul Istanbul <http://www.istanbul-istanbul.com> accessed on 15.07.2008.

“However, some people give importance to their privacy. They cannot achieve this in Istanbul Istanbul. They know this before they move there. So people who can live here comfortably, I mean are those who would not be disturbed by seeing their neighbours while sitting in their garden.” (P37)

This quotation explains the neighbourly attitude among residents which I explained in Chapter 5. The spatial design of Istanbul Istanbul allows people to interact and talk to each other. For the residents in Istanbul Istanbul, neighbourly attitude creates a difference from other gated communities in Gokturk which lack a neighbourly and friendly atmosphere, and several gated communities are regarded as “snobbish”, “cold” and “inhumane”.<sup>150</sup> The design of space to create neighbourly attitude in gated communities was also explained by a real estate expert by the concept of “neo-urbanism”:

“The concept of enclosed communities emerged in the West, why so? This is also called architectural society associated with neo-urbanism which would lead to neighbourly relations. This is social engineering which makes people interact and erases ruptures among them. It creates a lifestyle against societies without affection and social merging. Contact in close proximity. Do we need this in Turkey? In Turkey people have already been close to each other.” (P38)

This participant states that gated communities have emerged in the West, which consists of individualised and alienated societies and aim at bringing people together. He also uses the concepts of “architectural society” and “social engineering” in order to show how the architecture is designed to create “contact in close proximity”. Calderia argues that “neo-traditionalism” and “neo-urbanism” are new ways to create traditional revival in suburbs for the new middle classes (Caldeira, 2000: 272). An example for neo-traditional town is Celebration in Florida constructed by Disney, which recreates the past while preserving modernity (Ross, 2000). Neo-urbanism is based on “mixed-housing, mixed-use, walkable town with small lots, interconnected streets and an identifiable centre and edge” (Ross, 2000: 73). Ironically, lost old times when different communities were living together harmoniously are now realised by new

---

<sup>150</sup> See Chapter 5 section 5.4 “Which One is the Best?” in which I explain that neighbourly relations are not particular for Istanbul Istanbul. However, the residents in Istanbul Istanbul compared their communities only with Kemer Country and they used their better relations to compare themselves with Kemer Country, which was regarded as higher in terms of income level.

houses designed by foreign architects. However, how this is lived by the residents is the subject of the next section.

Apart from the neighbourly attitude designed and materialised in the space, in Istanbul Istanbul there are two bridges, two artificial lakes, a swimming pool, a social club building which are described in its brochures, advertisements and web page. For instance, in its web page it is explained that:

In order to distance our everyday life from monotony and to create a warm and friendly environment, artificial lakes and bridges together with green space are used to create a modern but natural environment which reflects Istanbul.<sup>151</sup>



**Fig 6.1.2.2:** Social club building in Istanbul Istanbul, the white building in the back.

By contrast, Kasaba acquires distinctiveness by the forest nearby which is described in an advertisement published in *Maison Française* magazine (October 2000 issue) as “the point where Nature (forest and a river) and comfort (people around a swimming pool) meet”. The forest was regarded as an “amenity” by an academic-researcher (P45). However, the overall “environment” that was being used in the marketing process has experienced degradation due to the increasing construction as explained by another researcher (P50). In the brochure, Kasaba is described by the words “In the midst of unspoilt Nature” and “Country style houses which protect traditional architecture with rich and modern infrastructure”. In this sense,

---

<sup>151</sup> <http://www.istanbul-istanbul.com> accessed on 15.07.2008.

Kasaba does not need “an artificial view” because of being built near the forest. As shown in the brochure, Kasaba has also a social club building with restaurant, swimming pools, fitness centre, beauty parlour and supermarket in a traditional courtyard style facing each other. There are also horse riding and tennis facilities.

### **Image Removed**

**Fig 6.1.2.3:** The plan of Kasaba (taken from Emlak Pusulasi, a real estate magazine, June 2005 issue. There is forestry land which surrounds it as well as trees among houses. There is also an artificial lake in the middle of Kasaba.

#### **6.1.3 “It Seems 40 years old...”<sup>152</sup>**

I now turn to the design of each house and how it is rendered original. According to experts, there are several ways of building the originality of the house: firstly, the use of eclectic style, secondly, the creation of “aged” and “individualised” details, and thirdly, the use of diversified façade (surface). An architect explained that while other gated communities consisted of similar houses, they constructed different houses and apartments which were sold very quickly (P37). So, the originality in architecture means success in the housing market. However, the architecture does not only provide distinctiveness to the gated community, but also to the overall region. For instance, a member of the Gokturk Municipality said that the freedom of using different styles of architecture made Gokturk a more popular region which attracted further development (P46). Also in the brochure of Gokturk published by the local municipality it is stated that:

The projects which include a unique architectural feature are built by distinct companies harmoniously with Nature. By this way, model projects which are talked about in the international arena continue to be built in Gokturk consecutively.

In the literature, architecture of gated communities in Istanbul is described with contradictory interpretations. For instance, Kurtulus argues that while Kemer Country has become the symbol of European values (2005b: 177), Beykoz Konaklari has become the

---

<sup>152</sup> A quotation of an architect (P37).

symbol of Ottoman values. However, Bartu argues that Kemer Country, also close to an Ottoman aqueduct, uses Ottoman references in its architecture (2002: 85). This inconsistency and difference in the literature is due to the eclectic architectures of gated communities. As an example, Kazmaoglu (2003: 76) argues that a combination of American, Turkish, Italian and Spanish styles is used in gated communities.

Similarly, in its brochure the architecture of Istanbul Istanbul is explained as the combination of modern Mediterranean style and traditional Turkish architecture. Interior design also creates distinctiveness through the use of brand names such as the model house in Istanbul Istanbul is decorated by Beymen Casa Club, the decoration brand of Beymen.<sup>153</sup> Istanbul Istanbul's decoration can be regarded as "plain chic" and is represented with less furniture and more function. In the brochure of Kasaba, the interior of a house is shown with details from the kitchen, bedroom, dining rooms and gardens. The decoration of the house is less minimal when it is compared with Istanbul Istanbul which is a combination of modern and classical style. Similar to its brochures and web page, an architect also said that the architecture of Istanbul Istanbul could be regarded as the combination of Turkish and Mediterranean styles:

"And small windows and solid façade... The use of wood is mostly common in the South, and I mean by South, the North of Mediterranean. It is not specific to Turkey, and Istanbul Istanbul is not similar to Bodrum which has a standard architecture." (P37)

He explained that while the Mediterranean style dominated the house overall, Turkish influence could be seen in the details. In this interview "the wood" was described as a material strengthened by the latest technology. For him, the wood used on the facades as an example of Turkish details, was similar to the past when:

"Our balconies made of wood which were protected by metal." (P37)

---

<sup>153</sup> Beymen is one of the leading textile brands of Turkey founded in 1971, which produces clothes and accessories. Beymen Casa Club was later transferred to another company "Boyner".

He added that nowadays the wood was not protected and it became decomposed and was thrown away. In this construction, aluminium was used to protect the wood and to render it more durable. He added that:

“However, besides this, it was aimed that three or four years after the completion of construction, the wood would seem as if had been there for 40 years.” (P37)

This quotation shows how the rootless house is being rooted and a new house is rendered as an old and lived in house. So, although these houses are marketed by the latest technology, this technology also renders them aged, as something with a past.<sup>154</sup>

Another aim of architects is to create individuality in a house, as if it is built by a specific craftsman. He also added that in the construction of Istanbul Istanbul:

“It was intended to look as if this house was built by Ahmet Usta while the next one was built by Mehmet Usta. It could be similar to others, but he made it. As if it is built by someone else. A lot of effort was spent in order to avoid standardisation.” (P37)

Thirdly,<sup>155</sup> different details are used in the design which gives a house its individuality. Several experts explained the inconsistency between the inside and the outside of a house.<sup>156</sup> For instance, another architect said that residents changed the interior of their houses, so while the interior remained a modern style the outside was similar to an old mansion (P36). Similarly, an academic stated that:

---

<sup>154</sup> This also opens the discussion about how the materials used in a construction are perceived. An interesting interpretation comes from Orhan Pamuk who explains the difference between old wood houses and brick apartments in Istanbul. He claims that while old wood houses can be regarded as temporary because of being easily burnt, brick and stone apartments can be regarded as more durable (2008). By contrast and ironically, gated communities are the most resistant and durable houses even if they have wooden parts, but at the same time they are regarded as “temporary”, rootless and artificial if compared with old neighbourhoods of Istanbul, even if they can be burnt easily. Several experts criticised gated communities to be artificial and fashionable places which imitate original and old houses or neighbourhoods in Istanbul.

<sup>155</sup> The importance of the facade is also mentioned by another architect as the difference based on the image; in order to explain that the difference of a house is created on the surface, while inside remains the same, see the section 6.2 “Real Communities”.

<sup>156</sup> A similar argument is shown by Ross who states that many Celebrationites mentioned a disparity between the body and the dress of the housing which refers to the difference between inexpensive infrastructure and expensive exterior spent to create old-styled houses (Ross, 2000: 47). So, in order to create an old style house, effort and money should be spent. By contrast, the body of these houses can be built by more inferior technology which shows the importance of the façade in these buildings.



“It should be looked at both the exterior architecture and the interior plan. If we look at all the Ottoman references, these houses have American suburban house plan inside. So, the interior does not have the design of an Ottoman mansion.” (P31)

This also shows the importance of the façade (outside) which gives a house its identity, rather than its depth and interior.<sup>157</sup> An architect explained that in Istanbul Istanbul while interiors had a standard layout, the facades were different from each other by the use of different details such as colours and balconies:

“Even if the interiors and the plan of the windows are the same, you can put an ordinary person inside the house number 101 and then number 401. They would say “the facades are similar”. However, they are not. You cannot locate apartments by looking from the outside. You will be confused where you are. A person can say “the house with a green oriels and balcony is mine”. ... In reality, there are three similar houses next to each other. A person can describe it with its colour and texture. Although the next house is the same, the person can describe it with its colour and texture. The other house has a different balcony and colour. There is a different façade....This is very good. People say “this is my house”. They would never say A Block or B number 5. This is said at the entrance only.” (P37)

By that way, a sense of belonging and familiarity to the place is created. Residents can describe their homes by their colours and textures, instead of numbering them such as number 5 or naming them with impersonal names such as A or B Block. Naming a house with numbers or impersonal titles belongs to the alienated language of strangers, said at the entrance of the gated community. In the above quotation, there is also a reaction towards quantifying things while there is inclination towards qualifying things. Also Kasaba has the same characteristic. In its web page, it is explained that each house has a different layout, but there is common style between houses due to the overall approach.<sup>158</sup>

These quotations summarise the aim of postmodern architecture which combines different pasts and styles in the same place. Harvey argues that while modernism considered

---

<sup>157</sup> A very interesting difference about gated communities and gentrified areas can be seen in the importance of the façade in gated communities which gives individuality to the house. However, facades of gentrified houses are not changed, while their interior are changed to be modernised. Despite this change which demarcates an old house from its originality, gentrified areas (or renovated houses) are not regarded as artificial by those who criticise gated communities. So, the disparity in old houses (the exterior is old, but interior is totally changed and modernised) is not regarded as “artificial”.

<sup>158</sup> <http://www.kasaba.net/default.asp?menuID=4&hLinkGo=mnuKavram> accessed on 13.11.2006.

space as a place for social purpose, postmodernism considers space as independent and autonomous detached from history (Harvey, 1990: 66). Newly-made wood should “seem” as old or a newly built house constructed with the latest technology should “seem” as made by the hands of an individual craftsman. However, Haila explains an important dilemma of postmodern architecture which is that while it celebrates diversity, it actually promotes uniformity (Haila, 2006: 285). Even if it is claimed to be a sign of distinction, Haila argues that a building can be regarded as a part in larger chain of global flows of real estate sector, which include real estate companies and jet-set architects, similar construction methods and foreign investments (Haila, 2006: 285). As argued by Featherstone, the postmodern city includes culture, style and decoration but in the context of a “no-place space” in which traditional cultures are “decontextualised, simulated, reduplicated and continually renewed and restyled” (Featherstone, 1991: 99).

In this aspect, gated communities can be regarded as “simulation” (Baudrillard, 1983) and a part of “sim-city” (Soja, 2000: 339) which is reproduced by simulating old places restructured in electronic cyberspace. “Simulation” erodes the difference between true and false, real and imaginary (Baudrillard, 1983: 5). It does not have a referential being or substance; rather it represents more a model of real without origin or reality. This does not mean that simulation is unreal or something exchangeable for the real, but that it can be exchanged for itself, without a reference or circumference (Baudrillard, 1983: 11). Baudrillard argues that the difference or “the smallest marginal difference” is created through artificially diversified models which make people believe into those commodities as “personified” items although they are “mass-produced” differences. Real differences between human beings have been eroded and people and products have been homogenised (Baudrillard, 1998: 88-90) through new technologies which allow “flexible mass production with mass repetition of almost personalised products with a great variety of styles” (Harvey, 1990: 76).

Gated communities combine orielis taken from Turkish architecture and comfort taken from Italian Toscana villas and American suburban lives (Aksoy and Robins, 1993: 60). So, they can be regarded as “undue and rootless” places where:

Symbols and characteristics referred do not have any meaning in the milieu they are used. Because of that, there emerge rootless “islands” isolated from their surroundings. (Aksoy and Robins, 1993: 60)

Moreover, certain gated communities are designed as “simulacra of simulacra”, imported from Europe or America.<sup>159</sup> For instance, an architect explained that a summer village in South France which was already an imitation of Venice in Italy has become the inspiration for Istanbul Istanbul [**The sentence was corrected**]. This impact continues over each other, when for example a detail in the façade is “imported” to other gated communities. This architect explained that the details used in the façades in Istanbul Istanbul were also used in Kasaba. By that way, details are now spread to other places:

“..The same detail was also used with a slight change in Kasaba. Because the project managers of Kasaba were the same with those who built Phase 1 in Istanbul Istanbul. They took this detail and used in Kasaba. Why? Because it was found to be successful in the marketing process...” (P37)

---

<sup>159</sup> A new example in Istanbul is “Bosphorus City” which is built similar to Bosphorus. See the web page <http://www.bosphoruscity.com.tr/tr-TR/>

**Image Removed**



**Fig 6.1.3.2:** Istanbul Istanbul, artificial lake and bridge, which was built similar to a summer resort in France.

#### ***6.1.4 The Competition between Foreign and Local Architects***

An academic-researcher explained that the design of these developments created distinction by the involvement of award-winning architects (P45). Similarly, Tanyeli explains that since the 1990s star-architects have emerged in Istanbul, similar to the emergence of “design” objects such as Alessi, Memphis, Bulthaup, and Cassina which provide distinction for the upper classes (Tanyeli, 2004: 302-303). He also adds that several housing developments are marketed with star-architects (Tanyeli, 2004: 131). Developer companies in Istanbul do not satisfy residents with star-architects and “design objects”, but as explained by several experts, they directly use foreign architects in the design of these houses. For instance, an architect stated that while foreign companies were providing the overall plan of the community because they were more experienced, local architects completed the developments (P48). Also another architect added that the names of foreign architects were a part of marketing in Turkey, as in

Kemer Country and Istanbul Istanbul. He also explained that while in Istanbul Istanbul French architects were involved in the design of gardens, they never visited Turkey.<sup>160</sup> Another reason for employing foreign architects is the belief that they have more knowledge than local architects. He also added that:

“However, this situation is represented in such a way that as if only foreign architects build these housing developments. By doing this, it is thought to have a better selling success. This is a marketing strategy and if you do business in Turkey, you accept this.” (P37)

The brochure of Istanbul Istanbul follows with the names of its creators; all are architects from France who designed Port Royal Golf Club in Mallemart (France), Port Grimaud in St. Tropez (France), Port Louise in Louisiana (the United States), and the leisure club of Capo Negro (Morocco). Also the web page of Kasaba lists the names of its creators, who are from the United States, Turkey and Belgium. Both gated communities have some common names.<sup>161</sup>

The use of foreign architects is not new in Turkey. Tanyeli explains the involvement of foreign architects especially from Germany in the construction of Ankara, the capital city in the early Republican period, due to the belief in Turkey that technical skills belong to the foreigners:

The bearer of the technical skills is the foreigner. This barrier was not overcome easily and for a long time in Turkey, even for those who were sent for education abroad and came back, because a traditional barrier of understanding comes into agenda. It is believed that technical skills -due to its definition- can only be carried out in its specific practices by those who know the practices; it is not believed that this can be transferred by the means of representations and its related literature. Moreover, it is not believed that this can be learned through by these means. Because of that, it is an unavoidable necessity to bring in people who know this specific practice (in our particular subject, foreign architects). (Tanyeli, 2004: 111)

For Istanbul Istanbul, apart from architects, an award, MIPIM (Marche International Des Professionnels De L’Immobilier) won in 2002, has become an important way to

---

<sup>160</sup> Similarly, Tanyeli explains the involvement of foreign architects in the Early Republican period who did not visit Ankara but designed buildings while staying at their home countries (Tanyeli, 2004: 102).

<sup>161</sup> <http://www.kasaba.net/default.asp?menuID=4&hLinkGo=mnuKavram> accessed on 13.11.2006.

distinguish it from other housing developments by being the best in the world in the category of “housing development”. The award is exhibited in advertisements and brochures while the web page of Istanbul Istanbul has a direct link to MIPIM’s web page. This award has become a legitimate way to market it as a good one, when a real estate expert explained that Istanbul Istanbul was a successful project both physically and socially, which confirmed that the plan of community encouraged neighbourly attitude among residents:

“There was an award which we won in 2002 or 2003 in France, Cannes. MIPIM... MIPIM is a fair in which developer companies participate. There are competitions for different categories of housing projects. You can join this competition when your project is completed. In this competition it is investigated whether the project you designed is a liveable project or whether your project can contribute to life and what you offer after the project is completed and if your plan is suitable.” (P44)

#### **Image Removed**

**Fig 6.1.4.1:** MIPIM award won in 2002. It shows the distinctiveness and success of Istanbul Istanbul which has now been legitimised.

The name of the developer company itself is another important feature of these developments. In the brochures it is claimed that Istanbul Istanbul is created by the cooperation of the financial power of Yapi Kredi and the real estate experiences of Koray Construction, which lead to “limitless trust” for Istanbul Istanbul. The name of the developer company is also very important for Kasaba. In the advertisement and brochures it is stated that Kasaba is built by the cooperation of Is Bank and Koray Construction. In its brochure, Kasaba’s resistance to the strongest earthquake is shown by the documents produced by a university’s geophysics department.

#### **6.1.5 Advertisements and Other Visuals**

While foreign architects are involved in the process of design, celebrities are involved after the completion of housing developments in the advertising campaigns, according to

several experts. However, celebrities do not always attract the right attention. For instance, a local in Omerli stated that celebrities were unwanted in Kasaba:

“Now, Kasaba is very different from other projects. And if you look at the profile of people who come here, you can see that the level is very high. The highest income level is selected and most people who live here is either general manager or the head of the executive council or directly the owner of a company. So, here celebrities are unwanted. Here a quiet life in its internal dynamics is aimed at and it is really like that.”(P32)

He rejects the “display” or attracting attention and highlights the “selectivity” of Kasaba, based on a quiet life. Instead, celebrities are associated with the display, exaggeration and noise. This shows that not all gated communities use celebrities for sales; rather some of them highlight the importance of being more closed and private than the rest. In the next section I will explain how Kasaba rejects visibility from the outside by hiding itself.

Advertisements are also very important for developer companies which aim at reaching the right target group, as stated by a real estate expert:

“The target group you choose and the project which addresses that target group and the means of advertisement. All of these should match well to reach our goal. This was realised very well in Istanbul Istanbul.  
...I think the right means of advertisement were chosen in Istanbul Istanbul and they worked very well. We never used the means of advertisements which did not address its target group. Generally these were the magazines read by its target group such as Sky Life.” (P44)

Sky Life was also mentioned by a writer, Bali, who explains that luxurious housing developments do not publish advertisements in mass newspapers, rather they prefer magazines of antiques and furniture decoration as well as Sky Life, the magazine published by the Turkish Airlines and distributed only during flights which is a symbol of status and wealth (Bali, 1999). Cook argues that the most important technique in advertisement is the consumer, i.e. the target group of a product or service. Since targeting consumer groups is more important than other techniques, it is important to create common language with that group (Cook, 2001). As I previously mentioned in Chapter 3, advertisements are said to influence people so that they

become target groups.<sup>162</sup> For instance, Istanbul Istanbul's advertisement published in *Vizyon Decoration* magazine (June 2002 issue) states "The best of the world". An advertisement of Kasaba, published in *Maison Francaise* (October 2000 issue) states "Casaba: the point where Nature and comfort meet".

Also in the advertisements, brochures and web sites, a personal language is used to explain the distance to the city. As example, Kasaba's brochure gives distances such as "25 minutes from Kadikoy, 35 minutes from Levent, it is in Ayvali Farm Land, Omerli Town". The web page of Kasaba also uses a similar language such as:

Kasaba is designed as a project which is far from Istanbul's problems but close to Istanbul due to its proximity, being 30 minutes from the Bosphorus Bridges and 25 minutes from Kadikoy. (Direct quotation from its web page)

This quotation does not only use a personal language for the potential residents, but it also leaves unspecified the name of two bridges over the Bosphorus, which are distant to each other. So Kasaba uses a language of "distance" in the visual media which strengthens its isolation, individuality and privacy. However, while Istanbul Istanbul uses a similar personal language, it is different from Kasaba in the sense that Istanbul Istanbul uses "proximity" rather than "distance" to Istanbul:

Istanbul Istanbul... Both inside and outside of Istanbul... Close and Very Close. It is close both to Levent and Maslak. Close both to Taksim and Nisantasi. Istanbul Istanbul is in Gokturk Town. (Direct quotation from its brochure)

By doing this, a personal language is used to create individuality and familiarity to the place, rather than numerical distances which might alienate those who will buy these houses. The use of a personal language in the advertisements is similar to Fishman's "city a la carte" which is based on time rather than space. Fishman argues that in the new city, instead of a single centre, there are individual centres and people measure distances in terms of time (Fishman, 1995: 409). However, in the overall process of design, gated communities are

---

<sup>162</sup> See Chapter 3 sub-section 3.6.1 "Status and Distinction".



rendered individualised and personalised through characteristics based on their “qualified” elements, rather than being limited to temporal dimension used in advertisements. However, this qualification is based on the superficial characteristics of gated communities. Individuality is created on the surface by colours and textures, while interiors are similar to each other. Individuality is created without the initiative of the residents, which means that architects create these houses and name them instead of residents.

#### ***6.1.6 The Crown of Distinction***

Lastly, gated communities are given names which reflect the values of their target groups, stated by an architect as:

“For instance, a place which targets young professionals does not have streets of blocks named as Magnolia, such as Magnolia number 42 or 36. This refers to a different classification (of people).” (P39)

The names of the two communities also reflect the references of them. “Istanbul Istanbul” refers to belonging to Istanbul which emphasises the importance of “Istanbul” in a place outside Istanbul. However, its Istanbulness is enabled by the culture and identity of the community.<sup>163</sup> By contrast, Kasaba has a more interesting story, which has changed its name from “Casaba” to “Kasaba”. In an ad, “Casaba” is depicted as a town by a road sign which shows its population and altitude. “Casaba” is written with a “C” derived from English which connotes Western town/ country life. Later the name “Casaba” was changed into “Kasaba” with the letter “K”, as correctly written in Turkish.<sup>164</sup>

---

<sup>163</sup> Koray Construction gives other housing developments names with the prefix “Istanbul”, such as Istanbul Zen, Istanbul Bis. It also builds another one in Ankara, named as “Ankara Ankara”. See the web site <http://www.koray.com.tr/> The identity of Istanbul Istanbul is ensured by a more homogenous population as stated in the interviews in Chapter 5.

<sup>164</sup> In the advertisement of Kasaba published in *Maison Française* (October 2000 issue), the name was still “Casaba”. This could be seen in other housing developments. In Maslak, Tasyapi Corporation built a development called Mashattan which combines the words “Manhattan” in New York and “Maslak” in Istanbul.

### Image Removed

**Fig 6.1.6.1:** The advertisement of Kasaba published in the brochure of Omerli Municipality. See the road sign which shows “Casaba” as a town with its population and altitude.

This reference to the English spelling with “C” shows the importance of English language as a form of distinction in Turkey. This is similar to Packard who explained how French phrases were used in advertisements as the language of the snob in the United States (Packard, 1961: 61). The use of English language in the ads is also mentioned in the literature by Alver (2007), Bali (1999) and Kozanoglu (1993). Kozanoglu states that English language in the advertisements is used either as a few words or in whole of the advertisement which attributes distinction to those who can understand this language (Kozanoglu, 1993: 188). Bali mentions that there should be a dictionary in English in order to understand the promotion catalogue of Alkent 2000 which is full of English words (Bali, 1999: 45). Alver also states that the image of the development is reflected in the name which consists of local and global words as in the example of “Kemer Country” as a combination of English and Turkish words and “Almondhill”, an English word designating another housing development in Istanbul (Alver, 2007: 126).

