RELOCATION FROM AN INNER-CITY NEIGHBORHOOD TO PERIPHERAL MASS HOUSING: FROM KADIFEKALE TO UZUNDERE, IZMIR

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ENSARI EROĞLU

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL POLICY

JANUARY 2019

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Tülin Gençöz
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayşe İdil Aybars
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıoğlu
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Kezban Çelik (TEDU, SOC)

Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıoğlu (METU, SOC)

Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger Tılıç (METU, SOC)

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name : Ensarı Eroğlu

Signature :

ABSTRACT

RELOCATION FROM AN INNER-CITY NEIGHBORHOOD TO PERIPHERAL MASS HOUSING: FROM KADIFEKALE TO UZUNDERE, IZMIR

Eroğlu, Ensarı
M.S., Department of Social Policy
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıoğlu

January 2019, 141 pages

As neoliberal urbanism spreads into the world urban authorities direct investment into the real estate market and accelerate the commodification of land in order to attract global capital and bolster economic competitiveness. While market forces became the main actor of urban transformation in the Global North, the state took this role in the Global South by urban renewal programs. Slum dwellers in the Global South that compose an important part of the urban poor are hit by urban transformation projects as the dilapidated inner-city areas became the hot point of capitalist accumulation by offering significant rent gaps for real estate market. Turkey's recent experience in squatter settlements provides illustrative lessons about the impact of urban transformation on the urban poor. Within this context, this thesis inquires how urban transformation projects change the livelihood of urban poor and impact the urban poverty dynamics in Turkey based on the Kadifekale Urban Transformation Project (KUTP) held in Izmir. The aim of the KUTP was to resettle the right holders of demolished properties in Kadifekale that was an inner-city squatter settlement into Uzundere Mass Housing Complex, an area in the periphery of Izmir. As recent studies have been critical about the urban transformation projects that relocate

residents of squatter settlements into mass housing estates revealing that they enable displacement and dispossession as a result of forced relocation and the imposition of homeownership with long-term mortgage loans on the urban poor, it was interesting to study a case from Izmir that is known for its social democrat municipality governments. Therefore, in order to detect the impact of the KUTP on the urban poor, 39 interviews with semi-structured questions have been conducted and the planning and implementation process of the KUTP and life of resettled people in Uzundere has been observed. This study demonstrates that the KUTP brought about a differentiation between the 'haves' and the 'have-nots' especially in case of the poor who feel now an increased stress to afford housing expenses and maintain their housing. Low-income residents are made consumers of the privatized land market and involved in the scheme of homeownership. Moreover, low-income residents, particularly those who feel under pressure of housing stress and of immobility in their new environment due to the peripheralization, explain their feeling of socio-spatial exclusion.

Keywords: neoliberal urbanism, urban transformation projects, relocation, urban poor, changing poverty dynamics

ÖZ

KENT MERKEZİNDEKİ BİR MAHALLEDEN ÇEPERDEKİ BİR TOPLU KONUT ALANINA YERLEŞTİRME: KADİFEKALE'DEN UZUNDERE'YE, İZMİR

Eroğlu, Ensarı
Yüksek Lisans, Sosyal Politika Anabilim Dalı
Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıoğlu

Ocak 2019, 141 sayfa

Neoliberal şehirciliğin dünyaya yayılmasıyla, kent yöneticileri, küresel sermayeyi çekmek ve ekonomik rekabeti desteklemek için emlak piyasasına yatırımı yönlendirmekte ve toprağın metalaşmasını hızlandırmaktadırlar. Küresel Kuzey'de kentsel dönüşümün ana aktörü piyasa güçleri olur iken, Küresel Güney'de kentsel yenileme programları ile bu rolü devlet üstlenmektedir. Küresel Güney'deki kent yoksullarının önemli bir bölümünü oluşturan gecekondu sakinleri, yaşadıkları kent merkezideki çöküntü alanlarının emlak piyasası için önemli rant boşlukları sunarak kapitalist birikimin sıcak noktası haline gelmesi nedeniyle kentsel dönüşüm projeleri tarafından etkilenmektedir. Türkiye'nin gecekondu yerleşimlerindeki son dönemlerdeki deneyimleri kentsel dönüşümün kent yoksulları üzerindeki etkileri üzerine önemli dersler sağlamaktadır. Bu çerçevede; bu tez, kentsel dönüşüm projelerinin, kentsel yoksulların geçim kaynaklarını nasıl değiştirdiğini ve Türkiye'deki kentsel yoksulluk dinamiklerini nasıl etkilediğini İzmir'de uygulanan Kadifekale Kentsel Dönüşüm Projesi'ni (KKDP) merkezine alarak incelemektedir. KKDP'nin amacı, kent merkezindeki bir gecekondu alanı olan Kadifekale'de mülkü bulunan hak sahiplerini, İzmir'in çeperindeki bir bölge olan Uzundere Toplu Konut

Kompleksi'ne taşıyıp yerleştirmekti. Son yıllarda yapılan akademik çalışmalar, gecekondu bölgelerinin sakinlerini toplu konut alanlarına yerleştiren kentsel dönüşüm projelerine karşı kent yoksullarını zorla yerinden ettiği ve onları uzun vadeli ipotek kredisi ile ev sahibi yapar şekilde emlak sektörüne müşteri yaptığı nedenlerle eleştirel bir yaklaşım vardır. Bu noktada, sosyal demokrat kimliğiyle bilinen İzmir'den bir örneğin incelenmesi faydalı olacaktı. Bu bağlamda; KKDP'nin kent yoksulları üzerindeki etkisini saptamak için yarı yapılandırılmış sorular üzerinden 39 görüşme gerçekleştirilmiş, ayrıca KKDP'nin planlama ve uygulama süreci ile Uzundere'ye taşınmış insanların yaşamı da gözlenmiştir. Bu çalışma, KKDP'nin, özellikle, şu anda konut masraflarını karşılama ve konutlarını korumak için artan bir stres hissettiğini düşünen yoksullar için 'sahip oldukları' ve 'sahip olmadıkları' arasında bir fark yarattığını göstermektedir. Düşük gelirli konut sakinleri özelleştirilen arazi piyasasının tüketicileri haline getirilmiş ve ev sahibi olma planına dahil edilmişlerdir. Dahası, düşük gelirli sakinler, özellikle çeperde olma stresinden dolayı yeni ortamlarında konut stresinin ve hareketsizliğin baskısı altında hissetmekte, bu da onların sosyo-mekansal dışlanma duygularını açıklamaktadır.

Anahtar kelimeler: neoliberal şehircilik, kentsel dönüşüm projeleri, yeniden yerleştirme, yoksulluk, kent yoksulları

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıoğlu for her generous support and help. This thesis would not have been completed without her guidance, advice, patience, instructive comments, and encouragements.

I also would like to thank Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç and Prof. Dr. Kezban Çelik who have made the thesis more clear and comprehensive with their critical comments, insights, and suggestions.

I am very indebted to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Neslihan Demirtaş-Milz and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Cenk Saraçoğlu for involving me in their research on the Kadifekale Urban Transformation Project which paved the way to this thesis. In addition, their guidance, advice, encouragements, and insights in deciding the topic of my thesis and the research question were also invaluable.

Zuhal Akmeşe (Ph.D.) is another great person who should be gratefully acknowledged. As an ex-resident of Kadifekale and victim of the KUTP, she provided me with great sources and knowledge of Kadifekale and the KUTP by sharing her experiences and the documentary that she had prepared on the project. In addition, she accompanied with me during my first visits to TOKİ Uzundere and introduced me to her ex-neighbors there which were very important and made it more comfortable for me to reach people and gain their trust.

The last but not least person who I should thank is my wife, İmren Borsuk (Ph.D.). Her accompany during some of my visits to TOKİ Uzundere and Kadifekale and her involvement in some of the interviews were priceless. I also should express my deepest gratitude for her patience and understanding towards my hard times of writing the thesis.