Simsek has an interesting approach to interpret names when he describes the change towards using direct meanings instead of metaphors (Simsek, 2005: 110). He gives the example of “Eskidji”, the name of an antique dealer shop in Istanbul. Although deformed, the word “Eskidji” means directly “antique-dealer”. He also gives the example of “Kahve”, the name of a coffeehouse which means directly “coffeehouse”. Simsek argues that while traditional middle classes did not refer directly to the meaning in a name, the new middle classes use direct meaning to title places. Kasaba means directly a “town” in Turkish language. However, this shows also a demarcation from its direct meaning, by transforming an ordinary town into “Casaba/Kasaba” for its residents. When someone asks “where do you live”, a person who lives in Kasaba answers “I live in Kasaba” instead of living in an ordinary “kasaba” (town),

which shows also the difference between a private (proper) and a common name. Using a common name for a private and proper place (in every aspect) changes the meaning of an ordinary town into a private and a proper place, which means “Kasaba”.

In its brochure, it is stated that there are four meanings of Kasaba. The first meaning is its dictionary meaning i.e. real and direct meaning of “Kasaba”, a life-centre smaller than a city larger than a village which protects its rural characteristics but has all the technological and cultural characteristics of the city. The second meaning refers to its private meaning which is a new housing development built by the partnership of Koray Company and Isbank (Is-Koray). The third meaning, “Kasabali” means each person who has the privilege of living in Kasaba. According to this brochure, Kasaba is more than a town which gives distinction to a “Kasabali” (person who lives in Kasaba). And lastly, “notables of Kasaba” are important people who live in Kasaba. This interesting but unspecified difference between those who live in Kasaba (Kasabali) and “notables” of Kasaba shows also that there can be differentiation between residents in terms of social class or cultural background. This brochure shows the process of transforming a common name into a privileged place and person. While the first meaning refers to its direct one, the last meaning refers to the differentiation of the privileged few who live in Kasaba. Also a local in Omerli explained that Kasaba was a real town (kasaba), by strengthening the link between a common name and a proper place:

“Kasaba is really a town. Really it has a town meaning, instead of a housing development named Kasaba. The word “housing development” is not suitable to describe this place. This place is a town. It really is like that and houses are plain, the image is beautiful, not excessive. It is a town among trees and forest and very beautiful streets... Really a precious town... Really a town...” (P32)

He states that Kasaba is a town by stressing the importance of “plain houses” which are “not excessive” and their value is based on their “plain” image. So, Kasaba either by its advertisements, name or physical design highlights the importance of privacy.

## 6.2 REAL COMMUNITIES

In this section I explain how residents live and even challenge these “imaginary communities”. Do they give importance to other factors in the plan and architecture apart from characteristics created in the design process? I focus on the spatial characteristics of Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba. Residents provided interesting answers to the question “Why did you prefer this community over other ones?” and “your reasons to move” which stand in contrast to the physical attractiveness created in the design process. There were only a few responses relating to architecture. In Istanbul Istanbul while only one resident mentioned the house “with a view and with best architecture” (P4), another resident stated that they preferred its colour and landscape (P7). Another resident mentioned the artificial lake but in combination with other things such as services provided by the community (P8). In Kasaba only one resident stated that they paid attention to the name of the architect and she mentioned the artificial lake (P16). Another theme was the overall “ambiance” of the community, but this was left unspecified in the interviews. In Istanbul Istanbul one resident mentioned that they liked its “ambiance” (P1). In Kasaba, one resident mentioned the ambiance of Kasaba when she compared it with Acarkent, another gated community (P18).

However, there are other things which are specified by them. Residents in Istanbul Istanbul stated the importance of the size of the land (or lower density), greenery, clean air and the name of the developer company. The size and density were associated with that of the house or the plan of the community or the garden with descriptions as:

“Large land and fewer houses...” (P1)

“Wide and bright...” (P4)

“Large garden...” (P8)

“There is no other place which has a large hinterland similar to this place.” (P11)

“(Because) it is safe, green and wide... So you can breathe. There is depth everywhere you look. You do not see concrete.” (P13)

The size of the house is also important for families which have experienced growth of their families and need larger and more private spaces for newcomers. As an example, a resident in Istanbul Istanbul explained that their previous residence was small:

“We lived in our previous flat for four years. Shortly after my son was born, we moved here. We had difficulties there because there was no room for the baby.”(P8)

The size is not only associated with the space, but also with the psychological relief because of living in a gated community, compared with their previous residences. For instance, a resident explained the difference between city and Istanbul Istanbul as:

“Greenery... This place is like a summer resort. When we come here we feel as we have come to our summer resort. And it is a very comfortable house. My husband likes to work in the garden. He has his therapy by working in the garden for at least one hour a day. He does not leave things to be done by the gardeners. He does not like too much the noise and the crowd of the city. City seems greedier, for him. Because of that reason, he is very happy here.” (P3)

This resident explains that it is not only the spatial layout of (green and/or wide) Istanbul Istanbul which makes them and especially her husband happier, but also the distance from the noisy, crowded and “greedy” city. The distance from the city removes them distant from the problems of Istanbul. She used a psychological concept, “therapy” to describe a physical activity, working in the garden. Another resident compared Istanbul Istanbul with previous residence which had problems such as water shortage and did not have a generator for electricity. By contrast, for them Istanbul Istanbul was a far more comfortable and tranquil place because they had experienced difficult conditions earlier. She added:

“Because of that reason, we are more happy to live here than anybody else. We know the value of this place better.” (P8)



**Fig 6.2.1:** Istanbul Istanbul. By contrast to Kasaba, houses are attached.

Secondly, “greenery” was mentioned as an important theme in the interviews such as “garden”, “Nature” and “the greenest development”. One of them also compared Istanbul Istanbul with their previous residence where there were no green fields and the streets were dirty (P7). Another resident explained that her foot touched the Earth and she added “So I am not in an apartment” (P13). This tactile relation with the land shows what is lacking in the city. However, the notion of greenery for the residents in Istanbul Istanbul was not very specific as the residents in Kasaba when they mentioned the forest. The green of Istanbul Istanbul is often associated with the garden or it might reflect the difference from city or previous residences.

“Air” was another theme in Istanbul Istanbul which was described under different descriptions such as “sunlight”, “darkness”, “clean” and “cool air”, used when especially they compared current residences with their previous ones or city life. One resident explained the reason to choose Istanbul Istanbul as “the other house was not getting sunlight” (P4), referring to the health brought by the sunlight, which reminds of the Turkish proverb “A house not visited by sunlight will be visited by a doctor”. The notion of sun was also used when another resident mentioned the difference between the sun’s effect in city centre and that in Istanbul Istanbul:

“Yes, we go to summer resort during summers but when we come back the sun’s effect ends soon. For example, you can see the sun here even in September and October but in the city you live among a concrete jungle.” (P14)

This resident’s description of the city reminds of Istanbul as an unhealthy city that I explained in Chapter 2. The “air” was also used when the same resident explained that her children could get clean air whereas in their previous residence this option was absent:

“In the first flat we lived in Tesvikiye, the nanny was holding children out of the window to make them to take a breath. There was no park. They could not go out of home. My child was sitting near the window all day. Now the residents here are very lucky. There are nannies who take children to the park. They are very lucky in this aspect.” (P14)

This resident showed that in the city there was no opportunity to breathe and no space (a park). In a similar fashion, another resident explained that her children were very lucky, because while the friends of her children were growing among concrete and exhaust gasses; her children grew among “greenery” (P5). Again this resident shows the link between concrete and exhaust, i.e. the link between space and air. In sum, these quotations show the rejection of “concrete” which represents apartment and city life.

The contrast between “dark” and “bright” was also used by two residents in Istanbul Istanbul when they compared it with their previous residences. For instance, one of them explained that while his previous residence was good in certain aspects such as social relations, activities and luxurious shopping opportunities, it had a dark and narrow atmosphere. However, he added that Istanbul Istanbul had a wide and bright atmosphere (P7). In this case again there is link between space (narrow/wide) and air (dark/bright). Also the weather was regarded as a positive characteristic of Istanbul Istanbul when one resident explained that:

“During summers outside is very pleasant. We never feel hot here when Istanbul is burning. Because our homes are always cool. We do not need even air conditioner. This place is always cool. We cannot even stay in the balcony at night without our cardigans.” (P5)

In Kasaba the first important theme was the size of the land, which was described as:

“Wide, if compared to Istanbul Istanbul.” (P16)

“The others are so close and stuck next to each other.” (P24)

“Istanbul Istanbul was concrete jungle in comparison with this.” (P26)

“Very wide if compared with other (housing developments). The others are so close and adjacently arranged.” (P28)

These quotations show the relatively larger land of Kasaba. Also another resident explained the space between houses as “houses are distant from each other”. She added:

“And it is very large. This is a village, modern village rather than a housing development.” (P18)

While another resident described Kasaba as a “satellite-town” (P25), another resident described Kasaba as a town, because it had the largest population. She also said that they were officially a town by referring to the size of the community as being the largest housing development in Omerli (P15).

These accounts complete the discussion in the previous section about the name “Kasaba” which means a town and regarded as a town due its size and population. These quotations strengthen the link between space, its name and the perception of it, which makes Kasaba a real “town”. So, the link between a common name and a proper place is strengthened. Related to the size of the land, “the crowd” was also mentioned by one resident as something unwanted or even hated (P27). In this aspect, Kasaba provided an escape from the crowd. Similarly, another resident stated that:

“Generally, I think not everyone goes outside of homes, because, sometimes I look at from the window that there is no one in the street. I ask myself “where are all these people”. Everyone is busy in their homes. At most I see those who were walking with their dogs.” (P21)

Supporting these views, a local in Omerli explained also that people did not use the streets very often (P32). So, Kasaba demonstrates an interesting dilemma. On the one hand, it is the biggest (gated community) with the largest population which makes it a real “town”. On the other hand, its residents do not like crowds or they are not visible in streets.



For the residents of Kasaba “size and lower density” is also associated with detached houses, which are absent in Istanbul Istanbul. On the basis of several interviews in Kasaba it can be also concluded that a detached house is desired and often is related to an individualised life in which ownership and privacy are crucial. A detached house shows the importance of private space for the family hidden from the public eye. This also shows the importance of “privacy” for these residents, not only in terms of social relations but also of physical proximity. A local in Omerli explained that the most important feature of Kasaba was its autonomy in terms of gardens, common areas and lower density of housing. She also added that while in other communities’ residents were seeing each other due to the proximity between houses, in Kasaba this problem was absent due to the fact that:

“Houses in other communities are very close to each other. There is no limit to the things that you can see with your eyes. Here the eye cannot see things. There are trees and forests between houses. So, people are not disturbed by each other.” (P49)

She stated that while visibility allowed communal living and “being disturbed”, invisibility allowed autonomy and privacy for residents in Kasaba. So, the forest ensures the invisibility and seclusion of residents inside Kasaba which creates privacy and individuality, which was not mentioned by the residents in Istanbul Istanbul.<sup>165</sup> The same person explained Kasaba’s difference from other communities as:

“People live a more individualised life in Kasaba. They have their own borders and land.” (P49)

Also another local in Omerli described Kasaba as one of “the superior projects” because of being surrounded by a forest in which villas were distant to each other (P32). The two communities are different in terms of spatial features and the perception of space. While Kasaba gives residents more space, more individualised and independent but less visible life due to the large land, detached houses and forest, visibility is not seen as a problem in Istanbul

---

<sup>165</sup> See Chapter 7 how Kasaba’s spatial layout affects the perception of safety, i.e. the forest and distance from nearby town decrease the invisibility and the fear of any other treat (the other) from the outside.

Istanbul or not mentioned. The seclusion and protection from both outsiders and insiders provide the residents in Kasaba more privacy. A resident said that in the current detached house everything was owned by them without any interference from the outside:

“Every part of the house belongs to me. Its garden... There is no one above who can shake carpets. We suffered too much from our previous neighbours. We had to install insulation on the ceiling. Discomfort...” (P15)

She added that Kasaba provided “freedom to her cats”. Another one said that her husband always wanted a detached house with a garden, instead of an apartment without any person above or below (P21). These quotations do not only show ownership and status, but also the freedom to use space, without interference. Apartment life in Turkey has a dilemma. While it has been the reflection of Western and urban way of life in Turkey (Oncu, 1988), apartment living restricts people in doing certain things, such as using the space as they want. Listening to music or having a dinner or party with friends is problematic in an apartment. Oncu argues that due to the increasing immigration towards big cities, the importance of apartment life has increased and living in an apartment flat nearby the sea (Bosphorus) has become the prestige symbol. However, since the 1980s a detached house has replaced the apartment which was the symbol of modern family life and Westernisation in Turkey (Oncu, 1999). However, residents did not focus on status, but on comfort, privacy and the freedom to use the space as they wished.

“Greenery” was another important theme in Kasaba. However, although residents in Kasaba used the same word to answer my questions, they referred to a different thing: green in Kasaba was mostly associated with the forest. In the interviews residents described green as:

“Inside the forest, close to Nature...” (P16)

“Inside the Nature...” (P19)

“Lots of greenery, garden, green and woody, forest. I preferred a house inside the forest.” (P20)

“Inside the forest...” (P26)

“The love of Nature, my daughter fell in love with the forest.” (P28)

Related to the green, another resident compared their current house with the previous apartment flat by words “I live on the 12<sup>th</sup> floor there, but here my feet touch the Earth” (P23) which shows the importance of tactile relation with the land, something absent in Istanbul which was stated also by a resident in Istanbul Istanbul.

In sum, despite the spatial differences between Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba, residents described each place with similar concepts and themes. Related to these themes, residents in both communities also stated the difference between their current and previous houses in terms of the size of the land (and/or lower density of the land, the garden, the house or the overall plan of the community). This shows the importance of distance from the rest which is a physical marker of their social distance keeping them hidden and protected from the rest. While in the Roman Empire, privacy meant deprivation, in modern times, privacy means something specific for the use of certain individual, group or class which shows privilege or wealth (Gurbilek, 2001: 57).

### **Image Removed**

**Fig 6.2.2:** Kasaba, photo taken from Emlak Pusulasi, a real estate magazine, June 2005 issue. The forest and detached houses provide residents a more individualised life.

Gated communities combine these two meanings of “privacy”. They are private in its modern meaning, which are specific for the use of certain groups and they also change common names into private ones which are “forbidden for the public use”. They are also private in its ancient meaning which refers to be excluded and deprived of public life although this deprivation is desired. In a larger context, the themes “greenery”, “clean air”, “wide and bright place”, “dark versus bright”, “sunlight” are associated with the perception of the city as an “unhealthy” place. These descriptions also verify the popular discourses on Istanbul which

is regarded as an “unhealthy” place and often described with a deteriorating urban infrastructure. Residents described city life and their previous residences with concepts such as “dirty air”, “narrow and dark”, “concrete jungle” by contrast to the life in gated communities.<sup>166</sup>

Residents also gave more attention to the name of the company rather than that of the architect. Almost all of the residents in both communities stated that they considered the name of the company as a reason to prefer this new house. In Istanbul Istanbul the name of the company was related to the quality of construction and resistance to earthquakes. The name of the company gives trust to the residents as in the words of a resident:

“There are some names such as Koray or Mesa. These are trustful names. People trust these companies, because they are committed to their promises. You join this project from its scratch. You join this project without seeing anything; we chose this house only by looking at the pictures there. These people realise the things they are committed to. This is very important. This is something which has an effect on future projects. Any defect in the construction will be known in this sector, so their credit would be diminished.” (P5)

In Kasaba the name of the company was also associated with the quality of construction and earthquake resistance. A resident explained that they only considered the name of the company and examined only housing developments built by the same company. Due to the company name, several residents in Kasaba also explained that they purchased this house before the construction began and/or waited for several years for it to be completed. The name of the company also guarantees the house as an investment for future, as stated by a resident in Istanbul Istanbul so that one reason to move there was the expectation of rent value from this house (P12). Also a resident in Kasaba described the house as “an investment within Nature” (P16). The name of the company does not only mean a “trustful” company, but it also reflects a more organic relation between the company and the residents. As I explained in Chapter 5, residents preferred their communities because they worked or knew someone who

---

<sup>166</sup>See Chapter 2 sub-section 2.5.1 “Tensions in Istanbul: The Entrapment of Elites” and section 2.6 “From a Global City into a City of Fear” about how Istanbul has been transformed into an unhealthy place which pushed people to escape from it.

was working in the Koray Group of Companies. While in Istanbul Istanbul three residents explained that they chose this place due to their ties with the Koray Company, in Kasaba, two residents gave similar explanations.

### **6.2.1 Turkish Life in an American House**

Contrary to expectation, only a few residents in Istanbul Istanbul mentioned admiration for a foreign country, architecture or architect. As an example, a resident described Istanbul Istanbul as a “European place” and one of the relatives who lived in Britain stated that they should have known the value of this place (P8). Another resident explained that Istanbul Istanbul was “realised with such labour and imitated foreign countries”. She added that when she was in Miami, Florida she was thinking as “Why don’t we create such houses in Turkey?” She continued to say:

“So, this place was built by imitating foreign countries. Also the project is imported from abroad. So, a local architect cannot design like that. And when you do this, the contractor would ask you, the cost of it. They built each flat different from each other. This is not economical. This place is realised through foreign intervention. This place is built through the prestige of a foreign architect.”<sup>167</sup> (P14)

This resident said something similar with respect to the technical skills of foreign architects as Tanyeli argues (2004), but she also said that the architecture had something beyond economic and functional considerations, which shows the admiration towards foreign culture (Miami/Florida). For this resident, the prestige of a house is associated with foreign culture and/or architect which is something “beyond economics”. The prestige of a foreign architect represents “sign value” (Baudrillard, 1998). On the difference between sign value and use value, Baudrillard suggests that:

All men are equal before objects as use-value, but they are by no means equal before as objects as signs and differences, which are profoundly hierarchical. (Baudrillard, 1998: 90)

---

<sup>167</sup> I explained this difference based on the façade of the house in the section 6.1.3 “It Seems 40 years Old”.

However, although sign value of this house is associated with something “foreign”, it is found on the facade of the house. This resident explained that houses were different from each other (and similar to an American house). However, this difference is created on the surface, as was mentioned by an architect who explained that architects created difference on the facade. This shows the importance of the surface of houses which has “sign value”.

I now show how this sign value which represents something “foreign” is rejected by several residents in Kasaba who criticised their houses. The comparison with foreign countries (Europe or the United States), and the use of foreign styles or architects turned into a more negative aspect in Kasaba, when several residents stated that they did not like their homes which were regarded as suitable for American life. By contrast, this criticism was absent in Istanbul Istanbul, because as was explained by an architect, the interior plan of row houses was changed while the social club building built by a French architect was totally demolished which was not designed on the basis of a lifestyle suitable for Turkish family and culture:

“In this project there were things unsuitable to Turkey. Mechanically and technologically the house was not functioning and also in terms of architecture... It was unsuitable for Turkish people.” (P37)

Bali argues that these developments refer to an Ottoman past and language by the names of the houses, but to an American suburban life in the advertisements without creating conflict (1999: 38). However and interestingly, residents in Kasaba criticised their houses for having an American house plan.<sup>168</sup> One resident explained that:

“We only considered the construction company. The architect was very bad. It was an American company. This (project) serves American society. ....The houses do not have gutters. As if it is in a place in America without much rainfall, as if it is a village in San Francisco.... The architect also used lots of windows. There are nine windows in a dining room. There were these kinds of mistakes. They built good houses in general. Not bad at all.” (P25)

---

<sup>168</sup> Gated communities are also criticised by several experts (architects and academics) who described gated communities as “imitation” and “fashionable” places in contrast to old houses or neighbourhoods such as Bosphorus in Istanbul. This shows another level of spatial distinction across Istanbul which is based on the “age” and “originality” of a house or neighbourhood.

The resident's dissatisfaction with the outside (gutters and the number of windows) is obvious. She was criticising the absence of gutters because of imitating American life (San Francisco) and so, unsuitable for Istanbul. She also complained about the number of windows in the dining room. There are several reasons which might affect this resident's reaction towards her house. The first is the profession of this resident, who as a civil engineer criticised the house with its "mistakes" in the design. So, the knowledge about the construction might give this resident the authority to judge a house, which I would call "professional/occupational capital" different from cultural capital.

Another resident complained about the interior of the house as being unsuitable for Turkish traditions, even if she previously referred to "European standards" to describe the household income:

"There is only a small change inside the house. There was a direct entrance to the dining room. So, the door was visible when I was sitting in the dining room. I closed that part with a plaster wall. It was done in American style but we were used to Turkish traditions, so it was not nice for me to see the door from the dining room. I did this alteration. I did not do anything else besides this." (P28)

This quotation shows the importance of Turkish traditions and the discomfort with the plan of the house which allows the outsiders' gaze. The rejection of such visibility is related to the importance of privacy in Turkish traditions. Privacy is associated with the privacy of home in Turkey i.e. the seclusion of women and family life from public life. As an example, previously in the Ottoman Empire the interior of houses were divided into harem and selamlik i.e. into male (public) and female (private) settings. In Istanbul there were also dead end streets (cul-de-sac) as a combination of public and private space. Although these streets were not totally closed to the public, the plan of these streets prohibited strangers from entering the

street. After the Westernisation efforts of Tanzimat Period in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, a new kind of urban space was designed, with open streets, open parks, boulevards and squares.<sup>169</sup>

This quotation might reflect the second factor, cultural background of this resident, where “taste” has become a differentiating factor. One explanation comes from Holt who argues that if everyone is consuming more or less the same commodities then it has become important how (the manner) to consume (Holt, 1998: 6). He argues that standards can be different in different contexts such as while in France high culture is at the centre of Bourdieu’s work; in the United States fine arts is not a concern of upper classes. Holt argues that the ideas of Bourdieu cannot be applied to other societies such as the case of the United States. Instead of Bourdieu who relied on consumption objects, Holt focuses on daily practices and mass culture such as food, interior decoration, vacation, fashion, sports, reading, hobbies and socialising (Holt, 1998). Holt argues that while people of HCC (high cultural capital) rely on the discourse of style, people of LCC (low cultural capital) rely on the comfort and importance of traditions in the use of interior decoration.

The refusal of American life or style was not only limited to the houses inside Kasaba. For instance, the resident who previously stated that they did not need to go to Switzerland (because they were now living in a similar place) explained that they did not choose to live in another gated community because it was designed as an American house:

“There is also Omerli Park Houses. However, they were built in American style, as if they were built suddenly, as a wooden house instead of being built with bricks on a foundation. They were very big houses as well. Heating is problem, without natural gas. These houses are heated with LPG (liquid petroleum gas).” (P21)

This resident rejects a house because of not looking like a Turkish house or like a “real” house in Turkey. So, even if Omerli Park Houses are good quality buildings, they are not

---

<sup>169</sup> However, this rejection of visibility can also be related to the protection of privacy of the upper classes. Although it does not refer to the visibility, also in Chapter 5 I explain that a resident in Istanbul Istanbul wants to keep social distance with their neighbours in order to keep a “private” life. This quotation can complete the visual aspect of such social relations between neighbours. See Chapter 7 which explains different aspects of visibility in terms of security.



regarded as “a house” because they are not built in a conventional style. This resident prefers a house in Kasaba which seems more as a “house” than the American style Omerli Park Houses. Interestingly, these residents in Kasaba had a dilemma when they criticised their houses for having an American house plan, while at the same time compared their houses with similar examples in Europe or in America (the United States).<sup>170</sup> By doing this, residents rejected “American life” in everyday life. This shows the difference between mind-sets and practices, which are unconsciously in conflict with residents’ everyday lives. I also argue that while these residents mentioned American culture or life, this was not a criticism of American culture. As I showed, these residents referred also to “European standards” or “European culture” in their conversations. These residents did not criticise an American life or culture, but they criticised the import of another culture into the everyday life in Turkey.

#### **Image Removed**

**Fig 6.2.1.1:** A sketch of the first floor of a house in Kasaba, photo taken from its brochure, which might be one of the houses mentioned in the interviews. See how the entrance and dining room allow a unified place, which is rejected by several residents.

An interesting explanation for the internal use of a dwelling in Istanbul is made by Tanyeli (2004) who argues that although the traditional interior plan has been changed due to the Westernisation and modernisation processes since the 19<sup>th</sup> century, there is no permeability between rooms which are separated by a corridor. He gives as an example the kitchen and its relationship with sitting and dining rooms. Even in the smallest dwellings, kitchens are not integrated with the sitting and dining rooms. Tanyeli argues that the walls of the kitchen are still strong which do not only avoid the smell of the food but also show the meaning of privacy which isolates the kitchen from the rest of the house. He explains that except for a few examples, dwellings in Istanbul do not have the fluidity and permeability of American middle class dwellings (Tanyeli, 2004: 155-156). He also adds that architects and their clients (Turkish

---

<sup>170</sup> A local in Omerli (P49) also stated that Kasaba was built in American style in terms of its architecture with big gardens and detached houses similar to farm houses.

bourgeois) in Istanbul do not take risks in design in order not to be seen as different from the rest (Tanyeli, 2004: 304-305).

So, even Westernisation and modernisation processes have changed the urban space in Turkey, the interior of an apartment flat resists changes and it remains divided into sections to protect privacy. The same point was also mentioned by an architect that these new housing developments did not bring much novelty to the interior architecture, although they seemed different from the outside:

“I do not think that there are important differences between houses, really. So, even if they seem to be built in a modern style, like the examples of Evidia or Istanbul Zen or the past projects, the interior does not provide something specific in terms of planning or how a house should be built. ...There is no radicalism in any neighbourhood of Istanbul or in Evidia similar to when the duplex apartment flat was firstly introduced in Turkey. Each of these new projects is not different from the familiar apartment flat. In sum, this difference can only be based on the “image.” (P35)

This quotation shows the importance of the difference based on the “image” i.e. the façade of the houses. This also explains that although many houses have different facades either modern or traditional, the interior has a traditional apartment flat plan. So, the sign value which represents something “foreign” is embedded in the façade of these houses or in the “stylistic distinctions” created in the design process. This also shows a demarcation from the use-value, which is equal for everyone, as argued by Baudrillard. By contrast, the use-value of a house designed in American style is not the same for residents from Turkey. In this aspect, the use-value of a house seems to be a differentiating aspect. This also shows that residents try to limit the influence of foreign cultures inside their houses.

Residents do not always give positive feedback about the physical characteristics of the house. In this aspect, they do not idealise their houses and rarely give importance to the characteristics created on the surface of a house.<sup>171</sup> And when residents mentioned these

---

<sup>171</sup> Also the residents in Celebration stated that they did not have any interest in the period styles of the houses while the sociability and walkability of the town or the school was more important (Ross, 2000: 91). However, I do not explain reasons to choose or move in a gated community such as children, school or social relations. Instead, I focus on the spatial characteristics which lead residents to prefer this community.

characteristics, this was because of a problem, such as when they criticised their houses to be suitable for the American lifestyle. This result also shows a challenge to the “myth of the ideal house” (Oncu, 1999: 27). Contrary to the importance of advertisements in the creation of the “myth of the ideal house”, residents criticised their “ideal houses” imported from the United States. Moreover, if they could find the opportunity and permission to make changes, they re-organised the interior of the house on the basis of their lifestyles. So the irony of searching the lost times of a harmonious Turkish society by the foreign architects and American styled houses was rejected by residents who ironically explained their admiration towards Western culture.

## CONCLUSION

In this chapter I explored how space is designed and lived in Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba, to complete the discussions made in Chapter 4 in which I examined general suburban transformation in Istanbul since the introduction of gated communities. Firstly, I explained how developer companies build gated communities as “packages” for various niches or target groups (which reflect class and cultural differences). As Oncu argues that the “myth of the ideal house” was created by advertising companies since the 1980s, I look to the overall process of design to understand how gated communities are rendered “imaginary communities”. By “imaginary communities” I mean gated communities designed on the basis of designers and architects’ inspirations taken from foreign examples in Europe or the United States by using “stylistic distinctions” attached to their surface. Then I explored the ways in which “imaginary communities” are created. One way is using artificial views necessary especially for gated communities built far from “natural views” such as Bosphorus in Istanbul. An artificial view such as a lake, a rose garden or an old mansion or even a natural view such

---

as a forest renders gated communities attractive for their target groups. More specifically, Istanbul Istanbul has an artificial lake, a swimming pool and it is designed on the basis of Neo-urbanist rules which aim at bringing residents together. Moreover, the spatial design of Istanbul Istanbul was supported by the concept of “among us” which refers to amenities such as child care services, social club, restaurant and cafe showing also how “packaging” works on the basis of different target groups. By contrast, while Istanbul Istanbul is created around the concept of “among us” which emphasises the importance of neighbourliness due its spatial features, Kasaba is created around the concept of “individuality” and “privacy” due to its large lands, detached houses and the forest, as a natural view which makes Kasaba distinct from other gated communities. Kasaba also has a social club building and amenities such as horse riding and tennis facilities.

Another way of rendering gated communities original is using an eclectic architectural style and aged, individualised and diversified façades which create the identity of the house. The use of eclecticism in architecture which brings together styles from different cultures renders a house “unique” and “original”. While Istanbul Istanbul combines Mediterranean and Turkish styles, Kasaba combines American suburban house and Turkish details. Also the surface of a house is rendered original by using different and/or “aged” details, such as when in Istanbul Istanbul it was used wood which was rendered “old” to give house a lived outlook with a past. Houses are also built different from each other but this difference lies on the surface. By these ways, architects or designers think that residents can qualify their homes instead of quantifying them and so, they can eliminate using impersonal descriptions such as “A or B block”. Instead, they can describe their homes with their colours and texture. More generally, these features summarise the aim of postmodern architecture which aim at creating unique places by imitating the old and the original, as Haila argues (2006). By this means, gated communities can be regarded as “simulacra of simulacra” because of being built similar

to other housing developments which are already “simulations”. For example, Istanbul Istanbul was built similar to a housing development in France which was designed similar to Venice and Kasaba was inspired by American suburban houses.

The design process also reveals the competition between foreign architects who are regarded as the guarantees of marketing success and local architects, who, despite not being regarded as gifted as their foreign counterparts, complete gated communities on the basis of the requirements of the Turkish housing market. Advertisements of these communities reflect the values of their target groups by using personal language so potential residents would not feel alienated from them. However, even if both communities use personal language, Kasaba is marketed as a “distant” gated community to Istanbul, while Istanbul Istanbul is marketed as “both close and distant” to Istanbul which emphasises its approachable and friendly image. Lastly, the names of these communities reflect the values such as the name of Istanbul Istanbul which represents “Istanbul” even it is a place outside of Istanbul. However, the names are not fixed, but they might change over time. For example, “Kasaba” has experienced an interesting transformation from “Casaba” into “Kasaba”. While “Casaba” reflects the importance of English as sign of status written with the letter “C”, “Kasaba” reflects a change towards the Turkish spelling with letter “K”. Interestingly, as I showed later, the transformation from a foreign design into a Turkish one would be revealed in Kasaba when several residents criticised their homes as “American”.

In the second section, I show the gap between “imaginary communities” created by the architects and “real communities” lived by the residents, which gives a new insight to the existing literature. The materialisation of “stylistic distinctions” is very different for the residents who give more importance to “functional distinctions”. Residents in both communities revealed their satisfaction with their present houses and/or communities and they made comparisons with their previous residences. Present communities provided them larger

lands (or house/ flats), the access to a greener environment and clean air resulting in a more comfortable life. The two communities are different from each other in terms of spatial layout: contrary to Istanbul Istanbul, Kasaba is built on a larger land and it mostly consists of detached houses (villas) and surrounded by a forest which provide residents a more individualised and private life.

Despite this difference, residents in both communities stressed similar themes about spatial characteristics such as the general plan of the community in terms of the size of the land (and/or lower density), clean air and access to greenery. Rather than relying on advertisements, residents also use their professional ties, established by working in the same company or knowing someone who works in the same company. Also the quality of construction and the name of the company were important factors to protect them and their families especially against an earthquake in Istanbul. The name of the company gives confidence to residents which provides a safe environment and guarantees the house as an investment.

I would argue that instead of the importance of sign value for the residents in both gated communities, exchange value and use value are as important as the sign value. If there is any sign value associated with these houses, it was mentioned by only two residents in Istanbul Istanbul, which restricts sign value on the façade which represents something “foreign”. Moreover, residents reject and change their houses if they find it unsuitable for their lifestyles, such as when several residents in Kasaba explained discomfort with their “American” homes, as something imported from a foreign culture. This criticism is based on the “professional/occupational capital” of residents which shows the importance of expertise on a subject and “cultural capital” of residents which shows the importance of cultural backgrounds which determine whether to admire discourse of style or to stick with the old and the traditional as Holt argues (1998). This criticism also shows the gap between residents’ values who admire

something “foreign” (culture or houses) in their conversations, and their material lives when they reject “foreign” in their homes. The importance of cultural context also indicates why the interior of a house (or a flat) resists changes as Tanyeli argues (2004) and why instead of interior, it is the surface which designers and architects work with to give originality to a house. So, while “sign value” of these houses which represents something “foreign” (architect or architecture or style) is created on the surface, for residents the value depends on its usefulness which is grounded in the house. I argue that instead of stylistic distinctions, the name of the developer company has become a “functional sign” which guarantees the house with high quality of construction making the house resistant to earthquake and also a good source of investment. The conflict between “stylistic distinctions” and “functional distinctions” re-evaluate and re-define the “sign value” (Baudrillard, 1998: 90) in the usefulness and exchangeability of a house in the housing market.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

# “GUANTANAMO CAMPS”<sup>172</sup> IN SUBURBAN ISTANBUL

### INTRODUCTION

In this Chapter, by discussing similarities and differences between the two cases, I explore security aspects of Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba, one of the most debated subjects on gated communities. As I explained in Chapters 2 and 3, security has become a major concern in the last years, especially in cities like Istanbul, leading people to move to gated communities which protect residents from the dangers of urban life. Firstly, I explain how residents described the city life which was shaped by personal experiences such as theft, crimes and the earthquake of 1999. Safety is also a goal for children who can be raised in gated communities without their parents’ surveillance. Secondly, I explore how security is created spatially and socially in a gated community which leads to the reversal of Panopticon, where the more powerful majority observes the less powerful minority, as the reflection of socio-political changes since the 1980s. However, gated communities do not only provide ready-made security, but also residents create spontaneous security out of necessity, besides the security provided by developer companies. Lastly, I explain that gated communities do not create totally safe places, but also new insecurities which create different perception of safety and threat and stand in contrast to the well-known “security-obsessed urbanism” (Soja, 2000: 303). There are insecurities arising outside of gated communities due to the income, religious and gender differences between the residents and the locals, longer commuting distances, lack of health institutions as well as insecurities inside gated communities such as the fear of stranger which is similar to “enemy inside” (Bauman, 1998: 48). By doing this, I show multiplicities of security and how it is created in social and spatial aspects.

---

<sup>172</sup> Quotation of a local in Gokturk (P47).



## 7.1 THE FEAR OF URBAN SPACE AND EARTHQUAKE

In this section I explore how residents in both communities explained dangers which they or their friends had experienced. Their description of urban space is similar to the general discourses which represent Istanbul as a place full of dangers, attacks, and crime as well as overpopulation. They described urban space in general and Istanbul in particular as negative and totally opposite of the life in gated communities. Residents in Istanbul explained that:

“Turkey is not sufficiently safe, because of terror and robberies. My child cannot go out without me. Abduction, accidents...” (P4)

“The neighbourhood started to worsen in streets further down. These places had been invaded by street children who were taking drugs. They occupied the vacant building of the Institution of Social Insurance and they settled there. There was a car park. Stealing and snatching began at that point.” (P14)

These quotations show how popular discourses about Istanbul have been internalised by residents and at the same time, they had experienced thefts and crime which diminished trust towards urban life. Similarly, residents in Kasaba complained about:

“The residents move here in order to escape from the traffic. They find this place safe.” (P15)

“There was more crime in the city. There was theft from our car. My friend encountered a thief in their flat.” (P21)

“There is security here.” (P28)

However, another threat for residents was the long-expected earthquake which would strike Istanbul leading to an apocalyptic end. The earthquake on 17 August 1999 which demolished the South-east Marmora region (Sakarya, Golcuk and Adapazari) was a turning point for Istanbulites.<sup>173</sup> According to Danis, the construction in Bahcesehir was accelerated firstly, between 1996 and 1997 when the construction of the first phase was over and the main services were slowly enabled, and secondly, after 17 August 1999 earthquake since the upper

---

<sup>173</sup> See Chapter 2 sub-section 2.6.1 “The Moment when Time Stopped...” and Chapter 3 section 3.2 “Socio-Economic Changes and The Search for Security”.

and middle classes had moved there to live in a safer place (Danis, 2001: 153-154). It is argued that the most important factor which led people to move in villas has been the fear of an earthquake<sup>174</sup> and the geological formation of land has become important for the housing developments constructed since 2000 (Inal Cekic and Gezici, 2005).<sup>175</sup> Similarly, several experts explained that the desire to live in gated communities showed the importance given to the distance from Istanbul (distance from the North Anatolian Fault Zone), the search for strong soil and housing quality such as:

“After the earthquake, the North has gained value.” (P35)

“Marmora Earthquake. Why Silivri has been chosen? Seismologists tell that if your house is built with good quality, you can build your house on the fault zone, because it is not the earthquake but the house that kills you. If you build the house strong enough to resist earthquakes, there would not be any problem.” (P51)

### **Image Removed**

**Fig 7.1.1:** Kasaba’s resistance to the strongest earthquake is guaranteed by the assurance given by a university’s geophysics department, photo taken from its brochure.

The earthquake in 1999 did some damage in Istanbul but the most important damage has been to people’s minds. The meaning of “home” has changed dramatically. Instead of being a place to protect the inhabitants from outsiders, home has become a place of insecurity. Since then, people demanded more good quality housing, as explained also by several experts who stated that good construction quality and technology made houses to be resistant to an earthquake:

“Technological race...” (P31)

“There was nothing in terms of regulation or legislation. So the quality of buildings depends on companies. There are lots of contractors in Turkey. So, lots of people who are not professional contractors try to build houses. Quite long time has passed since the 1999 earthquake. People forget this and do not think about it. They cannot do anything. This creates anxiety. Istanbul is a dangerous place because of this. The majority of

---

<sup>174</sup> Aysegul Akyarli, “100 Kisiden Ikisi Villada Yasiyor”, Hurriyet Emlak, 7 April 2005.

<sup>175</sup> See Chapter 4 where Esen explains that since the 1999 Marmora Earthquake, lands in the North have been opened up for construction for the new upper middle classes (Esen, 2007).

buildings are not durable and they are old. Most of them do not have construction permits. So, we live amongst irregular housing.” (P53)

More specifically, two locals in Omerli and Gokturk respectively explained that:

“They want to move from apartments i.e. vertical dwellings to horizontal ones.” (P32)

“Due to the earthquake... They moved in single-storey houses because of that.” (P34)

Residents in both communities stated that the earthquake in 1999 was the turning point for them. On the basis with interviews with the residents, there are three main themes related to earthquake. The first is the first-hand experiences of residents. The second is the wish to live in a good-quality house. The third is the wish to live in a house with only few-storeys (mostly with a garden). Three residents in Istanbul Istanbul stated that:

“Also we escaped from the earthquake. My husband was at home during the earthquake. The rumours... A house with a garden, resistant... So we can throw ourselves in the garden.” (P4)

This quotation shows how the experience of her husband and the rumours in the aftermath led these people to move to Istanbul Istanbul. Other examples were:

“The reason... In the 1999 earthquake, the lands of my wife’s family were strongly damaged. Demolished... We wanted to live in a house built on a safer soil with better construction quality. We found this place. Since we do not trust anything in our country, we thought that this place was done according to the new rules and regulations. We thought this was a way of escape.” (P2)

“The first reason is the earthquake. The fear and anxiety because of the earthquake led us here.” (P5)

The first quotation shows how the experience of an earthquake pushed people to search for a house built with better quality according to rules and regulations. This resident shows his distrust in “everything in Turkey” including their own flat in Istanbul and so, he prefers a new house. Two residents explained the importance of the quality of construction as:

“We trusted the name of the company. After the earthquake, we thought that this community would be safe for us. This shows the trust towards the company.” (P11)

“I know how this company works. I also know that this development was built after the earthquake. In 2000, the legislation about construction was changed. New regulations have been put in force about a building’s resistance. These are few-storeys houses.

Because of that reason, I was not worried. I also know how Yapi Kredi Koray works.” (P14)

In Kasaba, seven residents mentioned the fear of an earthquake. For most of them, the quality of construction and the name of the company were as important as it was in Istanbul Istanbul:

“The first reason was the earthquake.” (P16)

“I do not have fears such as “Is it going to collapse?” because I know that this house is built by a leading construction company of Turkey.” (P18)

“Earthquake triggered us to move here.” (P19)

“We searched for this kind of housing after the earthquake. We were living on 16<sup>th</sup> floor of an apartment. We were shaken very strongly. It was a safe building, but we experienced it for the first time. Because of earthquake, the house is two-storey.” (P20)

“Because of the earthquake... We experienced it.” (P24)

“We were looking for a house like this. There was Istanbul Istanbul. We firstly saw that place, however, after the earthquake people rushed into there. There were no houses left.” (P26)

“We escaped from the city because of the earthquake.” (P27)

These quotations show that a good-quality house built by a prominent developer company is one of the most important factors to move for residents in both communities, as explained in Chapter 6 which brings “functional distinctions” into focus rather than stylistic ones. The famous quotation of seismologists “not the earthquake, but the building kills” which was also repeated by an expert (P51), leads residents to search for good-quality housing.

### **7.1.1 Children**

Another reason to live in gated communities is to provide a safe place for the young and children (and more generally for the whole family). Raising children in a gated community is very comfortable and as in the words of an architect:

“Children can play without the fear of “if.” (P48)

Three residents in Istanbul Istanbul explained that:

“There is no exhaust or traffic. Children can always go out to play. Here we can let our children out even at nights during summers. They can go out at night freely, they play hide and seek. They go to swimming pool during the day and so benefit from social activities. In our previous residence opportunities were limited. However, here they can live their childhood.” (P6)

“I wanted my child would be comfortable.” (P8)

“Children can roam and move freely.” (P9)

So, comfort does not only create “free-range children” who can grow in a comfortable place and play without the threat of traffic, but it also allows parents to be more independent who can leave their children. Not only theft or abduction is regarded as threats to children, but also traffic is a big concern for parents, which I will explain in the last section in more detail. In Kasaba residents stated the same threats:

“Security, they escape from traffic, this is a child-controlled environment. They find this place safe. There is demand for safety.” (P15)

“Safety is very important here. Swimming pool, social club... We feel safe. We can also leave our children alone.” (P19)

“I also find this place safe in terms of leaving my daughter alone.” (P20)

And a local in Omerli supported these concerns:

“And also because it is a closed place they think that their children can roam freely. They believe that this is a safe place. Because of that they prefer to live here.” (P32)

Related to the present situation of Istanbul, safety for residents in both communities means also a “green” place with clean air so they can avoid environmental degradation such as air pollution.<sup>176</sup> The link between health and place was important for them, and they wanted their children to grow up in a safe place also with respect to environment. As in the words of a local in Omerli:

“And of course, there is the wish to live in a place where children can grow up by cycling and roaming freely in a clean and natural environment that Istanbul lost long time ago. The most important characteristic of Kasaba is this.” (P49)

---

<sup>176</sup> See Chapter 6 section 6.2 “Real Communities” how “green” leads residents to prefer to live in gated communities.

However, as explained by a researcher, there are also “social risks” associated with the city, similar to the popular discourses that I explained in Chapters 2 and 3. He said that:

“The life in these places is much focused on the family, which escapes from certain risks. The concept of risk is very large which covers both social and environmental risks, including the earthquake.” (P50)

This was also supported by an academic who said that people moved (into gated communities) to places far from urban areas and “bad habits” because of their children (P31). Similarly, one resident in Kasaba explained that she wanted to stay her daughter away from the city in her adolescence (P27). In this case, city is not only regarded as a threat in terms of traffic and environmental degradation, but also in terms of its culture represented in the media by the use of drugs or violence in schools. Also a resident in Istanbul Istanbul explained that although they had the opportunity to send their children out (to socialise), she was not sure if she would ever do this in Istanbul (because of the situation of Istanbul) (P14).

Another aspect of providing a safe environment for children is the schools nearby, as explained by residents in both communities, as one of the most important reasons to move to a gated community. Some residents mentioned that the best school was the closest one. They said that they would never send their children to a school far from their home even it was the best one. In Istanbul Istanbul four residents explained that their children went a nearby school:

“My child attends the school here. Home and work places are close to each other.”(P7)

“My daughter attends Hisar (school), one of the reasons why we moved here. The best school is the closest one.” (P11)

“My daughter attends a close-by school. We could not take the risk of such traffic.” (P12)

“My daughter attends a private school in this neighbourhood.” (P13)

In Kasaba three residents explained that they preferred a nearby school:

“My children attend Alev Primary School, the primary reason why we moved here.” (P26)

“My daughter’s school is very close, she goes with a shuttle.” (P27)

“My child attends the eighth grade of a school in Samandira and goes with a shuttle.”  
(P28)

One resident added that 80% of Kasaba’s population sent their children to Alev Primary School (P15). These answers show that there is no difference between the two communities in this aspect. However, there is contradiction in the sense that while residents explained that they preferred schools to be close to their homes, they had already said to move there because of these private schools. The schools mentioned in the interviews were “Kemerkoç Primary School” in Gokturk (inside Kemer Country, associated with the Hisar Educational Foundation Schools) and “Alev Primary School” inside Kasaba (associated with the Association of Austrian College Alumni). Thus, they send their children to private but nearby schools, which creates a controlled environment for their children. So, they used the proximity of the school as an excuse to send their children, however, they said to move there because of these schools.

However, the security for children is also criticised by several residents. The first problem arises when children are grown-up, a common problem for the parents in both communities. Young people want to be in the city where they can easily socialise with their friends. In Istanbul Istanbul two residents mentioned the problem of grown-up children who tended to prefer city life rather than a life in a gated community. In Kasaba seven residents described the same situation. The higher number in Kasaba can be related to the higher average age of children and the distance of Kasaba to Istanbul which makes commuting more difficult.

For instance, a resident in Kasaba explained that her daughter was complaining “You have tucked me in here”. She told that this kind of housing was good for children until 12 years old. She added that there was no problem for those who had cars. Children were dependent on their parents because they were driving them to the city (P24). Another resident explained that:

“Young people are bored here. Yes, for very small children this is a very great place. There are ballet and karate classes for them. There are swimming courses. There are summer schools for mothers. Even if the mother stays at home, she can let her children out. However, when children get older, problems emerge when private tutors come

home or when children attend courses (in the city)... There are those young people who are used to go to Bagdat Avenue. There are those children who are used to go out. They are bothered here.” (P21)

She added that her son was going to stay in his aunt’s house during summers when he wanted to be in Istanbul. Another resident in Kasaba explained:

“They play as if they are in a summer resort. However, they have difficulties when especially male children want to go out at night.” (P28)

So, a gated community is similar to a summer resort which provides a homogenous population (especially in terms of children) who socialise with others from the same age group and can find opportunities such as sports. Summer resorts in Turkey on the coasts of the Aegean, Mediterranean and Marmora Sea are popular among the middle classes. Summer resorts are suitable to raise children up to a certain age, because they provide a safe place where everyone knows each other in a controlled environment.<sup>177</sup> However, as children grow up, the controlled environment creates discomfort among the youth and in the case of gated communities, it leads to a mobile life among them, explained by a resident in Istanbul Istanbul as:

“The children of this young generation of residents are small. So children play with each other. However, when they get older, these children want to visit their friends in the city. So, a woman asks “I cannot take my child to the city. How can he/she go there? I cannot hire a chauffeur.” So, some children use their flats in the city. So, they do not come here.” (P8)

So, even if the parents live permanently in a gated community, their grown-up children move to their family flats in the city to socialise.

The second criticism was related to the creation of an over-controlled environment, which was explained by this resident when she compared her son with other children who did not know the meaning of poverty and absence. She also added that children, who grew in similar places and were attending nearby schools, could not develop their personalities:

---

<sup>177</sup> See Chapter 3 section 3.3 “A Suburban Phenomenon”.



“What happens here? There are children who go to short distances who are dependent on their nannies. This is a bad habit of this place. Nannies always stand just one metre behind them. This should not be like that. These children should gain their self confidence. However, they always go out with their nannies. They do not do anything independently.” (P8)

This shows how parents try to create an over-controlled environment with schools and nannies which create children without self confidence. She explained that they did not send their son to the local private school which could put limitations on the development of his identity. She criticised women who sent their children nearby private schools where children grew in an over-protective environment. She said that they wanted their son to go to a school in Istanbul in a “more normal environment” where he could develop his independence and learn about the world. However, I think the “independent character of their son” is an excuse to cover their wish to send him to a school in Istanbul, regarded as a status symbol which symbolises a more established and older education institution based on Western values. Similarly, a resident in Kasaba explained that although there were children who were attending the private primary school inside Kasaba, other parents were sending their children to private schools far from their homes which were providing education in English language (P28).

### ***7.1.2 A Safe and Mobile Life***

Another aspect of security is that of the relationship between security and mobility. An interesting result came out when four residents in Istanbul Istanbul did not mention anything about security mechanisms about their community or homes. Two of them were permanent residents but did not have any children (young couples). The other two were “mobile” residents and older than the average age in Istanbul Istanbul. One of them moved there because of her grandchildren. She explained that she was using Istanbul Istanbul during weekends and then returning to her home in Istanbul (P10). The other one explained only the “earthquake” as their security concern (P2). However, he did not mention anything about security mechanisms inside the community. Although this resident had a child, he was not living with his parents and

secondly, this resident was not using Istanbul Istanbul permanently. His situation connects the two: those who lived a mobile life and had no children did not mention security or threats.