Lastly, I would like to thank all people accepted to involve in my research by sharing their experience and knowledge on the project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....iii
ABSTRACT.....iv
ÖZ.....vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....x
LIST OF FIGURES.....xii
LIST OF TABLES.....xiii
CHAPTER
1. INTRODUCTION.....1
2. URBAN TRANSFORMATION, GENTRIFICATION, AND DISPLACEMENT.....4
2.1. Urbanization of Neoliberalism.....4
2.2. The Relation between Urban Transformation and Gentrification.....6
2.3. Gentrification and Displacement.....8
3. URBAN TRANSFORMATION AND URBAN POVERTY IN TURKEY.....14
3.1. The Literature on Urban Poverty.....14
3.1.1. Tangible Assets.....18
3.2. Urban Transformation and Urban Poverty in Turkey.....19
3.2.1. From Early Republic Era to Pre-1980s Period.....19
3.2.2. Post-1980s Period.....22
3.3. Neoliberal Urban Transformation under the AKP.....24
3.4. State-led Urban Transformation in Low-Income Neighborhoods and New Poverty in Turkey.....29
3.5. Recent Urban Transformation Projects in Gecekondu Neighborhoods.....32
4. METHODOLOGY AND THE RESEARCH.....38
4.1. Scope and Aim of the Research.....38
4.2. Methodology.....39

4.3. Sample 42
4.4. Field Research 45
5. IZMIR, KADIFEKALE, THE KUTP, AND UZUNDERE 47
5.1. Urbanization in Izmir 47
5.2. Kadifekale: An Old Inner-city Gecekondu Settlement 54
5.3. The Kadifekale Urban Transformation Project (KUTP) 56
5.4. Uzundere Mass Housing Area: High Rise Appartments as New Homes 60
6. FINDINGS: THE IMPACT OF URBAN TRANSFORMATION PROJECT ON RELOCATED KADIFEKALE RESIDENTS IN TOKİ UZUNDERE 65
6.1. The KUTP as a Non-Participatory Urban Transformation Process 66
6.2. Kadifekale vs. Uzundere as a Spatial Change: Decreasing Opportunity for Contact and Exchange with Family, Neighbors and the City 73
6.3. Kadifekale vs. Uzundere as a Social Change: Erosion of Social Capital 81
6.4. Kadifekale vs. Uzundere as an Economic Change: Increase of Livelihood Costs 88
6.5. Kadifekale vs. Uzundere as a Psychological Change: Relocation Stress and Tenure Insecurity 95
7. CONCLUSION 101
REFERENCES 107
APPENDICES
A. TÜRKÇE ÖZET / TURKISH SUMMARY 129
B. TEZ İZİN FORMU / THESIS PERMISSION FORM 142

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: The Location of Kadifekale and TOKİ Uzundere on the Map of Izmir 43
Figure 2: The Distribution of Buildings in TOKİ Uzundere.....43
Figure 3: The Position of Izmir on Turkey's Map 48
Figure 4: The Boundaries of Izmir Metropolitan City 48
Figure 5: The Map of Neighborhoods Demolished in the KUTP 55
Figure 6: The Layout Plan of Recreational Project of Kadifekale Landslide Site 60
Figure 7: The Layout Plan of Uzundere Mass Housing Estate Built by TOKİ 61

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: The Number of People Interviewed According to Type of Apartment 44
Table 2: Some Demographic Characteristics of Interviewees 45
Table 3: The Rate of Gecekondu Population to Overall Population of Izmir..... 52
Table 4: The Rate of Rural-Urban Immigration to Izmir..... 52
Table 5: The Population of Izmir 53
Table 6: Some Information about Buildings Demolished by the KUTP 59

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

As neoliberal urbanism spreads into the world, cities' landscapes are changing because of the entrepreneurial model of urban development. In collaboration with the private sector and local entrepreneurs, urban governments direct investments into the real estate market and accelerate the commodification of land in order to attract global capital and bolster economic competitiveness. Urban transformation projects accelerate gentrification and increase urban rent. While market forces became the main actor of urban transformation in the Global North, the state took this role in the Global South by aggressive urban renewal programs implemented in unregulated lands, incompletely commodified housing areas, derelict and low-productive areas (Smith, 2002).

Slum dwellers in the Global South that compose an important part of the urban poor by living in illegal settlements with precarious housing rights in inner-city areas are hit by urban transformation projects as the dilapidated inner-city areas became the hot point of capitalist accumulation by offering significant rent gaps for real estate market. A process of "class cleansing" is undertaken by urban transformation projects that aim to enhance the city image in dilapidated inner-city areas (Smith, 1998: 3–4; Whitehead and More, 2007: 2433). Marketed as a slum clearance policy (Gilbert, 2007), many urban transformation projects ended up displacing millions of urban poor and undercutting their capacity to enjoy the right to the city. Within this context, this thesis inquires how urban transformation projects change the livelihood of urban poor and impact the urban poverty dynamics in Turkey.