In Kasaba there were three residents who did not mention any security aspect of their community or homes. One of them, although having a child, was not permanently living in Kasaba (P23). As this resident shows, female residents who were not living permanently in a gated community did not give importance to safety. The other two were living permanently and had children, but their children were older. So, to have children makes a person more concerned with the physical and social milieu. This shows that a person with a dependent child gives more importance to security. As a male resident in Istanbul Istanbul explained (P7), those who had children gave importance to security of the overall community. However, this can also be associated with being the “head of the household” as the man who should protect his family (wife and children). So, there might be no difference between genders especially when they live a mobile life and/or have children. However, this male resident’s insistence on security is revealed only when he has someone whom he thought he should protect. This can reproduce the existing gender prejudices and inequalities.

So, there is a dilemma of gated communities. On the one hand, they are said to provide safety for families and children. On the other hand, gated communities in suburban areas which provide physical and psychological distance from the city are also used as non-permanent residences during weekends or summers. So, when these people return their homes in Istanbul, most of them live in standard apartments (no security and older apartments, or at least they return to Istanbul, which is told to be unsafe and chaotic). So, even if these residents give importance to security, when they return to the city centre, this automatically creates an “unsafe” situation.

## 7.2 SAFE LIVING

### 7.2.1 *Panopticon in Reverse*

In this section I analyse how security is provided inside gated communities. Gated communities include two forms of security. The first is composed of new technologies which provides a ready-made security and reverses Panopticon. Related to that, one theme brought into focus by experts was surveillance, explained by the terms “1984/Truman Show” (P31) and “1984 big brother” (P43). An academic explained that gated communities provided predictability:

“They remind me “1984” where everything is under control. Also children grow up with a fear towards the outside. It is also like the Truman Show which produces a strong contrast between the outside world which is very dangerous and the inside where happy families live.” (P31)

The visibility and seclusion, gaze and observation are the reflections of larger changes of recent times with paparazzi who intervene with lives of “celebrities” and TV programmes such as Big Brother, based on the observation of a group of people and their lives. Sometimes the observation might be the reflection for the search of safety and detection of crime, as in the examples of CCTV cameras which allow “private” lives to be opened for the gazers, which has also become subject of the movies like “Rear Window” (1954) and “Disturbia” (2007) in which the observation was to detect crimes. There are also more political examples such as “1984” (1984) in which the political elite watches everyone and “Minority Report” (2002) in which crimes are detected before being committed by reading the future.

In Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba, the community provides safety mechanisms such as alarms in each house, CCTV cameras in streets, and guards so that it can only be accessible for the outsiders by the permission of residents. As example, two residents, one in Istanbul Istanbul and the other one in Kasaba explained different forms of security systems in their communities:

“Robbers were not able to enter this place, because they were caught by the security cameras in the fences. They were caught while they were trying to jump over the fence. There are cameras everywhere. There is one just opposite our home, there are several in

the streets you passed, everywhere. Everything is fixed and observed 24 hours a day. There is three or four security staff inside the security centre. They go out patrolling every half an hour. Night and day... Security is very important. When there is a problem in the house such as with the electricity or facilities, or when your bulb is burnt or an electrical item has a problem, they are on duty for 24 hours. When you have a problem at three o'clock in the morning, you can call someone from the security. Moreover, there are also gas and fire detectors. When cologne poured out of the bottle, the house became a mess due to the alarms and they ran and asked "What is happening here?" So these kinds of things make me comfortable. Sometimes we can forget the iron on, in the case of a short circuit, all the systems stop in the house. There is nothing which would permit a fire. I know these things so I become more relaxed." (P5)

"Security is so well established here. There is an alarm system against theft." (P18)



**Fig 7.2.1.1:** The entrance of Kasaba. The building on the right side belongs to the management of Kasaba. At the centre there are guards who control the flow of people inside and outside the community by taking their names. On the left side, there is the building for visitors where they wait in a waiting room.



**Fig 7.2.1.2:** The entrance of Istanbul Istanbul. At the entrance guards check who come in by taking their names. In the second floor of the building there is the office of the management.

A local in Gokturk described gated communities as “Guantanamo Camps” (P47), which reverses the logic of Panopticon. Gated communities move away from the Panopticon mentality of Bentham in which modern society was created on the basis of order and control. Panopticon is a tower to observe the inmates in a prison divided into cells where every individual knows that the observer sees them without allowing his identity to be known (Foucault, 1991: 200). The isolation of inmates from each other allows observers to rule them easier rather than ruling a mass in communication and in action. An important feature of Panopticon is that power becomes disindividualised and anonymous so that it does not matter who exercises power, instead, any individual can control and observe the people in the cells. Another feature of Panopticon is the continuous control and surveillance, which provides observers the opportunity to carry out experiments, change behaviour, train or correct individuals (Foucault, 1991: 203).

There are two dimensions of discipline for Foucault (Foucault, 1991:209). The first consists of discipline-blockage applied over the individual in an institution established on the edge of society. The second is panopticism through which discipline has been established by

lighter forms of power and ended up in generalised surveillance in which the logic of Panopticon has been expanded towards larger society. Since the 18<sup>th</sup> century disciplinary society has been established through the expansion of disciplinary mechanisms, such as asylums, penitentiaries, reformatories, schools and hospitals, depicted as:

An islet, a privileged place, a circumstantial measure or a singular model became a general formula. (Foucault, 1991: 209)

Foucault argues that in ancient times, the spectacle was the base of the society in which the minority was observed by the rest, while in Panopticon a small minority observes the majority. Nowadays there are two challenges to the Panopticon of Bentham. The first challenge operates at the individual level through two ways. Firstly, the power has been generated at the individual level which transforms individuals into self-surveillants (McLaughlin and Muncie, 1999: 134). Secondly, the control also uses “biopolitics” so that it can be applied over the individual body by:

...Biometric scanning devices such as smartcards, fingerprints, eye scans, hand geometry scans, voice recognition, DNA testing and digitised facial recognition. (McLaughlin and Muncie, 1999: 130)

The second challenge is being experienced at a more general level with the reversal of Panopticon so that “the included” are excluded through a self and voluntary exclusion and surveillance process, seen with the rise of gated communities. This process is explained by Diken and Laustsen that while in the Panopticon era the camp was the exception, nowadays it has become the norm. It is no longer the city but the camp that has become the paradigm of social life (Diken and Laustsen, 2005). The logic of the camp has been generalized and the exception has become normalized in two ways. Firstly, the number of camp-like developments has increased. Secondly, the rule of the camp has become generalized and inserted into the logic of society. In this society, the camp and exception have become the rules whereas normality becomes one choice among others. Gated communities for the rich and detention

camps for the poor can be regarded as the camps for the top and the camps for the bottom (Diken and Lausten, 2005).

In the past “quarantined” referred to someone or something which was carrying disease. “Quarantined” was not only isolated from the healthy ones, but it was also controlled by the all seeing eye of the rulers. Nowadays, “quarantined” refers to someone or to something which should be isolated in order to be protected from the polluted mass. While in the past the excluded was surrounded by the gates in their ghettos now the included has voluntarily been excluded by the gates in their enclaves. Agamben argues that the sovereign, who has the legal power to suspend the validity of the law, legally places himself outside the law (Agamben, 1998: 15). As Diken and Lausten explain:

Outside the gates the city is turned inside out. The panoptic logic is overturned and through a strategic secession, deviant behaviour is restrained outside. In the disciplinary society, exception was enclosed inside the Panopticon; the “ghetto” of those defined as “other” constituted a “camp” in the form of an island of disorder midst today. Today, the situation is reversed and the city itself is excluded from the “defensible” ghettos of New Urbanism. (Diken and Lausten, 2005: 21)

However, the reversal of Panopticon in the form of gated communities is not the total opposite of Panopticon. As I explained in Chapter 2, elites and/or upper middle classes in Turkey have become “the other” which led to the debates of “voluntarily withdrawal” from the urban space. Interestingly, also the power relations have changed in Turkey which led to the conflict between “White Turks” and “Black Turks”. So, the powerful who have the right to exclude might not have the power once they had. So, the minority (security staff) who observes them have become the (majority) powerful in the society. The thing which is against the conventional Panopticism is that the -once- powerful voluntarily want to be observed for their safety.

In the literature gated communities are depicted as (mostly) suburban housing developments for the new middle classes in an ever fragmenting urban space described as the “city of walls” (Caldeira, 2000: 314), which stood in contradiction to open public space once

shared by people without conflict. The recent popular negative construction of urban space has been crystallised in the discussions of “neo-medievalism” which highlights a fragmented urban space and in the discussion of “carceral archipelago” (Soja, 2000: 298). Gated communities can be described as the deviation and exclusion of upper classes/ elites from urban space, which is in contrast to the Panopticon society where exception was locked inside the Panopticon, such as the exclusion of the Jewish population in Renaissance Venice (Sennett, 1994). Gated communities do not prevent touching alien bodies of the minority as in Renaissance Venice, instead, they provide the protection of the minority who has the fear of touching the majority. Gated communities are a new method to protect the minority (the other) from the rest (the majority).

### *7.2.2 Spontaneous Security*

In the mainstream literature, the reversal of Panopticon leads to an understanding of the security inside gated communities as “ready-made” for residents. As an example, Lang and Danielsen argue that due to the security mechanism in gated communities, residents can be less attentive to their surroundings which can attract more crime. They also argue that although residents might develop a siege mentality, they do not specify it (Lang and Danielsen, 1997: 876). Most of the studies are interested in the technological aspects of security which can be regarded as “electronic cottage” (Graham and Marvin, 2003: 222) with their security systems such as alarms connected to the central security office. In this context, also several experts focused on this aspect of security, which is ready-made for the residents. Moreover, an architect stated that:

“We do not have a gated community. However, the two classes, the rich and the poor have their own gated communities. While the former obtains security by purchasing it, the latter obtains security via its own community of solidarity or political community.”  
(P43)



## Image Removed

**Fig 7.2.2.1:** The “unnatural” security in contemporary societies is expressed by a cartoonist, Behic Ak, when a man sees a person attacking another in the street. He asks his friend “In older times we had good neighbourly relationships” and the other answers “What do you mean? Would you like to bankrupt the private security companies?” (Behic Ak, Cumhuriyet Newspaper, 10 July 2005).

This view is similar to Blakely who explains the difference between defensible space and defended space and argues that while defensible space belongs to gated communities with their security systems; defended space belongs to neighbourhoods of African Americans (Lang and Danielsen, 1997: 893-894). In this context, gated communities are regarded as “coerced community” (Lang and Danielsen, 1997: 883). Similarly, Wilson-Doenges argues that a sense of community and mutual responsibility are not achieved well in gated communities while the actual safety is not increased (Wilson-Doenges, 2000: 601). He states that:

...This total lack of community interaction is just the kind of result that the bulwarking approach warns us about, and this scenario is completely feasible in the high-income gated community. (Wilson-Doenges, 2000: 608)

The literature and the accounts of several experts show the prejudice towards gated communities and residents. However, besides providing a professional security by new technologies (alarms, CCTV cameras) and private guards, there is another form of security inside gated communities which is neglected in the literature. This is provided by the residents, which I call as “spontaneous security” by establishing relations with friends and neighbours. Residents usually mentioned that they felt comfortable with the security mechanisms provided by the community. However, they did not see any contrast between “spontaneous” security and that provided by the community. While residents explained ready-made security mechanisms through the use of de-personified terms such as “the system” as used by two residents in Istanbul Istanbul, they used personified descriptions when they explained security provided by people (either watchmen, guards or their neighbours). Residents became a part of security through traditional ways of “keeping an eye on the neighbour”, “checking and looking” if there

was a problem. This was also mentioned in Rivadulla's study on "Golden Ghettos" in Uruguay in which he argues that families share responsibility with neighbours to raise children because of intense traffic, crime and so on (Rivadulla, 2007: 53).

However, the two communities are different in this aspect. Despite the homogenous profile of residents, in Istanbul Istanbul only one person mentioned spontaneous security:

"Of course, concerns are the same because children are of the same age. For example, you leave your child and go somewhere. You can ask the next (person) to keep an eye on the child. In this sense, this gives trust. Relations are so warm. Very nice friendships... A place where there are warm relations." (P11)

However, this time it was Kasaba where residents explained a need of their neighbours. Moreover, a resident extended the child-centred security to a more general one in which neighbours were checking up on others:

"Are they not at home? Where are they? Why they did not come in the last hour? We call them "Where are you"? We check on each other. I think this is because we are not so crowded here. I mean houses in the same street. Four houses... Are we on holiday? We entrust our homes and flowers..." (P21)

Another thing which facilitates establishing relations (easier than an apartment) is the spatial layout of both communities (i.e. the difference between an apartment and few-storeys house). The importance of space was explained by another resident who said that she called her neighbours when she was worried about them:

"When I look from the window and cannot see the car of my neighbour, I ask myself "Why they are not at home?", and I become anxious. So, I definitely call them and ask if they are ill or they have a problem. I do not know, you can see with your eyes if someone visits them or their car stands in front of the door or opposite. So I become curious. However, in an apartment their cars stand in the car park. So in an apartment no one knows each other." (P18)

This is related, as residents in Kasaba explained, to the isolation they felt due to the distance to Istanbul. They also explained that they needed to find new friends especially when moved to the new community.<sup>178</sup> This might also be related to the large land of Kasaba which

---

<sup>178</sup> See Chapter 5 sub-section 5.4.1 "We Are Not as Snob as Kemer Country".

might lead them to check their neighbours. So, they did not explain any security concern in terms of their children but about their neighbours.

The importance of the size of the land is also very important for child safety as mentioned by several residents in Istanbul Istanbul. A resident explained that she did not find it difficult to leave her child in Istanbul Istanbul while she described Kemer Country as a larger community in terms of land where children would experience difficulty. This shows the importance of visibility and surveillance for parents so they do not need others to check their children. Another reason why residents in Istanbul Istanbul did not mention any strong sense of “spontaneous security” is the help provided by the staff. Istanbul Istanbul has a nursery and professional staff whom parents can ask where their children are, as in the words of a local in Gokturk:

“The land of the community is very large and its security especially is very strong. So, when a child does not return home till evening, his/her mother can call us and ask, “Is he at the swimming pool or park?” Everyone is comfortable. Some of the residents moved here, since the community is safe.” (P34)

So, gated communities cannot be described as totally alienated spaces in which the most basic community ties are now commercialised and left to the professional staff. Rather, gated communities consist of the combination of traditional and more commercialised relations which lead to safer places.

## **7.3 NEW FORMS OF INSECURITY**

### ***7.3.1 Class and Ethnic/Religious Segregation***

Gated communities do not only provide totally safe environments, but they also produce new insecurities. There are two kinds of insecurities. The first arises outside of the gates due to the class/income differences between residents and local populations which lead to the fear of

“the other” or the “locals”. However, these differences are also intermingled with religious/ethnic ones, as explained by a local in Gokturk:

“For instance, there is no one in Istanbul Istanbul who wears a headscarf. They come to see and then go. So, they do not want to live there. This does not mean that they are excluded because of wearing this. However, there is a community where they live with similar people...” (P47)<sup>179</sup>

This also shows an important community characteristic of gated communities in Istanbul. Five experts stated that people from certain religious communities chose to live in different gated communities. An architect explained that:

“There are those communities built by the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality. They are completely closed communities which do not allow anyone else inside their communities.” (P43)

Also another academic-researcher explained that while seculars preferred gated communities for “distinction”, Muslims preferred them for “lifestyle” (P45), which showed a strong separation between those who wanted to “show off” (seculars) and Muslims, who had “real communities” and would like to strengthen their community ties by living in the same place. Istanbul Istanbul has a more homogenous population than Kasaba in terms of income level, age, and occupation and belief system. This is related to two reasons. Firstly, Istanbul Istanbul is smaller than Kasaba which was sold to a more homogenous group of people who were working in the same company (Koray), as stated by sales officers, managerial staff as well as residents. Secondly, Kasaba has different kinds of housing units as diverse as villas and studios which allow Kasaba to have a more varied population in terms of income level and religious affiliation, also supported by a resident in Kasaba who explained that there were a few families who preferred a more Islamic lifestyle (P15).

However, the fragmentation across religious and ethnic lines can also create danger, as explained by a researcher:

---

<sup>179</sup>Recently, it is stated that Saudi Arabia will build four new cities where women can go out without a headscarf. These cities are described as “secular cities” of Saudi Arabia, <http://www.nethaber.com/Dunya/72191/Suudiler-> (21.08.2008) accessed on 12.06.2009.

“I want to add something about community characteristics. There is a social community, based on same income level. Those people gather in the same place. However, sometimes there is also religious community. Non-Muslim communities who were living in Istanbul moved to Kemerburgaz. This seems a very dangerous process to me. People who were living around these places told disturbing things to these residents, because these (housing developments) reflect both social and religious communities.” (P50)

These quotations complete the discussion about Gokturk where residents in gated communities might feel in danger and create more tension between them and the local population, especially when they are the “real other” of Turkey because of being a member of a non-Muslim minority group. For some, as explained by a real estate expert, to close off themselves from the outside world might attract the attention of the outsiders and can increase the risk of attack (P52). This is contrary to “target-hardening”, as explained in a research conducted in Britain that gated communities can attract crime by being the symbols of wealth (Atkinson, Flint, Blandy and Lister, 2003). Even though it did not show the conflict between different religious groups, the separation between the inside and the outside in Istanbul Istanbul was described by a local in Gokturk as:

“Walking is done inside the community. However, they do not go out for walking. Mud, dust... There are lots of constructions. There is also anxiety.” (P33)

While walls can enhance a sense of security, they can also create potential risks of becoming a target. So, in the case of minority groups in Gokturk, the targets are not hardened, but they might become more vulnerable, not because of being rich or closed from the outside, but because of being the “real other” of Turkey. As I explained in Chapter 2, not only upper middle classes feel alienation in public space due to cultural and ideological differences, but also “real minorities” of Turkey feel isolated and threatened.<sup>180</sup>

**[Sentence removed]**

---

<sup>180</sup> See Chapter 2 section 2.5 “Fragmentation of Public Space and Conflicting Istanbul” and sub-section 2.5.1 “Tensions in Istanbul: The Entrapment of Elites” how upper middle classes, seculars and minorities felt alienation in Turkey.

Pamuk explains that the reason for the modesty of the rich in Turkey is not similar to the Protestant modesty, but it is associated with the fear from the Ottoman State which regarded the wealthy as a threat to its own existence. Later the Turkish Republic levied heavy taxes on the rich, especially on Jewish, Armenian and Greek communities by the Wealth Tax in the 1940s (Pamuk, 2008: 179). Another fear of the rich, adds Pamuk, is being labelled of becoming rich through morally flawed ways. So, seclusion does not always mean “privacy of the rich”, but the fear of being labelled as someone who has become rich by illegal ways. As in the words of a resident in Istanbul Istanbul:

“There are also those who deal in suspicious activities, so they cannot establish close relations.” (P7)

Although religious differences were not explicitly mentioned, class differences were mentioned by the residents in Istanbul Istanbul as:

“Since the developments were built, there has been a material gap between the villagers and residents. So their world view is so different from ours. Sometimes you can feel the ambition in their eyes. However, they establish very close and humane relations with us. However, sometimes I can see this gap in their eyes.” (P6)

When there is a low level of education and income, then the fear of the insiders is described by another resident as:

“A life like this... I do not find it correct. It is not suitable for me. And I find it wrong. Everyone is afraid if there would be an uprising in the future...Because there is strong contrast... Suppose a man with the latest model of a BMW, goes out of these developments. He goes to grocery in the midst of this dust. How does the greengrocer consider this man?” (P8)

### ***7.3.2 The Forest: Protection and Danger***

The material and cultural contrast between residents and the locals was stronger in Istanbul Istanbul, combined with a sense of fear, due to its spatial features, while in Kasaba this contrast was rarely seen. By contrast, although average income level was higher in Kasaba, residents talked about their positive contributions to the local population in terms of new job

opportunities and an overall economic progress.<sup>181</sup> There are two reasons which make the residents in Kasaba to feel “safer”. The first is the forest which provides invisibility and isolation from the outside and the second is its distance to Omerli, the nearest town.<sup>182</sup> Kasaba’s spatial layout does not give residents a feeling of being besieged by other people. However, Istanbul Istanbul is closer to Gokturk which makes residents see the material and cultural differences. The material characteristics of space shape the perception of the self and others. The importance of distance to nearby towns/villages was also explained by a researcher as:

“Also the developments in Cekmekoy are told to have these kinds of insecurity, when for instance an expert told that there is only ten metres between housing developments and squatter-apartments which have totally different lifestyles. These people have purchasing power. This will lead to an unavoidable conflict.” (P50)

By contrast, several residents explained that Kasaba was not surrounded by villagers which gave them a feeling of safety. This was regarded as a positive characteristic of Kasaba and mentioned by a resident as:

“.. But the thing which disturbs me is that they build communities in the middle of these villages or in Cekmekoy or Samandira, and then build walls. So you pass through the village and squatter houses in your latest model car and children in squatter houses stand and look at you. The doors or walls open and then you go inside the community. This situation is very uncomfortable.” (P28)

This resident shows her discomfort with the difference between the outside and the inside. This view is also supported by a local in Omerli who explained that while in Kasaba residents did not see squatter areas because of its spatial layout, residents in other communities were seeing squatter areas and becoming disturbed by this situation. So, these people moved back to Istanbul city centre:

“When you look at other projects in Cekmekoy, there are squatter houses near them. Even if they cannot be regarded as squatter houses, there are shanties or unfinished construction areas. They are very close to the road. The other side of the wall is full of

---

<sup>181</sup> See Chapter 4 section 4.1 “A Symbiotic Relation”.

<sup>182</sup>This completes the discussion in Chapter 6 section 6.2 “Real Communities” in which I explain how the space and forest between houses provide a more individualised and private life for the residents in Kasaba.

buildings which can be regarded as “varos”. However, this is not a place like that. This is a place within a forest and is really a very beautiful place.” (P32)

This local’s rejection of “varos” completes the discussion in Chapter 2 about the unwanted crowds willing to vandalise urban space.<sup>183</sup> This visibility makes residents uncomfortable with this situation. By contrast, the forest is explained by an academic-researcher as:

“You can think of the forest as a wall. A house cannot be built in the forest. And when there is no forest, they build walls. You can call this place as a semi-closed community. So the forest both acts as an amenity and a barrier. This can also be an island. The important thing is not the gates but avoiding building houses behind. It is permitted to enter the forest, but no one can walk through the forest and enter a (gated community). However, people can also enter the forest. They take the risk.” (P45)

As this quotation shows, forest can act as a wall and barrier which can protect the residents. This account is similar to Low’s (2003) claim that sometimes a Nature reserve or a guarded bridge acts as a barrier.<sup>184</sup> So, Kasaba has a “natural wall” by being surrounded by a forest which creates a more positive security than high walls or security cameras which creates a more negative security.

However, “forest” as mentioned by this participant, can also create “risk” and be regarded as the unknown which renders gated communities open to outsiders’ threats as in the example of Kasaba. Because of the forest, Kasaba is perceived as a more secluded gated community which does not allow the gaze of outsiders. However, several residents mentioned that they did not prefer to live close to the border (forest), since this was regarded as dangerous. Forest, for Kasaba is a source of protection as well as danger.<sup>185</sup> Three residents in Kasaba mentioned a difference of security between the houses in the centre and the houses closer to the borders, which could attract robbers:<sup>186</sup>

---

<sup>183</sup> See Chapter 2 sub-section 2.5.1 “Tensions in Istanbul: The Entrapment of Elites” and section 2.6 “From a Global City into a City of Fear”.

<sup>184</sup> See Chapter 3, section 3.1 “Gated Communities Around the World”.

<sup>185</sup> See Chapter 6 how the forest has an impact on residents’ lives in Kasaba.

<sup>186</sup> Also Atkinson, Flint, Blandy and Lister argue that gated communities aim at: “informal surveillance, with properties overlooking communal spaces in courtyard designs. In general, the open space within these



“Our home is at the centre of Kasaba. There are road and houses behind the forest. We did not want to be near the border. We were careful about this.” (P17)

“There are thefts in the houses open to the outside, which are close to the border, near the forest. I live closer to the middle, at the centre. So there were thefts at the borders.” (P21)

“I did not experience (a theft). However, there was a theft last week. There are houses close to public lands. So they have borders close to the outside. There were thieves coming from the border. There were thefts in two houses. There is security at homes. However, people feel so confident that they do not switch on their alarm systems. I am one of these people. For example, there is more risk in these border houses. I live just at the centre. Those who entered the community stole something. Constabulary arrived. However, our relations with the constabulary is so good that now they wait for us at the borders. However, if we lived close to the border, I would be afraid. However, I am not afraid.” (P25)

### **Image Removed**

**Fig 7.3.2.1:** Kasaba and the forest. The trees between houses and the forest which surrounds Kasaba provide residents a more individualised but less safe place, photo taken from the web page <http://www.koray.com.tr/>, accessed on 04.06.2009.