Turkey's recent experience in squatter settlements provides illustrative lessons about the impact of urban transformation on the urban poor. The urban renewal projects

implemented in squatter settlements in Turkey aimed at producing commercial and recreational areas in the inner city by the relocation of urban poor as a result of state-led urban development (Bartu-Candan and Kolluoğlu, 2008; Kuyucu and Ünsal, 2010). Recent studies have been critical about the urban transformation projects that relocate residents of squatter settlements into mass housing estates revealing that they enable displacement and dispossession as a result of forced relocation and the imposition of homeownership with long-term mortgage loans on the urban poor (Baysal, 2010; Karaman, 2013; Kuyucu and Ünsal, 2010). Scholars demonstrate that they bring about 'urban captivity' (Bartu-Candan and Kolluoğlu, 2008), 'relocated poverty' (Bartu-Candan and Kolluoğlu, 2009) and 'robotic lives' (Karaman, 2013). Focusing on the Kadifekale Urban Transformation Project (KUTP) in Izmir, the third biggest city of Turkey known for its tourist gaze; this study explores how urban transformation projects change the livelihood of urban poor and the dynamics of urban poverty in Turkey. The KUTP is put into place by the collaboration of Izmir Metropolitan Municipality, Konak Municipality and the state's Mass Housing Administration (Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığı, TOKİ). It aimed to relocate residents in Kadifekale that is an inner-city squatter settlement into Uzundere Mass Housing Complex, an area in the periphery of Izmir. Kadifekale is also rearranged as a recreational touristic place as a strategy of place marketing in line with neoliberal urbanization. In order to detect the impact of the KUTP on the urban poor, I conducted 39 semi-structured interviews and observed the planning and implementation process of the KUTP in Kadifekale and Uzundere.

This study proceeds as follows: Firstly, it presents the relation between urban transformation, gentrification and residential displacement especially in the framework of neoliberal urban development. It is followed by discussing urbanization and urban poverty in Turkey with regard to the emergence and transformation of squatter settlements. This part highlights that squatter settlements in Turkey were different from slums in the Global North with its socio-economic assets such as kinship, extended family, neighborhood relations and clientelist networks influencing urban poor's ability to mitigate the consequences of urban poverty. The next part details the methodology

used in the research allowing the comparison of urban poor's livelihood in Kadifekale squatter settlement and Uzundere Mass Housing Complex. Then, it gives a broad overview of urban transformation in Izmir and Kadifekale. It continues with the analysis of the impact of KUTP on the livelihood Kadifekale residents in Uzundere and questions how individual and community assets of urban poor in squatter settlements change with their relocation in the periphery of the city. It concludes with a discussion on the changing dynamics of urban poverty in Turkey.

CHAPTER 2

URBAN TRANSFORMATION, GENTRIFICATION, AND DISPLACEMENT

2.1. Urbanization of Neoliberalism

Urbanization and capitalism are intrinsically related as urban area reflect the logic and dynamics of capitalist production and reproduction (Harvey, 1989, 2008; Lefebvre, 2003; Smith, 1984). Urban built-up is riven by class struggles that are formed and reshaped as a result of capitalist accumulation. As Harvey (2008) puts it:

> Urbanization has always been, therefore, a class phenomenon, since surpluses are extracted from somewhere and from somebody, while the control over their disbursement typically lies in a few hands. This general situation persists under capitalism, of course; but since urbanization depends on the mobilization of a surplus product, an intimate connection emerges between the development of capitalism and urbanization. (Harvey, 2008: 24)

In the welfare state and Fordist model of growth, the state was the main actor regulating cities in a regulatory and redistributive framework. But with the transition to "flexible accumulation regime" (Harvey, 1989), the regulatory framework of welfare state began to dissipate and post-Fordist cities are restructured according to the logic of neoliberalism that gave way to de-industrialization, global economic competition, labor market insecurity, and privatization. Thatcherism in the UK and Reaganism in the USA gave impetus to the globalization of neoliberalism in the world. The old-Keynesian principles that privilege affirmative action, state regulation over the market and welfare policies are curtailed by the flexibilization of capital and of social security, privatization of state-led industries and globalization of economic competition. This restructuring of economies in the world brought about a new division of labor as well: service and knowledge-based

professionals proliferated with the enlargement of multinational companies while de-industrialization eroded the number and capacity of working-class with a growing number of low-paid workers enmeshed in social insecurity under the pressure of global economic competition.