### **7.3.3 Different Forms of Visibility: A Gendered Dimension**

These quotations show that visibility is very important which provides a safe environment to the residents. However, visibility has different meanings. The first meaning is associated with the fear of outside of the rich, which was more prominent in Istanbul Istanbul closer to the nearest town, Gokturk. By contrast, residents in Kasaba were more comfortable about the local population, as I explained in Chapter 6 that the residents in Kasaba had a more “secluded” life inside their communities due to the spatial layout of Kasaba. The seclusion of Kasaba from the outside refers to the desire of the rich who would like to be hidden from the rest which also leads to debates about the wealth inside gated communities. However, this invisibility which makes residents more “visible” does not only lead to the attacks from the

---

developments is landscaped to prevent concealment, for example, through avoiding densely wooded areas.” (2003: 25).

outside, but it also becomes the symbol of conspicuous consumption and display of wealth. In this sense, gated communities have become one of the trademarks of wealth besides expensive cars, brand names of fashion and luxurious night clubs and restaurants “to be seen”. However, showing off does not represent the real wealth, i.e. “aristocracy” or “old bourgeoisie”, which has a sense of intimacy and privacy. Gated communities reveal a dilemma: On the one hand, they are gated and secluded, which protect “privacy”. On the other hand, by closing themselves off from the rest, they separate themselves from “the real wealth”, by becoming “visible” by living in a gated community.

The female body also becomes the object of debate as written by a columnist of the Milliyet Newspaper, Uckan (2005) who reveals the relation between wealth and visibility.<sup>187</sup> According to the writer, a celebrity in Turkey should have been divorced because of her photos published in almost all of the Turkish newspapers. She explains that her husband’s family is an elite family who cannot accept that kind of display of the body to the public as an example of self-advertising. In the vocabulary of aristocracy, she adds, there is no “openness”, but privacy. According to Uckan, there are rules of being a bride of the “old money”: being silent and secretive. This example combines two forms of “visibility”: the visibility of a female body in public space and invisibility of the “real rich”.

So, visibility also brings a gendered dimension into focus, which was explained by female residents in both communities in terms of their discomfort when they visited Omerli. Two female residents in Kasaba explained the difficulty and discomfort in public space in Omerli as:

“They are not bad intentioned people. As an example, I was thinking as a woman whether they would like if when I went outside without a headscarf. I take my son to the barber. Bakery and market... I go to the market; also the tradesmen are like that. So they do not look at me with hostility. There is also a woman who comes to clean our

---

<sup>187</sup> Uckan, “Su Uyum Para Uyumaz”, <http://www.milliyet.com.tr/2005/09/18/cumartesi/yazuckan.html> [19.09.2005], accessed on 19.07.2009.

home. So, I did not feel anything uncomfortable or they did not blame us until now. I did not feel anything like that.” (P16)

“Of course when I go to the village, I do not wear shorts like I wear inside this community. I wear longer shorts.” (P28)

In Istanbul Istanbul there was only one woman who stated that she wore longer shorts when she went outside of her home, even if this shows the importance of visibility inside the community:

“After we finish our dinner and my husband says “Let’s go!!” I wear longer shorts when I go out. This is my home clothes.” (P14)

In this context, Islam and seclusion of private life (family and more specifically women) have an important influence even on the secular and Westernised people of Turkey, not because of being influenced by Islam, but because of the fear of being labelled as a dishonourable woman by Muslims (especially by men). There are also Islamic groups who live in their gated communities. Despite this, they are never visible and do not attract the gaze of the outsiders. The only thing which makes Islamists visible in the public space, is the headscarf which ironically tries to make Muslim woman “invisible” in order to protect them from the male gaze. But because Islamic groups are not included into the consumer world yet (except White Muslims, as I explained in Chapters 2 and 5), their gated communities never receive attention. It can be argued that there is a priori privacy which protects them from the outside, as seen also in several experts’ perception of Muslims as “real communities”.

The honour of a woman is related to the extent of being kept behind the gates of their homes and their headscarves. In this sense, the female body should be covered for both groups. For the rich, it shows “modesty” and a non-excessive and non-flirty way of living as shown by Uckan, while for the Muslims it directly shows the modesty of an honourable woman who protects herself from the male gaze. So, it should be questioned in detail what kinds of fears and threats are felt in these communities. In this context, although being known as spaces of closure gated communities provide a freedom for their residents inside communities which can

be called as “the freedom restricted to locality”. Residents (female) explained that they could walk inside the community whenever they wanted. As in the words of two residents in Kasaba:

I can walk alone at 11 or 12 o'clock at night. In darkness...” (P19)

“There is no problem about security. This is a remote place, but when my husband goes abroad I can stay here at nights....I do not hesitate to stay here, although there is no window shutter or something like that.” (P21)

However, this freedom of walking is limited to the place they live. They do not go out of their communities. These quotations also show a greater dilemma of gated communities. On the one hand, gated communities provide a strictly regulated life, which render them “social” in an artificial sense, which is also mentioned in the literature. On the other hand, gated communities provide more flexibility for the residents and more particularly for female residents, so they can find freedom inside gated communities, similar to the gated communities in Saudi Arabia which provide freedom for women in a conservative country where foreign families are exempt from the rules of the country (Glasze and Alkhayyal, 2002: 326).

So, residents in both communities described similar concerns about the situation of women in public space, even it was mentioned in Kasaba with a stronger emphasis. So, the perception of safety or threat depends on gender. The majority of the residents were female. While they stated their discomfort (without headscarf or with shorts) when they went out in nearby towns/villages which were known as more conservative and/or traditional places, by contrast, they mentioned that they could easily go out late at night inside their community.

#### ***7.3.4 Less Traffic, Longer Road***

Another insecurity arising outside, as explained by both residents and experts, depended on the distance to Istanbul, the condition of the roads (without light, excavation and trucks), and the indirect concerns for health due the distance to Istanbul. The road was also an important issue for the youngsters. Related to that, the traffic culture of Turkey was a major concern for residents. One concern is the distance to Istanbul to be travelled on a road in bad

condition. This is interesting because residents mentioned also they escaped from the traffic in Istanbul. One resident in Istanbul explained that:

“It is a very dangerous road. Especially during winters it is open to danger because it becomes slippery. Moreover, there has also been additional truck traffic. There is no lighting. I remember that when I was travelling during winter, I was praying and driving slowly. Also winter conditions are more severe here than Istanbul because the temperature is two or three degrees lower. So, there is snow and ice on the road. Because of that, we try to drive more carefully.” (P12)

A resident in Kasaba also explained her concerns about the dangers of the road. She explained that when her son drove she got “heart palpitation”:

“My son drives. I am afraid of this road of thirty kilometres because it is risky. I do not complain, but because of that, I become excited. This disturbs me. Even he is careful and he tries not to arrive at home very lately, this causes heart palpitation. So, the traffic culture in our country is bad. This area is worse, because during weekends, people come for picnics. They take alcohol and there is always a fatal accident on their return. We do not go outside during weekends, but we know that there is always a fatal accident. The road is so bad. I do not know if it is complaining, but sometimes I think if I made a wrong decision by moving here.” (P25)

This shows how she does not complain about his son’s driving, but about the “traffic culture” of those who come for picnics. The traffic culture in Turkey is associated with the illiteracy of people who drive without paying attention and/or drunk driving. Because of these reasons, Turkey is one of the most dangerous countries in the world in terms of death associated with car accidents. As example, in a newspaper it is stated that in the last thirty years there were 300,000 deaths because of traffic accidents. One important reason of traffic accidents is “drunk driving”.<sup>188</sup> It is ironic that while Turkey is the third from the bottom among Caucasian and the Middle East countries in terms of alcohol consumption, it is the first in terms of death in traffic accidents because of “drunk driving”.<sup>189</sup> Because of that, traffic accidents or problems associated with the “traffic culture” are known as the “traffic terror” in

---

<sup>188</sup> Ahmet Zeki Gayberi, <http://www.porttakal.com/haber-bizimki-de-can-mi-55389.html> original text Milli Gazete (28.07.2008) accessed on 12.06. 2009.

<sup>189</sup> <http://www.porttakal.com/haber-alkolle-iliskili-trafik-kazalarinda-turkiye-on-siralarda-123813.html> original text Star (21.09.2008) accessed on 05.05.2009.

Turkey which is one of the most popular news in the media. Another resident in Kasaba explained that during weekends people are invading these lands:

“We try to finish everything during week days, because during weekends, especially during summers, it becomes very difficult to travel to Istanbul. You know, people who want to go for holiday to Sile invade these places in order to swim. Driving in this traffic becomes a burden. This is also a long road. It is approximately thirty seven kilometres between the company and our home.” (P21)

This quotation is similar to the depiction of “barbarians” who have invaded Istanbul with their inferior culture who do not know how to behave in public space. Both residents described those who came for picnic or vacation during weekends as outsiders who could bring danger. More generally, these quotations show a dilemma of gated communities. On the one hand, gated communities allow distance from urban traffic congestion. On the other hand, they produce new dangers due to the increasing distance to the city and the condition of the roads which was described as “without light”, “excavation”, “trucks” and full of those who come “during weekends for picnics and take alcohol”.

A resident in Istanbul Istanbul showed another side of the importance of the car and its relation to child safety:

“There is Sari Konaklar in Etiler, opposite Akmerkez, where our friends were living. We saw that place. Cars were not in streets, but they were entering directly underground into the car park. That was a good system, we were thinking. So cars would not roam in streets, instead they directly entered the car park. This was a very important priority for me.” (P8)

As this quotation shows, parents aim at creating a “carless” life for their children inside the communities. However, when children grow up another dilemma emerges between the inside and the outside. While inside the community, safety is achievable due to the educated and well-mannered people and rules and regulations, the outside still represents something uncontrollable, described with the terms of “alcohol” and “traffic culture”. In this aspect, residents also showed a preoccupation about their children when they grew up and wanted to go to Istanbul to socialise. While gated communities provide a safe life for children, problems

start when they get older. Several residents in both communities mentioned this, as I explained previously in this chapter.

Another interesting dimension of the traffic and roads was explained by this resident in Istanbul Istanbul:

“Even if I arrive at home late at night, even if I drive longer hours. I have been harassed. My car has broken down. You are alone on the roads. I experience everything. There are lots of breakdowns that I experience. However, I am happy to live here.” (P8)

This resident was used to the problems such as accidents or harassments during travel from Istanbul to her community. This shows a gendered dimension of the “traffic culture” in Turkey and she accepts and resists these problems, which leads to the chance of living in a gated community, which is worth everything.

Another form of insecurity is related to health concerns, which is again caused by the long distance to Istanbul and lack of health institutions and centres in nearby towns. This shows the relation between age and gated community. Two experts stated that these kinds of housing developments were not preferred by older people who would have difficulties to travel to Istanbul when they had health problems. An expert in the construction sector explained:

“Living outside of city as an example, in Kasaba... People over a certain age do not prefer to live there. This might be related to its distance to big hospitals and health centres. They might think how they can travel to city if there is a problem. Moreover, places like Kasaba are further than Istanbul Istanbul. Even if there are shuttle services; it is distant for older people who would like to go to the city whenever they want. So, a younger generation has preferred these places.” (P53)

More specifically, a local in Gokturk added that the main road in Gokturk caused problems especially during weekends when people were coming for picnics:

“...This situation creates weakness for us when for example ambulances cannot reach or when you have something to do in Istanbul.”<sup>190</sup> (P41)

One resident in Istanbul Istanbul mentioned that they had experienced problems related to health services:

---

<sup>190</sup> The same participant explained the condition of the main road which caused gated communities to sue the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality. See Chapter 4 section 4.2 “Cooperative Competitors”.

“Because, the connection to the TEM expressway closes in heavy snow...From Hasdal Military Barracks to here... God forbid, I have two children. I think of cases of emergency. When it snows, I become afraid of this and we go to the home of their grandmother. We go to the city centre, because I think what I would do when one of them would cut his hand or fall down from the stairs and need stitching.” (P5)

This problem is solved by the construction of new health institutions. For instance, a local in Gokturk told that a hospital in Gokturk will be built, so people would feel more comfortable (P34). In Kasaba one resident explained that they had experienced problems related to the lack of doctors (P26). However, two of them added that there was an ambulance ready for any case of emergency and health service. So, related to the road and insufficient health institutions, there was not a strong difference between Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba. However, Istanbul Istanbul is a lot closer to main networks in the city which can reduce the risks associated with the traffic.

### 7.3.5 “*Enemy Inside*”<sup>191</sup>

An architect explained an ironic dilemma of gated communities as:

“How do they create a trust towards each other, this is ironic.” (P35)

The second form of insecurity, as shown in this quotation, arises inside the communities. The trust towards each other can be provided by homogenous population, as in Istanbul Istanbul with people “of similar preoccupations” as stated by a resident (P11). However, there are other “dangerous” people inside gated communities. As example, two residents in Kasaba complained about the continuous change in the security staff hired by a subcontractor firm. One of them compared this situation with her previous residence as:

“These are the employees hired by the subcontractor company. I am not happy with this situation. In my previous residence, there was twenty five or thirty staff hired by the community itself. This was better, so the staff knew you. They knew my son since he was nine years old. So, they were more like us. The subcontractor company changes its personnel continuously in order to make more profit. This is not good in terms of security.” (P25)

---

<sup>191</sup> Bauman, 1998: 48.



This completes the discussion I made about the notion of “other”. The distrust of this resident towards ever-changing technicians does not show the fear of the “other” (poor) but the fear of the “stranger”. In this aspect, danger does not depend on the difference between insiders and outsiders, but on unfamiliar people. However, when residents know the workers (technicians) or the locals for a longer period, this creates a trust based on temporal dimension. For instance, a resident in Istanbul Istanbul stated that she did not want to send her child with a chauffeur whom they did not know:

“He attends Hisar Education (school). I do not send him even to the best school in the city. I do not give the custody of my son to a person whom I do not know, to have a good education. I do not send him a brand-name school. He cannot locate his house.” (P4)

Similarly, another one added that even if her child stayed alone at home, this did not create a security concern because parents knew the technicians of the community:

“This place has its own technical services. They help you in every aspect. However, if you live in the city the technicians can come to your house very late. They are strangers as well. So, this place has this advantage. Your child can stay at home when technicians come here. So, you will leave your child without hesitation. So, you can trust your home. So, there are great conveniences here.” (P6)

For developer companies, the stability of technicians allows gated communities to be “professional” as explained by an expert in the construction sector that gated communities were the examples of “professional management” similar to those in Europe (P53). For residents this means stability, trust and solving problems smoothly. In this sense, not only safety is important, but also whom the residents talk to. One resident in Istanbul Istanbul summarises three aspects of gated communities which give a sense of trust and safety: the comfort of a woman who can live without the fear of being observed, that of a civilised person who lives in a “serious” place (a non-flirtatious place) and that of a person who does not want any risk in a totally safe place which does not have any gaps open to attack coming from the outside:

“The members of the staff who work here consist of people of merit. As example, when I lie in the sun, and one of them passes in front of me, no one looks at me. ...Polite and

honest. There isn't any officious and unconventional behaviour, from plumber to the electrician, from gardener to the security staff.... If they behave in such a manner, they would definitely be fired. There was a security staff who flirted with a Moldovan girl (domestic worker). They fired them instantly. Or once a car cover of a homeowner was stolen... Because of this, three or four of the staff were fired because this was done in their shift. ...Simultaneously. So, because of that reason, the staff takes their duties very seriously.” (P5)

As I explained in Chapter 5, this resident was the same person who mentioned the importance of “privacy” in keeping social distance among the equals (other residents). So, while social distance is important to keep the privacy among equals, physical distance is important to protect their physical privacy from “the other” (male and poor). This resident also shows how a female body is protected from the gaze of “the other” inside gated communities. This is another dilemma of gated communities. On the one hand, they allow “visibility” of residents via CCTV cameras (as I explained previously via Panopticon in reverse). On the other hand, residents become disturbed by the eyes of the gazers (when they see their gazers).

However, instead of ever-changing staff, “stranger” has a different meaning for Istanbul Istanbul. As I explained how residents in Istanbul Istanbul perceived a bigger threat from the outside, which was absent in Kasaba, they perceived the same threat inside their community. Two residents explained that in the past there was a street market open also to the residents from other gated communities. However, this was abolished due to security concerns and as in the words of a resident:

“Because there is a very serious security deficiency, because a great number of people enter the gated community. We do not know who they are.” (P13)

As Bauman (1998: 48) describes, this threat of “enemy inside”<sup>192</sup> in Istanbul Istanbul was also seen in other instances. Another problem arose during the filming of an advertisement. The same resident explained that:

“As example, an advertisement was being filmed here recently by a homeowner, who was a movie producer. However, it was not allowed even to this after a certain stage. It

---

<sup>192</sup> See Chapter 3 section 3.2 “Socio-Economic Changes and the Search for Security”.

was allowed out of necessity to finish it, but it won't be allowed anymore in the future, because there are security concerns here. You control who enters the community, but there are lots of people whom we do not know. They might be good people, but if there was a theft inside the community, the management would be blamed for that." (P13)

Another fear inside Istanbul Istanbul emerges because of the domestic workers who see the life inside the community and tell this to the local people, as explained by a resident:

"They have domestic workers and nannies most of whom come from the village. They see what kind of a life is inside these communities.... Or they do not know the life inside communities. However, someone tells them because the women from the village come to clean your home. Some of them have goodwill. However, some of them are thieves. There are lots of people who stole." (P8)

So, in Istanbul Istanbul the fear is not only associated with the fear from the outside. Rather, also other residents (clients who were coming for street market or people who were filming) as well as the locals (who were working inside their homes) were seen as threats. These results show that residents in both cases do not want strangers inside their communities. However, in Kasaba no one mentioned a similar depiction of the "enemy inside" which might be related to the more strict rules of conduct.

## CONCLUSION

In this Chapter, I explained how security is understood and achieved in the two communities. Firstly, I explained how urban space is perceived by the residents, which completes the discussion that I made in Chapters 2 and 3. The degradation of Istanbul in terms of traffic, population (decrease in its quality but increase in its quantity), and increase in crime are shared by the residents in both cases. Contrary to the media and literature, residents explained their first-hand experiences of thefts and the situation of Istanbul associated with the larger political context of terror.

Another important theme was the fear of an earthquake which has become a "real" threat since 17 August 1999 when a strong earthquake hit the Marmora region. For residents this earthquake was a "lived" experience. As I explained in Chapters 2 and 3, this has resulted

into dramatic consequences in everyday life such as moving to “safer” places, which also explains why the number of gated communities has increased since then. Residents in both cases stated to have experienced earthquake in 1999 and wanted to move to a place where especially their children would live safely. A safe house for them means to be distant from city centre (lower density and distant to the North Anatolian Fault Zone), live in a few-storeys house of good quality built by a prominent developer company.

Another important reason for residents is their children who are dependent on especially their mothers. Gated communities provide a safe environment so that children can play without creating worry for parents. Not only gated communities but also nearby private schools are parts of larger chains of security. However, a dilemma of gated communities emerges when children grow up and want to go to Istanbul to socialise. On the one hand, gated communities legitimise parents’ wish to create a safe world for their children. On the other hand, children do not want to spend time in restricted places, so the security provided inside gated communities is broken when they travel to Istanbul which doubles the danger: that of Istanbul and the road conditions (and the distance to Istanbul). Another preoccupation about children is providing them an over-protected life which would result in unconfident and immature children. Another dilemma emerges when residents do not live there permanently, which make them vulnerable in the city. Moreover, those who did not use their homes permanently did not state any concern of safety. In this aspect, gender difference is eliminated so that even women with children who did not use their homes permanently did not mention any security concern. However, male residents when they had “dependents” like wives and children did mention that safety was important for them, which might lead to the reproduction of ever-existing gender inequalities.

The safety inside gated communities is ensured in two ways. The first is via security systems such as alarms, walls, gates and detectors (gas and fire) as well as the humanised form of it, as security staff. This is similar to the Panopticon of Foucault but in reverse aspects.

While in Panopticon the minority observed the majority to establish order, in gated communities the (once) powerful minority want to be observed by the (once) less powerful majority in order to be protected. However, against the literature which explains conventional forms of security, gated communities also produce “spontaneous security” which is provided by the residents, especially by those in Kasaba who explained that due to the distance to Istanbul and the isolation they felt, they needed each other which led them to control and check their neighbours’ houses.

However, gated communities do not provide a totally safe environment isolated from the world. There are new insecurities emerging outside and inside of gated communities. The first arises with the fear of the outside, which is based on class differences. However, in this aspect two communities are different from each other. Residents in Istanbul Istanbul stated a great difference between them and the locals with a negative interpretation which would lead to conflict. By contrast, Kasaba is quite different from Istanbul Istanbul due to its physical isolation by the forest and distance to Omerli, the nearest village which makes residents feel safe by not being seen by the locals or strangers. However, the forest creates a dilemma for the residents in Kasaba. While it protects them from the gaze of the outsiders, it also allows access into Kasaba, which creates a difference between houses in the middle, regarded as safer and these closer to the border and forest, regarded as open to danger.

However, the fear of the outside is not always based on class differences. As history shows in Turkey, minority groups are also preoccupied because of having experienced wealth confiscation by the Wealth Tax in the 1940s. Since gated communities show a fragmentation along ethnic and religious differences, this might create social tensions between different groups. Female residents in both communities also feel a bigger threat in terms of going outside which brings up the notion of honourable woman in public space in Turkey associated with the situation of women in Islam. Several women in both cases stated they felt uncomfortable to go

out “without a headscarf” or wear “shorts” which might attract the attention of the locals and create prejudice towards them.

The fear of the outside brings about also debates about visibility and gaze. Residents stated the discomfort of being seen from the outside. However, there are different meanings of visibility. Firstly, visibility is associated with class, which is crystallised in modesty in dress style and the importance of “privacy” in family life. However, while gated communities “hide” residents, they also allow them to be distinguishable for attacks from the outside. So, the success of closing themselves off in gated communities is debatable which also brings about the debates on different kinds of wealth. Secondly, visibility is associated with the visibility of a female body in public space by which women try to protect their honour. Women in the two cases stated that they were comfortable inside their communities. The condition of the main roads or distance to Istanbul reveals another dimension of insecurity. On the one hand, road is associated with the “traffic culture” in Turkey which residents in both cases would like to eliminate. On the other hand, it shows the distance to Istanbul which prevent residents from travelling to Istanbul in case of emergency and especially for their young children who would like to go to Istanbul. This also shows the lack of health institutions nearby these communities which make them dangerous for small children and older people.

The second form of insecurity arises inside gated communities. In this sense, the continuity of the staff who works inside gated communities is an important measure of security for residents. While continuous change of staff inside Kasaba gave residents distrust towards them, in Istanbul Istanbul the continuity of staff strengthened the “professional” nature of the community. However, Istanbul Istanbul had “distrust” this time towards the “stranger” inside their communities either as a local who was working in their homes or as people who were coming from other gated communities. To summarise, for residents of both cases the reasons which led them to move to gated communities were the same. However, Istanbul Istanbul and

Kasaba produce different securities and insecurities due to the spatial differences and distance to Istanbul, combined with other factors such as gender, age, ethnicity, religion and class differences.

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### CONCLUSION

In this research my main aim is to examine gated communities as parts of the urban space, rather than treating them as isolated and isolating places. As I showed in Chapter 1, although there has been a growing interest in gated communities in Turkey, this is far from locating them in urban context. Instead, gated communities are regarded as upper class “guilt”, due to the prejudice towards them. This is the first comparative research in Turkey which explores the relations of two gated communities with different actors. My initial aim was to compare cultural differences of newly emerging social groups in Turkey, as I explained in Chapters 2 and 3 and investigate whether they preferred different gated communities and the reasons for such differences. These differences show the importance of a community (either based on religion, ethnicity or professional ties) coming together in the same place.

However, the comparison between Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba is not only interesting because of being the representations of different communities, but also because of having different spatial features, demographic characteristics (in terms of income level, age, gender, marital status and having children and working life) and the history of construction which have produced different perceptions of identity, boundaries, social relations as well as securities and insecurities. In terms of spatial features, Istanbul Istanbul is close to nearby gated communities and the nearest town, Gokturk. It is also close to the main networks in Istanbul (work, school and social ties). Istanbul Istanbul maintains the characteristics of Neo-urbanist ideas, aiming at bringing people together. There is no a detached house (villa) in Istanbul Istanbul and individuality is not the main aim of the community. Instead, from its master plan to its advertising strategies and amenities, Istanbul Istanbul promotes proximity and friendliness. On the contrary, Kasaba can be regarded as an island surrounded by a forest, which makes it



difficult to be visible from the outside. Kasaba is also far from other gated communities and the nearest town, Omerli as well as from the main networks in Istanbul. Contrary to Istanbul Istanbul, Kasaba mostly consist of detached houses which allow residents a more individualised life. So, from its master plan to its advertising strategies, from its amenities to its name, Kasaba promotes individuality and privacy.

In terms of demographic characteristics of residents, Istanbul Istanbul has a homogenous population. It mostly consists of a relatively young population who work in service sector at the beginning of their careers. Their children are also dependent on their parents. On the contrary, Kasaba has a more varied population in terms of income level and demographic characteristics of residents. Kasaba has a higher income level than Istanbul Istanbul and consists of a much older population. The residents are either retired, part-time working or have a much flexible working life than the residents in Istanbul Istanbul. Also the children in Kasaba are less dependent on their parents, either they pursue university education or they already left home. In terms of the history of construction, Istanbul Istanbul is the second gated community in Gokturk built after Kemer Country. On the contrary, Kasaba is the first, biggest and the most expensive one which makes it the “pioneer” gated community in Omerli.