This is a shift from a managerial system of city governance to the entrepreneurial system of city governance (Harvey, 1989) and this new entrepreneurialism is shaped by three features:

i. It is founded upon public-private collaboration, in which local powers are integrated into new investments,
ii. More than rational and coordinated development, it is based on speculation in which public and private sector make its gains on the risks taken by the public sector,
iii. This entrepreneurialism is designed according to "political economy of place rather than territory". The necessity-driven projects such as housing, schools, education are left in a secondary place compared to tourism and capital attractive activities (Harvey, 1989: 5).

Cities reflect as well this neoliberal restructuring with a new spatial organization, defined by Brenner & Theodore (2002) as "urbanization of neoliberalism". Urban areas are reconfigured according to the entrepreneurial model of urban development, turning into "global cities", reflecting the effects of globalization, de-industrialization, and tertiarization (Fothergill et al., 1986; Sassen, 2006). This boosterist type of city development seeks to provide a favorable arena for business-related activities and bolster economic competitiveness (Boddy and Parkinson, 2004).

State's role in this neoliberal mode of urban governance is multifaceted, complex and contradictory. Two interrelated processes are playing out: while "roll-back neoliberalism" is promoting "the active destruction or discreditation of Keynesian-

welfarist and social-collectivist institutions (broadly defined)" (Peck & Tickell, 2002: 37), "roll-out neoliberalism" is forming public-private coalitions replacing Keynesian welfare policies with intensive privatization of public services and covering of federal funding fallouts. "Landscapes of production" turns into "landscapes of consumption" in line with the needs and expectations of global capital and new rising classes (Zukin, 1998: 825). The new form of urban governance is shaped more by a pro-growth coalition composed of private business, local entrepreneurs and urban authorities changing the urban arena based on a more piecemeal and pragmatic planning rather than big-scale regulated master plans (Amin, 1994; Mayer, 1994). This growth coalition facilitates the property-led urban redevelopment and spatialized capital accumulation privileging private interest over the public. While disinvestment in urban economies propels municipal governments to rely more intensively on property taxes and property-led subsidiaries, central and local authorities facilitate the commodification of land and land speculation by allocating resources and directing investment into real estate market.

2.2. The Relation between Urban Transformation and Gentrification

While cities are competing for their place in global capital accumulation, the urban transformation is enhanced by flagship projects, "themed" neighborhoods, infrastructure formation to attract "creative" industry (Hall and Hubbard, 1998; Sassen, 2006; Smith, 1994). This transformation is neither sporadic nor random but planned, organized and generalized across the globe (Atkinson, 2002; Atkinson and Bridge, 2005; Butler and Lees, 2006; Lees, 2003; Smith, 2002; Wyly and Hammel, 1999). Branded by many epithets, "urban renaissance", "urban regeneration", "urban transformation", a vast number of urban development projects are initiated to comply with global economic competition facilitating the commodification, marketization, and privatization of land (Cameron, 2003). Implemented mostly by the rent-seeking pro-growth coalition, these urban transformation projects are implemented with little input from civil society and low-income residents.

Neoliberal urban development heads especially towards the rehabilitation and reconstruction of low-income housing areas in order to generate rent and space for urban growth. Inner city and its nearby surroundings turn into the "soft spot" of urbanization of neoliberalism attracting 'high profile real estate investment, neoliberal policy experiments, and governance changes' (Hackworth, 2007: 13) since they possess a significant rent gap, the difference between the capitalized ground rent (CGR) and the potential ground rent as a necessary condition of urban regeneration (Smith, 1979). Dilapidated areas in inner cities that suffer disinvestment have become subject of neoliberal urban development and subsequent gentrification due to its rent potential. While investment and reconstruction of these areas entice middle classes to buy homes in these areas, low-income residents, unable to afford dwellings in the city center, are pushed into the margins of the city. Thus, with the transition from Keynesian to the neoliberal city, a new episode of gentrification is launched under the rubric of urban transformation projects (Brenner and Theodore, 2002a; Newman and Ashton, 2004).

Gentrification was already debated in the literature related to class succession as a replacement of lower class residents by middle-class residents in redeveloped areas. Ruth Glass (1964) defined gentrification as "a process of class succession and displacement of classes in areas broadly characterized by working-class and unskilled households". It involved particularly the rehabilitation of old neighborhoods inhabited mostly by working classes and their transformation into the middle-class neighborhood (Smith and Willams, 1986). Its meaning was broadened in the 1970s with globalization and transformation of socio-economic divides (Butler, 1997). While it was considered as "a narrow and quixotic oddity in the housing market" in its early manifestations, it became in the 1990s "the leading residential edge of a much larger endeavor: the class remake of the central urban landscape" (Smith, 1996: 39). No longer restricted to the old neighborhoods, gentrification became the new instrument of the neoliberal urban economy (Fainstein, 2001; Hackworth, 2007) and a major determinant of socio-spatial construction of post-industrial cities with all its adverse effects of social polarization, growing inequality, socio-spatial segregation (Davidson, 2007).

Gentrification has spilled over into non-Western cities through policy learning (Atkinson and Bridge, 2005). Not only Western cities but also cities in Brazil, China, Turkey, India, and Singapore are gentrified with neoliberal urban development. Different conjectures of neoliberal urban development shaped by different cultures and socio-economic structure diversified the experiences of gentrification and thwarted the overgeneralization of gentrification in the example of Europe and North America (Lees et al., 2015). Especially in the Global South, more than market forces, the state became the dominant actor that boosted commodification and privatization of land by aggressive renewal programs. It is no longer a consumerist of the capitalist market but an agent of capitalist production in charge of promoting neoliberal urban strategy (Smith, 2002). Hackworth and Smith (2001) refer to the latest neoliberal restructuring of the city as a 'third-wave gentrification' or 'state-led gentrification'. Smith (2002) calls it a 'revanchist model of urbanization'.

2.3. Gentrification and Displacement

Gentrification studies delve into the status of residents; generally the replacement of low-income residents by higher-status residents pushing low-income residents' out-migration (Atkinson, 2000; Newman and Wyly, 2006; Slater, 2006). However, this residential mobility is insufficient to explain the social change in the neighborhood as migration is also intervening in the process. Some studies point out the role of in situ social mobility in neighborhood upgrading or downgrading (Clay, 1979; Teernstra, 2014; Van Criekingen and Decroly, 2003). In addition, demographic shifts can trigger social change especially in economically-developed cities (Buzar et al., 2007), triggered by the influx of young people, middle class residents willingness to stay in the city center and ageing traditional working class (Boterman et al., 2010; Butler and Hamnett, 2009; Rérat, 2012). The upward social mobility of residents prolongs gentrification while in-migrating residents are relatively low income in a prolonged period (McKinnish et al., 2010). The pattern of life differs within the city; different demographic change will affect unevenly

neighborhood transformation. Slater et al. (2004: 1142) highlight the challenges that studies on displacement should address. Firstly, it is hard to trace back long-term displacees. Secondly, researchers' dependence on research grants distributed by state agencies makes it hard to recognize the perspective of the displaced. Shaw (2008) also stresses the methodological challenge of documenting displacees on long-term durée.

Gentrification carries in itself the component of displacement. Firstly, due to financial investment and physical upgrading of the area, higher income residents buy and move into low-income housing areas. Secondly, as a result of the revaluation of the area, low-income people cannot afford to buy into these neighborhoods while pre-existing low-income residents are being replaced by higher-income residents. Hence, the socio-cultural characteristics of low-income neighborhood scale up into a higher class (Kennedy and Leonard, 2001; Smith and Willams, 1986). Marcuse (1986) identifies four types of displacement:

i. economic/physical displacement where residents are forced to move out due to rent increase or due to pressures from landowners, developers etc.
ii. last-resident displacement counting the last resident of the housing unit displaced
iii. chain displacement that considers the gradual out-moving of residents from the housing unit
iv. exclusionary displacement when residents are now allowed to move into new housing units or its surroundings for the reasons beyond their control.

Drawing on Marcuse's (1986) work, Slater (2009) suggests four types of displacement:

i. direct displacement when owners or tenants cannot afford to pay the housing unit as a result of demolition, eviction, expropriation or increased rents;
ii. consecutive displacement as a result of urban decay or deterioration;

iii. exclusionary displacement when new services in the neighborhood are inaccessible to low-income residents and they are displaced under increased living costs.

iv. displacement pressure when poor and working-class families suffer from dispossession during the transformation of the neighborhoods where they live.