By looking at gated communities in comparative perspective, I propose a new understanding of gated communities methodologically which locate them in the urban context. So, the comparison of the two cases enables me to engage with more general social and spatial problems. While gated communities are regarded as the negative consequences of an ever-heterogenising urban space, I examined how gated communities led to new heterogeneities in urban space by which they have also been influenced. The two cases show that gated communities are not homogenous entities which further urban spatial and social segregation, but they engage in different relations with their outside. So, not only a simple comparison between two gated communities, but also the relations between different actors are an

important part of this research. This research has also provided a comprehensive understanding of gated community phenomenon, by integrating demand and supply-led approaches. I did not only explore the demand-led factors such as why residents prefer to live in gated communities and how they come together, but also the supply-led factors such as why developer companies build gated communities and how they operate in suburban lands by interacting with different local actors. Following this approach, in Chapter 2 I showed that there are multiple factors which have led to the emergence and proliferation of gated communities. In Chapter 3 I explained the literature in more detail with global patterns which lead to the emergence of gated communities. However, I also explained local dissimilarities of gated communities in Turkey because of being the symbols of cultural differentiation within the upper class (Danis, 2001; Kurtulus, 2005a). In the end of the chapter, I provided four major subjects to investigate: the relations inside and outside of gated communities, class and cultural divisions in Turkey, how “space” is created and materialised and lastly, how security and insecurity is perceived and created socially and spatially.

### **8.1 MAJOR CONTRIBUTION**

This research does not only examine the interactions of gated communities with the outside, but it also “enters” other zones, such as class and cultural divisions, space, urban politics and security. By rejecting hierarchical power relations, the first contribution is in the arena of relations between gated communities and local populations, which have changed urban politics and space and opened up new forms of cooperation and competition. On the basis of results that I showed in Chapter 4, Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba establish different relations with the outside which can be summarised as: firstly, suburban space is shaped by the initiatives of different actors, such as developer companies, local municipalities, local populations and residents. Secondly, these actors change “sides” according to their benefits

such as when gated communities in Gokturk sued the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality to solve problems with the increased traffic which caused danger on the road, while they came together as a pressure group against local municipality to solve the problem with the main road.

Thirdly, gated communities are not “independent” from other local actors, but rather they are interdependent in political and economic terms, such as when gated communities experience the dilemma of preserving the privacy of the community while trying to attract “clients” from nearby ones, seen both in Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba. Gated communities are also dependent on local municipalities to solve regional problems. Moreover, residents in both cases also opened new small scale businesses in local towns, while residents in Istanbul Istanbul also purchased real estates in different gated communities in Gokturk built by Koray Construction. As the residents in Kasaba defended their local municipality against the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality, there are other interesting competitions between different actors as the result of more general socio-political changes in Turkey since the 1980s which can be summarised as the conflict between seculars and Islamists.

Relations with the local populations are a deficient subject in the world literature. As I explained in Chapter 4, gated communities cannot only be judged on the basis of their contribution to urban fragmentation, because there are differences between gated communities in terms of their relations with the outside due to their spatial differences, different histories of construction, and demographic characteristics of residents. As an example, because of being nearby Gokturk, resident is Istanbul Istanbul felt discomfort due to their differences from the locals. This has also affected their likelihood to go out to interact with them. However, Kasaba is an isolated gated community, surrounded by a forest and it is also far from Omerli. So, despite having a higher income level, residents in Kasaba did not feel any threat from the locals. Also the demographic characteristics of Kasaba have played an important role in terms of relations with the locals. As an example, an interesting gender impact came when female

residents in Kasaba, since they had more time, “invested” in local relations by helping the poor, organising aid campaigns, giving courses and moreover, encouraging female local children to pursue education by being a role model for them. So, the relations between local populations and residents, which have always been regarded as “unequal”, instead present “in-between” situations, such as “modernity” brought by female residents to the local female children in Omerli. Also because of being the biggest and the first gated community in Omerli, its residents are pushed to pay “volunteer tax” towards the locals, by the efforts of people who were working in NGOs.

However and interestingly, not only residents change local populations but also the rural life and the locals change the residents. Residents in both cases, this time without any difference, stated that they were using local products while they were making homemade foods such as bread and yogurt. Instead of experts who criticised residents for “using” local men as “buffer zones” to limit the relations with the locals, residents in both cases stated to know local men who were bringing fresh fruits and vegetables and “rare” flowers “undiscovered” by other residents. Knowing the locals was also a source of pride and gave them a sense of belonging, strengthened by shopping in street market, using local facilities such as “natural village cemetery” and establishing face to face relations by giving courses to them and hiring them inside their homes as domestic workers. Instead, residents criticised urban life not only in environmental or cultural aspects, as stated in most of the literature, but also in social aspects, shaped by relations described as “greedy”, “cheating”, and “formal” while they could find opportunities to get rid of “urban duties” to become more casual not only physically but also mentally.

The second contribution of the thesis is in the arena of class and cultural divisions in Turkey. I am interested in the interrelation between class and cultural divisions which set the socio-political agenda of Turkey since the 1980s. In Chapter 5 I expanded these questions and

examined how residents in Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba established boundaries with different groups: with the local populations, the residents in the same community and other gated communities in the same area. Firstly, residents in both communities established boundaries with the local populations, on the basis of economic and cultural differences. Economic difference is based on income level, while cultural differences are seen in daily behaviours, and their criticisms of the illiteracy and conservatism of local people reflected by their rejection of eating meat sold in local butchers, contrary to their willingness of eating fresh fruits and vegetables and planting rare flowers brought by local men.

Secondly, residents in both communities establish boundaries inside the same community in terms of economic differences such as income level and cultural factors such as the attitude towards and respect for the staff. Similar to Danis (2001) who examines cultural differentiation inside Bahcesehir and Kurtulus (2005a) who examines how differences in sources of income lead to divisions inside Bahcesehir, another aspect of this differentiation is how long and how it takes to achieve the wealth. Thirdly, residents also differentiated themselves from other gated communities on the basis of economic difference, the source of wealth and the characteristics of social relations. However, this time it was residents in Istanbul Istanbul who stated to have better social relations with each other than the residents in Kemer Country which was described as the “highest”, “extreme” or the “richest” gated community in Gokturk.

These results show the importance of morality as a way of exclusion such as when the residents in both communities but especially in Istanbul Istanbul differentiated themselves from illicit ways of earning money such as “black money” and earning money without labour such as “inheritance” and “chance”. Following this, I became interested in Lamont’s “symbolic boundaries” which consist of economic, cultural and moral boundaries, as a more comprehensive way of looking at boundary formation than Bourdieu did. However, as I

showed in Chapter 5, while Lamont argues that morality is an end itself and can act independent from socio-economic processes, the way that the residents in Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba defined themselves showed the opposite of that. The moral criteria used by these residents are similar to the moral boundaries of Lamont, but they are not independent; rather they are embedded in the capitalist system. Moreover, residents in Istanbul Istanbul used moral boundaries to differentiate themselves only from residents in Kemer Country, those who have higher income level. The residents in Istanbul Istanbul legitimised their wealth as something deserved and achieved by their own labour by contrast to that of inherited or undeserved (illegal) wealth. In this context, they created a moral boundary (in Lamont's sense) or symbolic capital (in Bourdieu's sense), by earning money through legitimate ways. These results show that morality depends on other factors such as class position and socio-economic system. The moral boundaries used by the residents in Istanbul Istanbul show the boundaries of "moral capitalism" which can be summarised as "playing the game according to the rules" and show the legitimate framework of capitalism around earning money by labour instead of illicit ways or inheritance. While there is no link between "moral boundaries" (Lamont, 1992) and "symbolic capital" (Bourdieu, 1984), I propose the concept of "symbolically accepted moral boundaries" to show the missing link between Bourdieu and Lamont. In this respect, moral boundaries used by these residents have a symbolic dimension which indicates the symbolic capital of moral capitalism leading to exclusion and inclusion (hierarchy).

However, there is another kind of morality used by residents in both communities when they differentiated themselves from the locals. As I mentioned previously, when the residents criticised the locals by being conservative, illiterate or narrow-minded, they were (implicitly) criticising a religious world view. These results show the competition between groups in terms of religion. In the last years, there have been emerged new Islamist middle classes who rely on a more conservative lifestyle who create their own boundaries of inclusion and exclusion. The

rise of Islam in Turkey as a lifestyle is an example for a different symbolic and moral capital which is relevant for Muslims. It also brings out the relation between religion and morality. While Islamists are criticised by seculars who integrate religious ideology into their everyday life, for Islamists this is the right way of living. So, while there is a relation between morality and religion, this is not always a “legitimate” way of life in the capitalist world. On the basis of these results, I argue that there is a relation between a secular lifestyle (and mind-set) and class-related hierarchies (or inequalities) which is heavily underestimated in the literature (at least in Turkey). A secular person uses class inequality or hierarchy (even hidden by moral criteria) to establish boundaries. This underestimation in Turkey is seen in the criticisms from far left and liberals who consider secular middle-classes as those who give importance only to the elimination of secularism in Turkey which would affect their “secular” lifestyle in public space and is crystallised in the debate on the headscarf.

So, combined with the hatred towards “middle classes”, these criticisms towards “seculars” (Westernised, middle class and the “urban” face of Turkey) are made because they only give importance to the freedom limited only to their physical attributes (going out without a headscarf and consuming alcohol). However, it has always been underestimated that a material and modern mind-set bases its existence on the inequality created in this world, instead of waiting for an “other world” for justice. A “religious” person, even exploited in the capitalist economy might not refer to class inequality or hierarchies, but to other hierarchies “written” by God. However, how a religious person describes the self and creates boundaries (either by using “this worldly” or “other worldly” criteria) is the subject of another research, which become even more interesting with the emergence of “White Muslims” in Turkey in the last years.

The conflict between this-worldly and religious morality shows a more fragmented society in terms of morality. By contrast, Lamont takes these different forms of morality as the

same. In this context, Hall's (1992) alternative argument of cultural capital should be re-evaluated also considering religion as a form of differentiation. So, by carrying forward Hall's alternative "socially situated distinction" (1992) and adding also religion as a form of differentiation by the rise of Islam in Turkey which has brought new discussions about the relation between morality, religion and capitalism, I propose the concept of "socially situated symbolic capitals" to explain the divided structure of society in terms of morality. And although the same person differentiates the self on the basis of cultural criteria inside the same community, he/she defends the community against the outside by using moral criteria, which shows "multiple socially situated distinctions", when used by the residents in Istanbul Istanbul who erased the differentiation inside their community to differentiate from Kemer Country. At a more general level, the multiplicity of morality shows also that not only moral boundaries but also symbolic boundaries should be symbolically accepted capital in Bourdieu's sense to function in a particular society or group.

The third contribution is about the space which is changed by and changes people's lives. So, I do not consider space as a segregating arena, instead I examine how space is integrated in everyday life through social relations and networks in and out of gated communities. Space has become a political arena for different actors, such as developer companies, residents, local municipalities and local populations. As I show in Chapter 4, space does not only reflect a material change, but also a cultural one as seen by the term "5<sup>th</sup> Levent" which shows how the "financial and yuppie face" of Istanbul has moved to Gokturk. However, there is conflict between imagination and reality, as I showed in Chapter 6 the inconsistency between imaginary and real communities. I explore the "myth of the ideal house" (Oncu, 1999: 27) by analysing the design process which creates "imaginary communities" by the use of "natural" and "artificial views", eclecticism in the architecture, and the help of foreign architects, advertising campaigns, and lastly, the names of gated communities which reflect the



values of their target groups. However, several residents in Kasaba criticised their American style houses regarded as imported houses inappropriate for a different culture. While imaginary spaces are an important subject in the literature, real spaces should be examined about how they are interpreted and challenged by the residents, which lead to the re-evaluation of “sign value” (Baudrillard, 1983) of a house embedded in the “functional distinctions” such as the size of the land or the house, a green environment, clean air, the housing quality and the name of the developer company. I argue that function has become the sign of a house in a gated community which shows its usefulness and exchangeability in the housing market.

The fourth contribution is about multiple aspects of security, as one of the most important subjects in the literature on gated communities. By providing a comprehensive analysis of the two cases I examined how security is understood and established inside gated communities. At a more general level, I am interested in how security is made by the interaction between space and social relations. Residents in both communities experienced some dangers in Istanbul such as thefts and more specifically, the earthquake in 1999 and they moved to gated communities for a safer life which was secured by the distance to the North Anatolian Fault Zone and good-quality and few-storeys houses. The security inside gated communities is regarded as “ready-made” achieved by the latest technological devices such as CCTVs, walls, wires and guards, which lead to the debates of “Big Brother” and reverses the well-known “Panopticon” of Foucault. However, the reversal of Panopticon should be considered with the debates of “power shift” in Turkey since the 1980s. So, the powerful who is excluded, do not keep the same power in the society. Even so, the once powerful minority want to be observed by the powerful majority to be protected. However, also residents establish “spontaneous security” when they checked on their neighbours, especially inside Kasaba due to the spatial isolation they felt and so, they needed neighbours and friends.

However, as I explained in Chapter 7 gated communities are not safe havens isolated from the outside. There are new insecurities emerging inside and outside of gated communities. Space has an important influence on residents when for instance, the residents in Istanbul Istanbul feel threatened from the locals and they stated great discomfort with the local population because they were seeing their economic and social difference. They stated a stronger difference between them and the local population due to their proximity to the local town. However and interestingly, even if the income level was higher in Kasaba, residents did not express a difference with the locals which could cause social conflict, being isolated by a forest and distant to Omerli. However, residents in Kasaba revealed a dilemma inside their community: On the one hand, the forest protected them from the gaze of the locals. On the other hand, the forest opens Kasaba to the outside world, as an uncontrollable border line.

Also gender is an important factor which shapes the perception of threat, when female residents in both cases explained comfort inside the community and discomfort in the local town/ village. Apart of class and gender, religious and ethnic differences also play an important role, as in the example of Gokturk when several experts stated segregation along ethnic and religious lines, whereas for Omerli this was absent. Also the distance to Istanbul makes the road the new source of a danger, instead of the heavy traffic that the residents escaped from. In this aspect, distance to health institutions in Istanbul is another threat for residents, especially for small children and older people.

There are also new insecurities inside gated communities arising from the notion of “stranger” either as the staff members whom residents do not know for a long time (as in Kasaba) or as residents who come from other gated communities and domestic workers who work in their homes (as in Istanbul Istanbul). The security inside the two cases is provided by strict rules and regulations about who enters the community. One dilemma emerges for the residents who do not live permanently, since they return their apartment flats in Istanbul which

is still regarded as a dangerous city. Also when a resident does not live there permanently, regardless of the gender, he/she becomes less interested with safety measures inside the community. When children grow, they start to live in their family flats in Istanbul, so while gated communities can create a safe environment for children, this is lost when these children return to Istanbul. In the end, this research provides a comprehensive understanding of gated communities in Istanbul by analysing Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba in terms of social relations and everyday life, suburban change which shows a multidimensional economic, political and cultural change, space and lastly security which show how space and social relations interact.

## **8.2 MUTUALLY-INCLUSIVE FACTORS**

In Chapter 1, I wanted to propose a new categorisation of gated communities in Istanbul and this research has shown that there are mutually-inclusive categories rather than mutually exclusive ones. So, the separate categories based on only space, class, and unit type in the literature in Turkey which I explained in Chapter 3, are too simple to explain different forms of gated communities. On the basis of the results from the fieldwork, it can be concluded that there are several factors which affect the preference of the place of residence (in my case which gated community), the style and the size of the house: space (as distance and as the overall plan of the gated community), time, demographic characteristics, affiliation (religious, ethnic and professional) and the plurality of distinctions.

Space is a very important factor which affects which gated community is chosen. However, I would rather separate “space” into two categories, such as “space as distance” and “space as the overall plan” of a gated community. It would be difficult to separate gated communities under “urban” and “suburban” categories, because of blurring boundaries between urban and suburban due to the increasing travel opportunities and construction. As examples, Gokturk could be regarded as “urban” in suburban lands as described by several residents and

experts as “5<sup>th</sup> Levent”, while Omerli was still “rural” in suburban lands, as explained by a resident in Kasaba (P21) in Chapter 4, while I was doing the fieldwork. So to categorise gated communities under the titles of “urban” and “suburban” is useless. However, “space as distance” affects the preference of a gated community, which is associated with the distance of a gated community to the main networks of a person (where he/she works/socialises/and the distance to educational and health institutions). If Istanbul Istanbul is compared with Kasaba in this aspect, it is far closer to the main networks on the European side (main educational and work centres, shopping areas and personal networks of residents). Istanbul Istanbul is also close to Gokturk, the nearest town which is connected to Istanbul by shuttle services and public travel opportunities (bus). However, Kasaba is far more distant to the main networks on the Anatolian side which renders it difficult to travel. Kasaba is also distant to Omerli, the nearest village, and (at the time of the fieldwork was conducted) there was no frequent bus services to the main centre on the Anatolian side, Kadikoy. So “space as distance” to the main networks affects which gated community is chosen.

In this aspect, the role of space as distance mixes with time, as the second factor. The likelihood of choosing a home as “temporary” has a role in selecting which gated community to live. For instance, if a home is chosen to be lived occasionally, then its distance to main networks or its size would not be important. Time combines with the demographic characteristics of residents, which is the third factor which affects the place of residence and the housing size. By demographic characteristics I mean age, gender and marital status (together with having children) and working life. On the one hand, as age increases, gated communities create new forms of insecurity for the elderly as I showed in Chapter 7 due to the distance to health institutions in Istanbul. On the other hand, they can also provide “havens” for them who can escape from the urban chaos. Moreover, demographic characteristics of residents

(age and working life) affect the temporal use of a house, due to the more flexibility of a person to choose where to live and when to live.

Gender is another important factor which leads women to prefer a safer life inside a gated community, as explained by female residents in Kasaba in Chapter 7, that they felt safer inside their community to walk in streets and remain alone at home. Marital status (and having children) affects the preference of gated communities in terms of a green environment, a house with a garden where children can play, a safe place where mothers can leave their children unattended which can be strengthened by the help of the staff as I showed in Chapters 6 and 7. Having children also affects the size of the house when for example a mother in Istanbul explained that they needed a larger house since the birth of their son. However, once children grow up, gated communities especially like Kasaba which are far from city centres, become “dangerous” because of the dangers of the road.

Fourthly, as I showed in Chapter 7, religious and ethnic communities (affiliation) are important, as explained by several experts which show how “real” communities prefer to live inside the same gated community. Religious and ethnic differences can also lead to social conflict with the locals. However, professional ties (or working in the same company) are as important as other “real” communities which create social networks by excluding other ways of promoting these houses. Interestingly, while several experts regarded religion and ethnicity as “real” communities, instead of gated communities, for residents their “professional” ties are very important to establish social networks. Several residents in both cases stated that they preferred their community due to their ties with a specific company or profession.

The importance of professional ties in the formation of a community makes an interesting contribution to the difference between public life (*Gesellschaft*) and traditional community (*Gemeinschaft*) which consists of private, close and exclusive living together (Tönnies, 1974: 7). This difference is argued by Harvey who proposes three types of

communities: The first is “real community”, the second is “imagined community” and the third is “packaged” communities formed by companies (Harvey, 1990: 82). In this sense, residents in two cases blur the boundaries between “real” and “packaged communities”. As I explained in Chapter 3, and showed in various sections of Chapters 4, 5 and 6, gated communities consist of commodified communities due to strict rules put by developer companies as the reflection of packaging and real communities as the reflection of traditional communities. So, instead of the conventional understanding, gated communities do not only consist of “packaged” communities, but they also represent a priori professional communities or moreover, they have become real communities by establishing relations or as Wilson-Doenges states, residents create a “sense of community” (2000: 598).

Fifthly, also “plural distinctions” such as economic and cultural capital affect the place of residence as well as the size and the style of the house. As I showed in Chapter 6, “space” is created in the design process according to certain “niches” so that large villas are built for higher income groups while smaller apartment flats are built for middle or upper middle income groups. The place of residence and the size of the house depend on economic capital. While housing size is an important factor which shows the purchasing power of the individual, size does not always matter, when cultural capital and professional capital enter the scene. In Chapter 6, I show how some residents in Kasaba criticised certain physical attributes of their houses, because of being regarded as a “foreign” intervention into Turkish everyday life and traditions. This rejection can be associated with the professional capital of a resident who criticised the design and architects because of her expertise on that subject (civil engineer). I state briefly in Chapter 6 that gated communities are also criticised by several experts (architects and academics) because of being regarded as imitations of old neighbourhoods and houses in Istanbul. I argue that the criticisms of “American style” homes made by the residents in Kasaba and general criticisms made by experts are based on cultural capital which reveals

the difference between style and traditions (Holt, 1998: 8). However, even residents with high cultural capital prefer to live in gated communities because of the factors that I described before, which show an interrelation between space, time, demographic characteristics, affiliations and plural distinctions.

Besides the factors which affect the decision of gated communities, there are also other factors which affect social relations and the integration with the outside when a person starts to live in a gated community: space, plurality of distinctions (economic and cultural capital), demographic characteristics, affiliation and the temporal use of a house. Space (this time as the overall plan of a gated community) is still an important factor which affects social relations and the perception of security. As I explained in Chapter 5, even if Istanbul Istanbul was planned on the basis of Neo-urbanist ideas to make residents to become “neighbours”, it was Kasaba where residents stated the importance of a neighbourly need because of the isolation they felt due to detached houses, the forest and its distance to Istanbul. So, the more individualised space in Kasaba ironically led them to establish better relations and pushed them to interact with their neighbours. In Chapter 7 I showed that the residents in Kasaba felt safer when they did not see any threat from outside due to the distance from Omerli and the forest, while residents in Istanbul Istanbul had a more fearful attitude towards their surroundings because they were “seeing” their economic and social differences with the local population.

However, as I showed in Chapter 5, this does not always mean that space is the ultimate measure of social relations. Rather, it combines with different factors such as plurality of distinctions (economic and cultural capital) which affects social relations and the people to make friends. For instance, the residents in Istanbul Istanbul put distance with the residents in Kemer Country, the biggest and the most expensive gated community in Gokturk, based on their moral ways of earning money and better social relations. Income (class) differences also work even inside the same gated community, as stated by several residents in both cases who

used economic differences when to establish boundaries, as I explained in Chapter 5. Cultural capital is also very important to establish boundaries as I showed in Chapter 5, when residents in both communities differentiate themselves from others on the basis of cultural factors such as “parvenu”, “respect to the staff”, “illiteracy”, “inconsistency between money and culture”.

Demographic characteristics (working life, marital status, age, and gender) are also important. As an example, even if Istanbul Istanbul was designed to increase social interaction between residents, they stated that they did not have time to socialise with their neighbours because they were working. Also marital status (having children) affects mothers with dependent children who did not have time to get involved with the outside. Age and working life affect the degree of integration so that while residents in Istanbul Istanbul did not have much time to be involved with their outside, residents in Kasaba found the chance due to more flexibility and time to get involved with the local population, because they were much older and either retired or part-time working. So, the residents in Kasaba had more opportunity to reduce the individuality offered by the space to socialise with their neighbours and to help the local population. Moreover, as I showed in Chapter 4, gender is another important factor which led to a gendered “in-between” modernisation in Omerli brought to the local female children, instead of male ones. As I showed in Chapter 7, gender was also an important factor which shaped female residents’ hesitation in public space about whether “to wear or to not-wear headscarves” in local villages and was crystallised in the debates of different forms of “visibility” and “invisibility”. To a certain extent, affiliation (religious, ethnic and professional ties) affects a person’s engagement with the outside, while residents in both cases explained that they preferred to live in a specific gated community due to their affiliations. They might also get in touch with only those of the same affiliation, which might create “communities inside communities”.



Lastly, the temporal use of a house (how long it is used and when it is used) affects belonging, the formation of community and the participation in the local events and politics. Moreover, as I showed in Chapter 7, even mothers with children who were living a “temporary” life were less involved with the safety measures inside their communities and with the overall social milieu. So, the temporal use of a house is an important factor especially related to belonging and formation of community which can have an effect on local governance. Due to the availability of gated communities which can be used temporarily, people can satisfy their lifestyles when for example in Chapter 5 a resident in Istanbul Istanbul stated that their social life was based in the cultural life of Istanbul and they preferred to use Istanbul Istanbul when they needed. So, those people with high cultural capital who would like to attend cultural activities in the city can use gated communities temporarily to meet their needs. In the end, I show that rather than being mutually existing factors, class and cultural divisions are complementary and inclusive.

### **8.3 FUTURE RESEARCH**

Following these results, future research should be undertaken. Firstly, an important contribution would be a longitudinal study about residents’ lives in terms of their integration and relations with the outside, which can provide new insights to belonging and identity. It is important to consider whether they were engaged with their outside in their previous residences. Related to that, how residents interact with the city is another subject to study, in a period of increasing intra-urban mobility as these two cases show which can explore the changing meaning of “home” for the residents and belonging and spatio-cultural changes due to the increasing networks between different spaces. As explained by several experts, suburban change in Istanbul shows further urban spatial sprawl which also entails environmental and

preservation concerns as the result of political regulations since the 1980s which have opened these lands for further construction.

An interesting result is how residents consider “urban”. Contrary to expectations, residents in both cases did not show any hostility towards (or stigmatise) “black crowds” in Istanbul, even though they stated their concerns about and experiences of crimes. Although they regarded Istanbul as a dirty, crowded and polluted city similar to the main literature, residents in both communities also stated their discomfort with higher prices, greedy life, artificial relations or alienation in the city, as the result of capitalist life which pushes people to earn more and spend more. In this sense, residents in both cases implicitly stigmatised capitalist urban life. The city, in this case Istanbul is a “greedy” vacuum which does not leave any space for the mind and the body. This can point to new ways of thinking about the urban as the centre of “vice” and the rural as the centre of “unspoilt environment and honest relations”. However, I would ask, what kind of a future can be developed on this contrast? Is it possible to create a “good” city, outside of capitalist order which has until now offered “more” for less, such as the “affordable” prices during sale season in order to make us spend more or the “sustainable” environments, ironically regarded as “solutions”, in order to survive capitalist exploitation of the Earth and other creatures living on her? What would be the result if the village would be transformed into a rural vacuum, becoming similar to “greedy” city, but a lot smaller model?

Secondly, local populations should be investigated in order to understand their views about the changes they experienced in their social milieu. Local populations were regarded as “real locals” by several residents in Istanbul Istanbul and Kasaba similar to when the locals in Beykoz asked if the newcomer residents in gated communities could identify themselves as those who belonged to Beykoz in the research of Kurtulus (2005b: 182). This can lead to interesting results, because this situation changes the classical immigrant image which consists of illiterate crowds coming to cities where civilised people live. However, residents who are the

newcomers are literate, secular, civilised people. Also as I stated in Chapter 4, these locals lost their lands which might lead to conflict. So what kinds of conflicts emerge with the locals? Will the relations being established by helping the poor erase these conflicts or will they be totally useless when these locals cannot find any job as a source of livelihood?

Thirdly, my research has a gender-bias, as most of the participants consist of females. This gender-bias was especially prominent when I showed in Chapter 4 how female residents in Kasaba interacted with local female children and in Chapter 7 about the security aspects inside and outside of gated communities. However, gender becomes a more important and interesting subject, if it is thought that “suburban” has always been regarded to increase existing gender inequalities. What are the implications of gated communities which reflect another form of “womanhood” who is mother, married and working at the same time, different from the previous generations? And what are the fears, ideas, interactions and changes of male residents? Lastly, there is also the need for comparative research between gated communities in the same city, the same country and different countries to detect differences and patterns which can provide clues about economic, social and political changes at a global level.

## APPENDIX 1

### CHAPTER 3

#### INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PARTICIPANTS

##### 1. Interview Questions for Residents

Name surname

Contact information

##### **Personal information**

1. Age
2. Could you please talk a little about yourself? (profession, education, job, marital status, children)
3. Education of the partner
4. Current occupation of the partner
5. Monthly household income (approximately)
6. The place of employment of you and your partner
7. How do you travel (to the city and school)?

##### **Previous house**

8. Where did you live before you moved here?
9. How long you lived there?
10. Tell me more about your previous neighbourhood.

##### **Present house**

11. Is this your main residence?
12. Why did you move here?
13. Home tenure?
14. Who lives in the house?
15. How long have you been living in this house? In this gated community?
16. Tell me more about this neighbourhood.

##### **Activities**

17. Are there any activities held in this gated community?
18. Do you participate in these activities?
19. What kinds of facilities (golf course, shopping) are being offered?
20. Where do you usually go for shopping?
21. Do you use local shops?
22. Where do you go for daily shopping?

##### **Social relations and networks**

23. When you moved here, did any friends move with you?
24. Did you know any person in this gated community before you moved here?
25. Tell me more about the residents and the staff.
26. Tell me more about the life in this neighbourhood.

### **Construction and decoration**

27. Did you change the design of the house before or after you moved?
28. Did you consider the name of the architect or the developer company?

### **Comparison with other communities**

29. Did you investigate other neighbourhoods before you moved here?
30. Why have you chosen this place over the other ones?

### **Environment**

31. Tell me about the area (local population and the village, gated communities and local municipality)

## **2. Interview Questions for Experts**

1. Could you please talk a little about yourself? (your profession, for how long you have been working in this sector)

### **Real estate sector**

2. Being a ....., could you please tell me about Istanbul's real estate market?
3. Which parts of Istanbul are preferred as residential places nowadays?
4. Which parts of Istanbul will be preferred as residential places in the future?

### **Reasons**

5. Why do developer companies build these communities?
6. Why do people move to a gated community?

### **Identity**

7. Who lives in these gated communities?
8. Is there any difference between gated communities?

### **Gated communities and surroundings**

9. How would you describe the relations of these gated communities with nearby villages and local politicians?
10. Are there any changes they bring to their surroundings? If yes, what kinds of changes do they bring?
11. What is the best word to describe these communities?
12. Is there something you would like to add lastly?

## DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESIDENTS

These descriptions are made by the residents.

### 1. ISTANBUL ISTANBUL

#### P1

Gender: Male

Age: 38

Marital Status: Married/no children

Education: University

Profession: Chemical engineer/ sales manager

Education-profession of the partner: University/ bank employee

Income Level: -

Residential Status: Permanent

Home ownership: Rent

#### P2

Gender: Male

Age: 60

Marital Status: Married/ one child

Education: University (pharmacist)

Profession: Retired

Education/profession of the partner: University/pharmacist

Income Level: Upper middle

Residential Status: Temporary

Home ownership: Owner

#### P3

Gender: Female

Age: 34

Marital Status: Married/ no child

Education: University (graduate)

Profession: Education sector

Education/profession of the partner: University/ working

Income Level: Between upper and middle

Residential Status: Permanent

Home ownership: Owner

#### P4

Gender: Female

Age: 41

Marital Status: Married/ one child

Education: High school (public relations)

Profession: Housewife

Education/profession of the partner: University (graduate)/ working

Income Level: Slightly upper than the middle

Residential Status: Permanent

Home ownership: Owner

**P5**

Gender: Female

Age: -

Marital Status: Married/ two children

Education: University (graduate)

Profession: Housewife

Education/profession of the partner: University (PhD)/ banking sector

Income Level: -

Residential Status: Permanent

Home ownership: Owner

**P6**

Gender: Female

Age: 33

Marital Status: Married/ two children

Education: High school (art)

Profession: Bank employee/ housewife

Education/profession of the partner: High school/self employed

Income Level: Middle

Residential Status: Permanent

Home ownership: Owner

**P7**

Gender: Male

Age: 44

Marital Status: Married/one child

Education: University

Profession: Manager

Education/profession of the partner: University/housewife

Income Level: Upper

Residential Status: Permanent

Home ownership: Rent

**P8**

Gender: Female

Age: 41

Marital Status: Married/ one child

Education: University

Profession: Manager

Education/profession of the partner: University/ general manager

Income Level:-

Residential Status: Permanent

Home ownership: Owner

**P9**

Gender: Female

Age: 38

Marital Status: Married/ two children

Education: University

Profession: Working

Education/profession of the partner: University/ bank employee  
Income Level: Slightly upper than the middle  
Residential Status: Permanent  
Home ownership: Owner

**P10**

Gender: Female  
Age: 78  
Marital Status: Married/ two children  
Education: Left university  
Profession: Housewife  
Education/profession of the partner: Retired/ banking sector  
Income Level: Slightly upper than the middle  
Residential Status: Temporary  
Home ownership: Owner

**P11**

Gender: Female  
Age: 36  
Marital Status: Married/ one child  
Education: University  
Profession: Nursery  
Education/profession of the partner: University/ bank employee  
Income Level: Upper middle  
Residential Status: Permanent  
Home ownership: Owner

**P12**

Gender: Female  
Age: 40.5  
Marital Status: Married/ two children  
Education: University  
Profession: Psychologist  
Education/profession of the partner: University/ journalist  
Income Level: Upper middle  
Residential Status: Permanent  
Home ownership: Owner

**P13**

Gender: Female  
Age: 36  
Marital Status: Married/ two children  
Education: University  
Profession: Housewife  
Education/profession of the partner: University/ civil engineer  
Income Level: -  
Residential Status: Permanent  
Home ownership: Owner



**P14**

Gender: Female

Age: 42

Marital Status: Married/ two children

Education: University

Profession: Architect

Education/profession of the partner: University/ self employed

Income Level: Middle

Residential Status: Permanent

Home ownership: Rent

**2. KASABA****P15**

Gender: Female

Age: 48

Marital Status: Married/ one child

Education: University

Profession: Art teacher

Education/profession of the partner: University/ general manager

Income Level: upper middle

Residential Status: Permanent

Home ownership: Owner

**P16**

Gender: Female

Age: 34

Marital Status: Married/two children

Education: University (graduate)

Profession: Works at home

Education/profession of the partner: University (graduate)/ working

Income Level: Upper middle

Residential Status: Temporary

Home ownership: Owner

**P17**

Gender: Male

Age: 21

Marital Status: Single

Education: University student

Profession: -

Education/profession of the partner: -

Income Level: -

Residential Status: Permanent

Home ownership: Owner

**P18**

Gender: Female  
Age: 50  
Marital Status: Married/ one child  
Education: University  
Profession: Retired  
Education/profession of the partner: University/ working  
Income Level: upper for Turkey/ lower for Kasaba  
Residential Status: Permanent  
Home ownership: Owner

**P19**

Gender: Female  
Age: 45  
Marital Status: Married/ one child  
Education: High school  
Profession: Airline employee/ housewife  
Education/profession of the partner: University/ works at home  
Income Level: Upper middle  
Residential Status: Permanent  
Home ownership: Owner

**P20**

Gender: Female  
Age: 43  
Marital Status: Married  
Education: University  
Profession: Housewife  
Education/profession of the partner: University (graduate)/ bank employee  
Income Level: B+, B.  
Residential Status: Permanent  
Home ownership: Owner

**P21**

Gender: Female  
Age: 44  
Marital Status: Married/ one child  
Education: University  
Profession: Management  
Education/profession of the partner: University (graduate) / general manager assistant  
Income Level: Earn money to keep their standards  
Residential Status: Permanent  
Home ownership: Owner

**P22**

Gender: Female  
Age: 51  
Marital Status: Married/ two children  
Education: University  
Profession: Housewife

Education/profession of the partner: University/ architect  
Income Level: Upper middle  
Residential Status: Permanent  
Home ownership: Owner

**P23**

Gender: Female  
Age: -  
Marital Status: Married/ one child  
Education: University  
Profession: Working  
Education/profession of the partner: University (graduate)/ self employed  
Income Level: Do not ask income level  
Residential Status: Temporary  
Home ownership: Owner

**P24**

Gender: Female  
Age: 40  
Marital Status: Married/ two children  
Education: High school  
Profession: Housewife  
Education/ profession of the partner: University (graduate)/ working  
Income Level: Normal standard  
Residential Status: Permanent  
Home ownership: Owner

**P25**

Gender: Female  
Age: 49  
Marital Status: Single/ one child  
Education: University  
Profession: Civil engineer  
Education/profession of the partner:-  
Income Level: -  
Residential Status: Permanent  
Home ownership: Owner

**P26**

Gender: Female  
Age: 42  
Marital Status: Married/ two children  
Education: University  
Profession: Civil engineering/ self employed  
Education/profession of the partner: University/ civil engineering/ self employed  
Income Level: Upper middle  
Residential Status: Permanent  
Home ownership: Owner

**P27**

Gender: Female

Age: 43

Marital Status: Single/ one child

Education: High school

Profession: Retired

Education/profession of the partner: -

Income Level: Middle

Residential Status: Permanent

Home ownership: Owner

**P28**

Gender: Female

Age: 42

Marital Status: Married/ one child

Education: University

Profession: Retired

Education/profession of the partner: University/ general manager

Income Level: Upper middle. It is “high” for Turkish standards, but not for European standards.

Residential Status: Permanent

Home ownership: Owner

## APPENDIX 2

### CHAPTER 5

Table 1 shows the location of previous residences of residents in Istanbul Istanbul, while Table 2 shows that of residents in Kasaba.

**Table 1 Istanbul Istanbul**

Previous Residence (number of residents)	
Etiler	3
Ulus	3
Atakoy	1
Bakirkoy	1
Zekeriyakoy	2
Gayrettepe	1
Nisantasi	2

**Table 2 Kasaba**<sup>193</sup>

Previous Residence (number of residents)	
Etiler	2
Atasehir <sup>194</sup>	2
Ziverbey	1
Kozyatagi	1
Kosuyolu	1
Fenerbahce	1
Erenkoy	2
Goztepe	1
Suadiye	1
Atakoy	1

---

<sup>193</sup> There are 14 residents but I stated 13 places because there were two residents from the same household.

<sup>194</sup> Atasehir has become a separate district of Istanbul on the Anatolian side in 2008.

## REFERENCES

- ACIKGOZ, E. (2005) “‘Big Brother’ Is Basinda”, *Cumhuriyet Pazar*, 7 August, p. 8-9.
- AGAMBEN, G. (1998) *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- AKBAS, T. and OZGAN, G. (2006) “Turkiye'nin Zencileri”, *Tempo*, vol. 12, no. 23, March, pp. 22-26.
- AKSOY, A. and ROBINS, K. (1993) “Istanbul'da Dinleme Zamani”, *Istanbul*, vol. 7, October, pp. 56-62.
- AKYARLI, A. (2005) “100 Kisiden Ikisi Villada Yasiyor”, *Hurriyet Emlak*, 7 April, p. 8-9.
- AKYARLI, A. (2005) “Sandalla Komsu Keyfi”, *Hurriyet Emlak*, 1 September, p. 5.
- ALVER, K. (2007) *Siteril Hayatlar: Kentte Mekansal Ayrisma ve Guvenlikli Siteler*, Ankara: Hece Yayinlari.
- ARAT, Y. (2005) “Turkiye'de Modernlesme Projesi ve Kadinlar”, in Bozdogan, S. and Kasaba, R. (ed.) *Turkiye'de Modernlesme ve Ulusal Kimlik*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Istanbul: Tarih Vakfi.
- AROLAT, E. (2003) “Site”, *Arredamento*, vol. 07-08, pp. 73-74.
- ATKINSON, R. and FLINT, J. (2004) The Fortress UK? Gated Communities, The Spatial Revolt of The Elites and Time-Space Trajectories of Segregation, *ESCR Centre for Neighbourhood Research*, CNR Paper no 17, July.  
<http://www.neighbourhoodcentre.org.uk/gated.html> (This web page does not exist anymore).  
Available: [http://eprints.utas.edu.au/2288/1/Fortress\\_UK.pdf](http://eprints.utas.edu.au/2288/1/Fortress_UK.pdf) [06.08.2009]. (Another version)
- ATKINSON, R., FLINT, J., BLANDY, S. and LISTER, D. (2003) The Extent and Neighbourhood Impacts of Gated Communities, Abbreviated Version of the Report Gated Communities in England, London: Office of The Deputy Prime Minister.  
Available: [http://www.bristol.ac.uk/sps/cnrpapersword/report\\_gated12.doc](http://www.bristol.ac.uk/sps/cnrpapersword/report_gated12.doc) [06.08.2009].
- AYATA, B. and YUKSEKER, D. (2005) “A Belated Awakening: National and International Responses to the Internal Displacement of Kurds in Turkey”, *New Perspectives on Turkey*, vol. 32, pp. 5-42.
- AYATA, S. (2002) “The New Middle Class and the Joys of Suburbia”, in Kandiyoti, D. and Saktanber, A. (ed.) *Fragments of Culture: The Everyday of Modern Turkey*, London; New York: I.B. Tauris & Co Publishers.
- BALI, R. (1999) “Cilgin Kalabaliktan Uzak”, *Birikim*, vol. 123, pp. 35-46.
- BALI, R. N. (2004) *Tarz-i Hayat'tan Life Style'a Yeni Seçkinler, Yeni Mekanlar, Yeni Yaşamlar*, 6<sup>th</sup> edition, Istanbul: Iletisim Yayinlari.
- BARNES, J. A. (1979) *Who Should Know What? Social Science, Privacy and Ethics*,

Harmondsworth; New York: Penguin Books.

BARNETT, C., CLOKE, P., CLARKE, N. and MALPASS, A. (2005) "Consuming Ethics: Articulating the Subjects and Spaces of Ethical Consumption", *Antipode*, vol. 37, pp. 23-45.

BARTU, A. (2000) "Eski Mahallelerin Sahibi Kim? Kuresel Bir Cagda Tarihi Yeniden Yazmak", in Keyder, C. (ed.) *Istanbul: Kuresel ile Yerel Arasinda*, Istanbul: Metis.

BARTU, A. (2002) "Dislayici Bir Kavram Olarak 'Mahalle'", *Istanbul*, vol. 40, January, pp. 84-86.

BAUDRILLARD, J. (1983) *Simulations*, New York City, NY, the United States: Semiotext(e).

BAUDRILLARD, J. (1998) *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures*, London; Thousand Oaks; New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

BAUMAN, Z. (1998) *Globalization: The Human Consequences*, Polity Press.

BAYCAN LEVENT, T. and GULUMSER, A. A. (2004) "Production and Marketing of Gated Communities in Istanbul", *44th European Congress of the European Regional Science Association Regions and Fiscal Federalism*, Porto, Portugal.  
Available: <http://www-sre.wu-wien.ac.at/ersa/ersaconfs/ersa04/PDF/525.pdf> [15 July 2009].

BAYCAN LEVENT, T. and GULUMSER, A. A. (2005) "Gated Communities from the Perspective of Developers", *45th European Congress of the European Regional Science Association Land Use and Water Management in a Sustainable Network Society*, Amsterdam, the Netherlands.  
Available: <http://ideas.repec.org/p/wiw/wiwr/ersa05p782.html> [15 July 2009].

BEST, S. and KELLNER, D. (1997) *The Postmodern Turn*, New York: The Guilford Press.

BILA, F. (2006) "Insaat Ormani Yutamayacak", *Milliyet*, 3 December, p. 20.

BINDEL, J. (2006) "There comes a time when you want to live without children", *The Guardian Saturday: Family*, 8 April, p. 2.

BLAKELY, E. and SNYDER, M. G. (1997) *Fortress America*, Washington DC: The Brookings Institution Press; Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

BLANDY, S., DIXON, J., DUPUIS, A. and PARSON, D. (2006) "The Rise of Private Residential Neighbourhoods in England and New Zealand", in Glasze, G., Webster, C and Frantz, K. (ed.) *Private Cities: Global and Local Perspectives*, London: Routledge.

BORA, T. and ERDOGAN, N. (2005) "Zenginlik: 'Zengin' Bir Arastirma Gundemi, 'Yoksul' Bir Literatur", *Toplum ve Bilim*, vol. 104, pp. 3-12.

BORATAV, K. (2005) *1980'li Yillarda Turkiye'de Sosyal Siniflar ve Donusum*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Ankara: Imge Kitabevi.

BORSODORF, A. and JANOSCHKA, M. (2006) "Condominios fechados and barrios privados:



the rise of private residential neighbourhoods in Latin America”, in Glasze, G., Webster, C. and Frantz, K. (ed.) *Private Cities: Global and Local Perspectives*, London: Routledge.

BOURDIEU, P. (1980) “The Aristocracy of Culture”, *Media, Culture and Society*, vol. 2, pp. 225-254.

BOURDIEU, P. (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, London: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.

BOURDIEU, P. (1994) “Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste”, in Grusky, D. B. (ed.) *Social Stratification: Race, Class and Gender in Sociological Perspective*, Boulder: Westview Press.

BOZKULAK, S. (2005) “‘Gecekondu’ dan ‘Varos’a: Gulsuyu Mahallesi”, in Kurtulus, H. (ed.) *Istanbul’da Kentsel Ayrisma*, Istanbul: Baglam Yayıncılık.

BRENNER, N. and KEIL, R. (2006) “Editors’ Introduction”, in Brenner, N. and Keil, R. (ed.) *The Global Cities Reader*, London: Routledge.

BRYMAN, A. (2004) *Social Research Methods*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

CAHILL, C., SULTANA, F. and PAIN, R. (2007) “Participatory Ethics: Politics, Practices, Institutions”, *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*. Available: <http://www.acme-journal.org/vol6/CCFSRP.pdf> [15 July 2009].

CALDEIRA, T. P.R. (2000) *City of Walls: Crime, Segregation, and Citizenship in Sao Paolo*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

CASTELLS, M. (1997) *The Power of Identity*, Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.

CAVUSOGLU, E. (2006) “Istanbul Orneginde Kent ve Suc”, *Birgun*, 7 January, p. 11.

CINAR, C., CIZMECI, F. and KOKSAL, A. (2006) “The New Address of Social Polarization in Istanbul: Gated Communities”, *42nd ISoCaRP International Planning Congress*, Istanbul, Turkey. Available: [http://www.isocarp.net/Data/case\\_studies/854.pdf](http://www.isocarp.net/Data/case_studies/854.pdf) [15 July 2009].

COOK, G. (2001) *The Discourse of Advertising*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, London; New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.

COY, M. and POHLER, M. (2002) “Gated Communities in Latin American Megacities: Case Studies in Brazil and Argentina”, *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, vol. 29, pp. 355-370.

DANIELSON, M. and KELES, R. (1985) *Politics of Rapid Urbanization: Government and Growth in Modern Turkey*, New York: Holmes & Meier.

DANIS, D. (2001) “Istanbul’da Uydu Yerlesmelerin Yayginlasmasi: Bahcesehir Ornegi”, in Gumusoglu, F. (ed.) *21. Yuzyil Karsisinde Kent ve Insan*, Istanbul: Baglam Yayıncılık.

- DAVIS, M. (1998) *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles*, London: Pimlico.
- DAVIS, M. (1999) *Ecology of Fear: Los Angeles and the Imagination of Disaster*, the United States: Vintage Books.
- DIKEN, B. and LAUSTSEN, C. B. (2003) "Camping" as a Contemporary Strategy - From Refugee Camps to Gated Communities", AMID Working Paper Series, vol. 32, Aalborg: AMID Aalborg University.
- DIKEN, B. and LAUSTSEN, C. B. (2005) *The Culture of Exception: Sociology Facing The Camp*, London: Routledge.
- DIREN, M. (1993) "Istanbul'un Bilinci Belirleyici Olacak", *Istanbul*, vol. 7, October, pp. 40-49.
- DOGUC, S. (2005) "Yeni Orta Siniflarin Gozunden Zenginlik ve Yoksulluk", *Toplum ve Bilim*, vol. 104, pp. 73-91.
- DUNDAR, O. and OZCAN, Z. (2003) "An Example of a Gated Community from Ankara, Turkey", *Gated Communities: Building Social Division or Safer Communities Conference*, Glasgow, Scotland.
- EKINCI, O. (1994) *Istanbul'u Sarsan On Yil: 1983-1993*, Istanbul: Anahtar Kitaplar.
- EKINCI, O. (1995) *Dunden Bugune Istanbul Dosyalari*, Istanbul: Anahtar Kitaplar.
- EKINCI, O. (2003) "'Varoslardaki Komsular'" ve Bir '1 Mayıs'in Animsattiklari", *Mimar.ist*, vol. 8, pp. 80-83.
- ELIAS, N. (2000) *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations*, Revised edition, Oxford: Blackwell.
- ENLIL, Z. M. (2003) "1980 Sonrasi Istanbul'da Toplumsal Ayrismanin Mekansal Izdusumleri", *Mimar.ist*, vol. 8, pp. 84-89.
- ERGUN, N. (2006) "Gentrification Kuramlarinin Istanbul'da Uygulanabilirliigi", in Behar, D. and Islam, T. (ed.) *Istanbul'da "Soylulastirma": Eski Kentin Yeni Sahipleri*, Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi Universitesi Yayinlari.
- ERMAN, T. (2001) "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.
- ESEN, O. (2007) "Gokturk: Temel Parametreler", *Istanbul*, vol. 59, May, pp. 98-101.
- ESPING-ANDERSEN, G. (1993) "Post-industrial Class Structures: An Analytical Framework", in Esping-Andersen, G. (ed.) *Stratification and Mobility in Post-industrial Societies*, London; Newbury Park; California: SAGE Publications.
- EVRAN, E. (2008) "Iste Istanbul'un En Zengin 50 Mahallesi", *Sabah*, 19 May.

Available: <http://www.sabah.com.tr/2008/05/19/haber.5084DB031DE4479B8DC976C0F13C7688.html> [8 July 2008]

FAINSTEIN, S. S. and HARLOE, M. (1992) "Introduction: London and New York in the Contemporary World", in Fainstein, S.S., Gordon, I. and Harloe, M. (ed.) *Divided Cities: New York & London in the Contemporary World*, Oxford: Blackwell.

FEATHERSTONE, M. (1991) *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism*, London; Newbury Park; California: SAGE Publications.

FISHMAN, R. (1995) "Megalopolis Unbound", in Kasinitz, P. (ed.) *Metropolis: Centre and Symbol of Our Times*, Basingstoke, Hants., United Kingdom: MacMillan.

FISHMAN, R. (1996) "Bourgeois Utopias: Visions of Suburbia", in Fainstein, S.S. and Campbell, S. (ed.) *Readings in Urban Theory*, London: Blackwell.

FOUCAULT, M. (1991) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of The Prison*, Penguin.

FRANK, T. (2002) *New Consensus for Old: Cultural Studies: From Left to Right*, Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press.

FRIEDMANN, J. and WOLFF, G. (2006) "World City Formation: An Agenda for Research and Action", in Brenner, N. and Keil, R. (ed.) *The Global Cities Reader*, London: Routledge.

FUKUYAMA, F. (1992) *The End of History and The Last Man*, Penguin.

GASKELL, G. (2000) "Individual and Group Interviewing" in Bauer, M.W. and Gaskell, G. (ed.) *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound: A Practical Handbook*, London: SAGE Publications.

GAYBERI, A. Z. (2008) "Bizimki de Can mi?", *Milli Gazete*, 28 July.  
Available: <http://www.porttakal.com/haber-bizimki-de-can-mi-55389.html> [12 June 2009].

GENIS, S. (2007) "Producing Elite Localities: The Rise of Gated Communities in Istanbul", *Urban Studies*, vol. 44, pp. 771-798.

GEORG, G., GUNTHER, M., FRANTZ, K., WEHRHEIM, J., TOWNSHEND, I. J., THUILLIER, G., JÜRGENS, U., GNAD, M., LEISCH, H., WEHRHAHN, R., RAPOSO, R., AL-HAMARNEH, A., STRUCK, E., MUTSCHMANN, E., GLASZE, G., ESCHER, A., MEYER, G., ABDEL-KADER, M. and SCHLIEPHAKE, K. (1999) "Global Expansion of A New Kind of Settlement", in Georg, G. and Meyer, G. (ed.) *Workshop: Gated Communities as a Global Phenomenon*, Hamburg: DAVO Nachrichten.  
Available: [http://www.gated-communities.de/abstr\\_ham.html](http://www.gated-communities.de/abstr_ham.html) [15 July 2009].

GIROIR, G. (2003) "Gated Communities, Clubs in A Club System: The Case of Beijing (China)", *Gated Communities: Building Social Division or Safer Communities Conference*, Glasgow, Scotland.  
Available: <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/sps/cnrpapersword/gated/giroir.doc> [15 July 2009].

GLASZE, G. and ALKHAYYAL, A. (2002) "Gated Housing Estates in the Arab World: Case

Studies in Lebanon and Riyadh, Saudi Arabia”, *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, vol. 29, pp. 321- 336.

GOIX, R. L. (2006) “Gated communities as predators of public resources: the outcomes of fading boundaries between private management and public authorities in southern California”, in Georg, G., Webster, C. and Frantz, K. (ed.) *Private Cities: Global and Local Perspectives*, London: Routledge.

GOLBASI, S. (2008) *Kentlesme ve Suc: Istanbul'un Kentlesme Sureci ile Sucluluk Arasindaki Iliskinin Kuramsal Degerlendirilmesi*, Istanbul: On iki Levha Yayıncılık.

GOLE, N. (2005) “Modernlesme Baglamında İslami Kimlik Arayışı”, in Bozdoğan, S. and Kasaba, R. (ed.) *Türkiye'de Modernlesme ve Ulusal Kimlik*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı.

GOKGUR, P. (2006) “Rezidanslar ve Gentrified Konutlar”, in Behar, D. and Islam, T. (ed.) *Istanbul'da “Soylulastırma”: Eski Kentin Yeni Sahipleri*, Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

GRAHAM, S. and MARVIN, S. (2001) *Splintering Urbanism: Network Infrastructures, Technological Mobilities and the Urban Condition*, London: Routledge.

GRAHAM, S. and MARVIN, S. (2003) “The Social and Cultural Life of The City”, in Miles, M., Hall, T. and Borden, I. (ed.) *The City Cultures Reader*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, London and New York: Routledge.

GULER, S. (2001) “Kent ve Tarihsel Kimlik”, in Gumusuoglu, F. (ed.) *21. Yuzyil Karsisinda Kent Ve Insan*, Istanbul: Baglam Yayıncılık.

GURBILEK, N. (2001) *Vitrinde Yasamak 1980lerin Kulturel Iklimi*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Istanbul: Metis.

GUVEN, A. A. (2005) “Hirsizlik Artıyor, Alarma 10 Milyon Dolar Gidiyor”, *Hurriyet Emlak*, 22 September, p. 12.

HACISALIOGLU, Y. (2000) *Küreselleşme: Mekansal Etkileri ve İstanbul*, Istanbul: Akademik Düzey Yayınları.

HAILA, A. (2006) “The Neglected Builder of Global Cities”, in Brenner, N. and Keil, R. (ed.) *The Global Cities Reader*, London: Routledge.

HALL, J. R. (1992) “The Capital(s) of Cultures: A Nonholistic Approach to Status Situations, Class, Gender and Ethnicity”, in Lamont, M. and Fournier, M. (ed.) *Cultivating Differences Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

HARLOE, M. and FAINSTEIN, S. S. (1992) “Conclusion: The Divided Cities”, in Fainstein, S.S., Gordon, I and Harloe, M. (Eds.) *Divided Cities: New York & London in the Contemporary World*, Oxford: Blackwell.

HARVEY, D. (1990) *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*, Oxford, UK; Cambridge, MA, the United States: Blackwell.

HARVEY, D. (2001) *Spaces of Capital: Towards a Critical Geography*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

HARVEY, D. (2005) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

HOLT, D. (1998) "Does Cultural Capital Structure American Consumption?", *Journal of Consumer Research*, vol. 25, pp. 1-25.

ILKNUR, M. (2006) "Kiyim 12 Eylul'le Basladi", *Cumhuriyet*, 6 December, p. 9.

INAL CEKIC, T. and GEZICI, F. (2005) "Spatial Impacts of New Housing Trends in the Periphery of the Istanbul Metropolitan Area", *45th Congress of the European Regional Science Association Land Use and Water Management in a Sustainable Network Society*, Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

Available: <http://www-sre.wu-wien.ac.at/ersa/ersaconfs/ersa05/papers/41.pdf> [15 July 2009]

ISIK, O. (1995) "1980 Sonrasi Turkiye'de Kent ve Kentlesme", in *Yuzyil Biterken Cumhuriyet Donemi Turkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Istanbul: Iletisim Yayinlari.

ISIK, O. and PINARCIOGLU, M. (2005) *Nöbetleşe Yoksulluk: Sultanbeyli Örneği*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition, Istanbul: Iletisim Yayinlari.

ISLAM, T. (2006) "Merkezin Disinda: Istanbul'da Soylulastirma", in Behar, D. and Islam, T. (ed.) *Istanbul'da "Soylulastirma": Eski Kentin Sahipleri*, Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi Universitesi Yayinlari.

JANES, L. and MOONEY, G. (2002) "Place, Lifestyle and Social Divisions", in Braham, P. and Janes, L. (ed.) *Social Differences and Divisions*, Oxford, UK; Massachusetts, the United States: The Open University, Blackwell Publishing.

JESSOP, B. (2002) "Liberalism, Neoliberalism and Urban Governance: A State Theoretical Perspective", *Antipode*, vol. 34, pp. 452-472.

JEWSON, N. and MACGREGOR, S. (1997) "Transforming Cities: Social Exclusion and The Reinvention of Partnership", in Macgregor, S. and Jewson, N. (ed.) *Transforming Cities: Contested Governance and New Spatial Divisions*, London; New York: Routledge.

JURGENS, U. and GNAD, M. (2002) "Gated Communities in South Africa, Experiences from Johannesburg", *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, vol. 29, pp. 337-353.

KANDIYOTI, D. (1995) "Patterns of Patriarchy: Notes for an Analysis of Male Dominance in Turkish Society", in Tekeli, S. (ed.) *Women in Modern Turkish Society*, London: Zed Books.

KANDIYOTI, D. (2005) "Modernin Cinsiyeti: Turk Modernlesmesi Arastirmalarinda Eksik Boyutlar", in Bozdogan, S. and Kasaba, R. (ed.) *Turkiye'de Modernlesme ve Ulusal Kimlik*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Istanbul: Tarih Vakfi.

KANDIYOTI, D. (2007) *Cariyeler, Bacilar, Yurttaslar: Kimlikler ve Toplumsal Donusumler*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Istanbul: Metis.

- KASABA, R. (2005) "Eski ile Yeni Arasinda Kemalizm ve Modernizm", in Bozdogan, S. and Kasaba, R. (ed.) *Turkiye'de Modernlesme ve Ulusal Kimlik*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Istanbul: Tarih Vakfi.
- KAZGAN, G. (Ed.) (1999) *Kuresellesme ve Ulus Devlet: Yeni Ekonomik Duzen*, Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayinlari.
- KAZMAOGLU, A. (2003) "Kapali Siteler ve Kentsel Yalitim", *Arredamento*, vol. 07-08, pp. 75-76.
- KEOHANE, R. O. and NYE, J. S. (2000) "Globalization: What's New? What's not? (And Do What?)", *Foreign Policy*, vol. 118, pp. 104-119.
- KESKIN, K. (2005) "İçki deęmemiş 30 bin düęün bardaęı siparişı", *Hurriyet*, 4 August. Available: <http://hurarsiv.hurriyet.com.tr/goster/haber.aspx?viewid=613087> [12 June 2009].
- KEYDER, C. (1993) *Istanbul*.
- KEYDER, C. (1996) *Ulusal Kalkinmaciligin Iflasi*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Istanbul: Metis.
- KEYDER, C. (1999) "The Housing Market from Informal to Global", in Keyder, C. (ed.) *Istanbul: Between the Global and the Local*, Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield.
- KEYDER, C. (2000) "Arka Plan", in Keyder, C. (ed.) *Istanbul Kuresel ile Yerel Arasinda*, Istanbul: Metis.
- KING, A. (1984) *The Bungalow: The Production of A Global Culture*, London; Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- KING, A. (1990) *Global Cities: Post-imperialism and the Internationalization of London*, London; New York: Routledge.
- KIRIKKANAT, M. G. (2003) *Bir Gun, Gece*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Istanbul: Om Yayinlari.
- KONGAR, E. (1998) *21. Yuzyilda Turkiye*, Ankara: Remzi Kitabevi.
- KOZANOGLU, H. (1993) *Yuppieler, Prensler ve Bizim Kuşak*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Istanbul: Iletisim Yayinlari.
- KUCUKUSTA, A. R. (2006) *Modern Zaman Hastalıkları*, Istanbul: Hayykitap.
- KURTULUS, H. (2005a) "Bir 'Utopya' Olarak Bahcesehir", in Kurtulus, H. (ed.) *Istanbul'da Kentsel Ayrisma*, Istanbul: Baglam Yayıncılık.
- KURTULUS, H. (2005b) "Istanbul'da Kapali Yerlesmeler: Beykoz Konaklari Ornegi", in Kurtulus, H. (ed.) *Istanbul'da Kentsel Ayrisma*, Istanbul: Baglam Yayıncılık.
- LAMONT, M. (1992) *Money, Morals, and Manners: The Culture of the French and American Upper-Middle Class*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- LAMONT, M. and FOURNIER, M. (1992) "Introduction", in Lamont, M. and Fournier, M.

(ed.) *Cultivating Differences Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

LANDMAN, K. and SCHONTEICH, M. (2002) "Urban Fortresses: Gated Communities as a Reaction to Crime", *African Security Review*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 71-85.

LANG, R. E. and DANIELSEN, K. A. (1997) "Gated Communities in America: Walling Out the World?", *Housing Policy Debate, Fannie Mae Foundation*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 867-899.

LASH, S. and URRY, J. (1994) *Economies of Signs and Space*, London; Thousand Oaks; California: SAGE Publications.

LOW, S. (2003) *Behind The Gates: Life, Security and the Pursuit of Happiness in Fortress America*, New York: Routledge.

LURY, C. (1996) *Consumer Culture*, Polity Press.

LYON, D. (2001) *Surveillance Society: Monitoring Everyday Life*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

MAGGONUL, Z. (2005) 'Seçkin' Sementin 'Seçkin' Sakinleri: Teşvikiye-Nişantaşı, İstanbul: Kitabevi Yayınları.

MARCUSE, P. (2000) "Cities in Quarters", in Bridge, G. and Watson, S. (ed.) *A Companion to the City*, Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

MARCUSE, P. (2006) "Space in the Globalizing City" in Brenner, N. and Keil, R. (ed.) *The Global Cities Reader*, London: Routledge.

MARCUSE, P. and KEMPEN, R. V. (2000) "Introduction", in Marcuse, P. and Kempen, R.V. (ed.) *Globalizing Cities: A New Spatial Order?*, Malden, Mass: Blackwell.

MARDIN, S. (2005) "Modern Turk Sosyal Bilimleri Uzerine Bazi Dusunceler", in Bozdogan, S. and Kasaba, R. (ed.) *Turkiye'de Modernlesme ve Ulusal Kimlik*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfi.

MAYER, M. (1996) "Post-Fordist City Politics", in Legates, R.T. and Stout, F. (ed.) *The City Reader*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, London; New York: Routledge.

MCGUIGAN, J. (1999) *Modernity and Postmodern Culture*, Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open University Press.

MCKENZIE, E. (1994) *Privatopia: Homeowner Associations and the Rise of Residential Private Government*, New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

MCLAUGHLIN, E. and MUNCIE, J. (1999) "Walled Cities: Surveillance, Regulation and Segregation", in Pile, S., Brook, C. and Mooney, G. (ed.) *Unruly Cities, Order/Disorder*, London; New York: Routledge in Association with the Open University.

MILLER, V. A. (2001) *Enclaves: Realities, Imagination and Representation in the Urban Life*



World, PhD Thesis. Department of Sociology, Lancaster: Lancaster University.

MOLLENKOPF, J. and CASTELLS, M. (1991) "Introduction", in Mollenkopf, J.H. and Castells, M. (ed.) *Dual City: Restructuring New York*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

NADER, L. (1972) "Up The Anthropologist-Perspectives From Studying Up", in Hymes, D. (ed.) *Reinventing Anthropology*, N.Y.: Pantheon Books.

NASH, K. (2000) *Contemporary Political Sociology: Globalization, Politics, and Power*, Malden, Ma.: Blackwell Publishing.

NASSER, H. E. (2002) "Gated Communities More Popular, and Not Just For the Rich", *USA Today*, 12 December.  
Available: [http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2002-12-15-gated-usat\\_x.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2002-12-15-gated-usat_x.htm) [16 July 2009].

OKTAY, A. (2002) *Metropol ve Imgelem*, Istanbul: Turkiye Is Bankasi Kultur Yayinlari.

OKTEM, B. (2005) "Kuresel Kent Soyleminin Kentsel Mekani Donusturmedeki Rolu", in Kurtulus, H. (ed.) *Istanbul'da Kentsel Ayrisma*, Istanbul: Baglam Yayincilik.

ONCU, A. (1988) "The Politics of the Urban Land Market in Turkey: 1950-1980", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol.12, no.1, pp. 38-64.

ONCU, A. (1999) "'Idealinizdeki Ev' Mitolojisi Kulturel Sinirlari Asarak Istanbul'a Ulasti", *Birikim*, vol. 123, pp. 26-34.

ONCU, A. (2000) "Istanbullular ve Otekiler: Kureselcilik Caginda Orta Sinif Olmanin Kulturel Kozmolojisi", in Keyder, C. (ed.) *Istanbul: Kuresel ile Yerel Arasinda*, Istanbul: Metis.

OZKAN, E. and KOZAMAN, S. (2006) "Gated Communities: As an Efficient Force in the Fragmentation Process of Istanbul", *42nd ISoCaRP Congress*, Istanbul, Turkey.  
Available: [http://www.isocarp.net/Data/case\\_studies/881.pdf](http://www.isocarp.net/Data/case_studies/881.pdf) [15 July 2009].

OZKOK, E. (2003) "Kardesiniz Bir Zenci Turktur", *Hurriyet*, 14 May.  
Available: <http://hurarsiv.hurriyet.com.tr/goster/haber.aspx?id=146646&yazarid=10> [16 July 2009].

OZYEGIN, G. (2005) *Baskalarinin Kiri: Kapiçilar, Gundelikciler ve Kadinlik Halleri*, Istanbul: Iletisim Yayinlari.

PACKARD, V. (1961) *The Status Seekers: An Exploration of Class Behaviour in America*, Middlesex: Penguin Books.

PAMUK, O. (2008) *Istanbul: Hatiralar ve Sehir*, 17<sup>th</sup> edition, Istanbul: Iletisim Yayinlari.

PATTON, M. Q. (1990) *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Newbury Park, California: SAGE Publications.

PEROUSE, J. F. and DANIS, D. (2005) "Zenginligin Mekanda Yeni Yansimalari: Istanbul'da



Guvenlikli Siteler”, *Toplum ve Bilim*, vol.104, pp. 92-123.

RIENIETS, T. (2007) “Gokturk: Inkar, Mubadele, Adaptasyon” *Istanbul*, vol. 59, May, pp. 102-105.

RIVADULLA, M. J. A. (2007) “Golden Ghettos: Gated Communities and Class Residential Segregation in Montevideo, Uruguay”, *Environment and Planning A*, vol. 39, pp. 47-63.

ROBINS, K. and AKSOY, A. (2000) “World Apart and Together: Trial by Space in Istanbul”, in Bridge, G. and Watson, S. (ed.) *A Companion to The City*, Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

ROSS, A. (2000) *The Celebration Chronicles: Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Property Value in Disney's New Town*, London: Verso.

SABATINI, F. and SALCEDO, R. (2007) “Gated Communities and the Poor in Santiago, Chile: Functional and Symbolic Integration in a Context of Aggressive Capitalist Colonization of Lower-Class Areas”, *Housing Policy Debate*, vol. 18, pp. 577-606.

SAHIN, H. (2006) “Kanyon'dan Istanbul'a Bakis”, *Radikal*, 25 October.  
Available: <http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=202555> [16 July 2009].

SALCEDO, R. and TORRES, A. (2004) “Gated Communities in Santiago: Wall or Frontier?”, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 27-44.

SASSEN, S. (1996) “Rebuilding the Global City: Economy, Ethnicity and Space”, in King, A.D. (ed.) *Re-presenting the City: Ethnicity, Capital and Culture in the Twenty-First Century Metropolis*, London: Macmillan.

SASSEN, S. (2001) *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Princeton; N.J.: Princeton University Press.

SASSEN, S. (2002) “Globalization and Its Discontents”, in Bridge, G. and Watson, S. (ed.) *The Blackwell City Reader*, Malden, Mass.; Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

SASSEN, S. (2004) “Afterword”, in Gugler, J. (ed.) *World Cities beyond the West: Globalization, Development and Inequality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SAVAGE, M. (2002) “Social Exclusion and Class Analysis”, in Braham, P. and Janes, L. (ed.) *Social Differences and Divisions*, Oxford: Blackwell.

SAVAGE, M. and WARDE, A. (1996) “Cities and Uneven Economic Development”, in Legates, R.T. and Stout, F. (ed.) *The City Reader*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, London; New York: Routledge.

SCHORSKE, C. E. (1998) “The Idea of The City in European Thought: Voltaire to Spengler”, in Schorske, C.E. *Thinking with History: Explorations in the Passage to Modernism*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

SEKMAN, M. (2003) *Turk Usulu Basari*, 5<sup>th</sup> edition, Istanbul: Alfa Yayinlari.

- SEN, B. (2005) "Soylulastirma: Kentsel Mekanda Yeni Bir Ayrisma Bicimi", in Kurtulus, H. (ed.) *Istanbul'da Kentsel Ayrisma*, Istanbul: Baglam Yayıncılık.
- SENNETT, R. (1994) *Flesh and Stone: The Body and The City in Western Civilization*, New York: W.W. Norton.
- SENYAPILI, T. (2003) "Kacis Adalari", *Arredamento*, vol. 07-08, pp.57-61.
- SERIN, N. (2004) "Kentlerde getto ekonomisi olustu", *Hurriyet*, 15 November. Available: <http://webarsiv.hurriyet.com.tr/2004/11/15/553474.asp> [16 July 2009].
- SHORT, J. R. and KIM, Y-H. (1999) *Globalization and the City*, New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- SILVERMAN, D. (2005) *Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, London: SAGE Publications.
- SIMSEK, A. (2005) *Yeni Orta Sinif*, Istanbul: L&M Yayinlari.
- SOJA, E. W. (1995) "Heterotopologies: A Remembrance of Other Spaces in the Citadel-LA", in Watson, S. and Gibson, K. (ed.) *Postmodern Cities and Spaces*, Oxford, UK; Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.
- SOJA, E.W. (2000) *Postmetropolis: Critical Studies of Cities and Regions*, Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- SONMEZ, M. (1994) *Grafiklerle 1990'larda İstanbul*, Istanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür İşleri Daire Başkanlığı Yayınları.
- SONMEZ, M. (1996) *Istanbul'un İki Yuzu 1980'den 2000'e Değişim*, Ankara: Arkadas Yayınevi.
- SONMEZ, M. (2005) "İstanbul, Parislesmenin Neresinde?" Available: [http://www.sendika.org/yazi.php?yazi\\_no=3771](http://www.sendika.org/yazi.php?yazi_no=3771) [14 July 2009].
- SONMEZ, M. (2006) "Krizden Buyumeye İstanbul: 2002-2006 Donemi Yatirimlari". Available: [http://www.sendika.org/yazi.php?yazi\\_no=8595](http://www.sendika.org/yazi.php?yazi_no=8595) [14 July 2009].
- TANYELI, U. (2004) *İstanbul 1900-2000: Konutu ve Modernleşmeyi Metropolden Okumak*, Istanbul: Akin Nalca Yayinlari.
- TAYMAN, E. (2004) "En Beyaz Turkler: Kuzeyliler", *Tempo*, March.
- THORNTON, S. (1995) *Club Cultures: Music, Media and Subcultural Capital*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- TONNIES, F. (1974) "Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft", in Bell, C. And Newby, H. (ed.) *The Sociology of Community: A Selection of Readings*, London: Frank Cass & Co.
- TUNA, K. (2005) "Villalarda Ice Donuk Hayat Yasaniyor", *Hurriyet Emlak*, 7 April, p. 8.

- TUNCER, B. (2005) “Kentte Yasamanin Kurali Var mi?”, *Radikal*, 21 December, p.12.
- TURGUT, S. (2004) “Can Cekisen Beyaz Turkler”, *Aksam*, 3 June.
- TUTENGIL, C. O. (2001) “Profitopolis: Insani Umursamayan Bir Kentlesme”, *Mimar.ist*, vol. 3, pp. 82-85.
- UCKAN, I. (2005) “Su Uyur Para Uyumaz”, *Milliyet Cumartesi*, 19 September.  
Available: <http://www.milliyet.com.tr/2005/09/18/cumartesi/yazuckan.html> [16 July 2009].
- URRY, J. (2000) *Sociology beyond Societies: Mobilities for the Twenty-first Century*, London; New York: Routledge.
- USTUNDAG, E. (2005) “Zorunlu Goc: Bir Neslin Travmasi”, 22 February.  
Available: <http://bianet.org/cocuk/cocuk/55012-zorunlu-goc-bir-neslin-travmasi> [12 June 2009].
- UYSAL, Y. (2001) “Kenti ve Yasami Sorgulamak”, *Mimar.ist*, vol. 3, pp. 62-63.
- UYSAL, Y. (2003) “Parcalanan Kent, Parcalanan Yasamlar”, *Mimar.ist*, vol. 8, pp. 66-68.
- WEBER, M. (1963) *Selections from His Work*, (with Introduction by SM Miller), New York: Crowell. [The reference was corrected]
- WEBER, M. (1978) *Economy and Society: An Outline for Interpretive Sociology*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- WEBER, M. (1985) *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, London: Unwin Paperbacks.
- WEBSTER, C. (2002) “Property Rights and the Public Realm: Gates, Green Belts and Gemeinschaft”, *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, vol. 29, pp. 397-412.
- WEBSTER, C., GLAZSE, G. and FRANTZ, K. (2002) “The Global Spread of Gated Communities”, *Environmental and Planning B: Planning and Design*, vol. 29, pp. 315-321.
- WEBSTER, C., WU, F. and ZHAO, Y. (2006) “China’s Modern Walled Cities”, in Glasze, G. and Frantz, K. (ed.) *Private Cities: Global and Local Perspectives*, London: Routledge.
- WEHRHAHN, R. and RAPOSO, R. (2006) “The Rise of Gated Residential Neighbourhoods in Portugal Spain”, in Glasze, G., Webster, C. And Frantz, K. (ed.) *Private Cities: Global and Local Perspectives*, London: Routledge.
- WILSON-DOENGES, G. (2000) “An Exploration of Sense of Community and Fear of Crime in Gated Communities”, *Environment and Behaviour*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 597-611.
- YELDAN, E. (2002) *Küreselleşme Sürecinde Türkiye Ekonomisi: Bölüşüm, Birikim ve Büyüme*, 6<sup>th</sup> edition, Istanbul: Iletisim Yayinlari.
- YILMAZ, B. (2003) “Goc ve Kentsel Yoksullugun Istanbul Tarlabasi Mahallesi Orneginde

İncelenmesinde İlk Adımlar, İlk Sorunlar”, *Toplumbilim*, vol. 17, pp. 95-105.