There is a lively debate about whether gentrification entails necessarily involuntary displacement of low-income residents (Atkinson, 2002) or exclusion of low-income residents (Marcuse, 1986) or cohabitation of new residents paying higher prices due to the natural turnover of housing units (Freeman, 2005). Empirical studies with different methods and measures present a fuzzy picture. Freeman and Braconi (2004) compare the out-migration levels of gentrifying and non-gentrifying neighborhoods and argue that involuntary displacement does not necessarily follow gentrification. Newman and Wyly (2006) criticize Freeman and Braconi (2004)'s study for ignoring a more subtle way of gentrification. In Latin America, scholars talk about "light gentrification" in which large-scale investment in the inner city does not necessarily lead to the expulsion of low-income residents. Rather, they cohabite with the local population (González, 2010; Sabatini et al., 2009). Ellen and O'Regan (2011) argue that gentrification does not necessarily lead to the out-migration of lower-income residents. They can benefit from the in-moving of higher-class residents with increased property value (Freeman, 2005; Hamnett, 2003; McKinnish et al., 2010). Some studies point out the role of in situ social mobility that ameliorates segregation patterns between higher-income and lower-income residents (Bailey, 2012; Finney and Jivraj, 2013). The upward social mobility of residents can propel gentrification when in-migrating residents are relatively low-income in a prolonged period (McKinnish et al., 2010). Maloutas (2004) shows in his study of Athens that in situ social mobility does not happen in all neighborhoods to the same extent. Especially in working-class neighborhoods with low levels of the residential takeover, in situ mobility is an important catalyst for social change.

Three mechanisms are put forward to explain the relationship between gentrification and displacement. The first explanation stems from the rent gap "the disparity between the potential ground rent level and the actual ground rent capitalized under the present land use" (Smith, 1979: 545). This opportunity for profit draws large-scale investment into devalorized urban areas and urban renovation ends up with displacing low-income residents due to rising property taxes and increased housing prices. While the first explanation delves into production-side of gentrification, the second explanation looks into consumption-side of gentrification. The second explanation builds upon cultural explanations as middle-class identity are drawn back to the city by shifting consumer preferences and penetrate into gentrified areas rendering previously undesirable dilapidated areas attractive for high-income residents (Ley, 2003). This sort of gentrification does not necessarily lead to exclusionary displacement but gentrifiers are added to housing stock without necessarily displacing old residents. The third explanation is related to the economic restructuring of global cities and the reshaping of a new division of labor rendering inner-cities desirable for high-income residents (Hamnett, 1994; Sassen, 1991). This sort of gentrification increases urban density in inner areas without displacing eventually lower-income residents.

While the debates on urban transformation focus more on gentrification and displacement by market-forces in the Global North, studies on the Global South accentuate more the dominant role of the state in shaping urban transformation, gentrification and displacement since there was never a proper Keynesian period in the Global South as in the case of Global North. In the neoliberal transformation of cities of the Global South, the state plays a key role in enforcing urban transformation and gentrification through eviction, demolition, reconstruction and reinvestment (Herrera et al., 2007). Harris' (2008) study of Mumbai and London is significant to display differences and similarities between market-driven and state-driven gentrification as the landscapes of two cities that are far away from each other in political, cultural, economic sense resemble each other with residential and commercial transformation by shopping malls, office complexes, and leisure facilities. In London, market-driven gentrification

redesigned the areas deemed as marginal according to global city outlook with the encouragement of public policies. In Mumbai, state-led gentrification was undertaken under the rubric of slum redevelopment strategies.

Cities in the Global South offered vast areas for urban transformation and gentrification as they are pervaded by unregulated lands, incompletely commodified housing areas, derelict and low-productive areas (Smith, 1987). Marketization of land and urban space by urban transformation projects in these contexts are also related to slum clearance policy (Gilbert, 2007) benefiting from the ambiguous property rights and large informality in the market (Weinstein and Ren, 2009; Wu et al., 2013). Thus, scholars focus on "the right to the city" as these urban transformation projects result in eviction and displacement of low-income residents in most cases. In Turkey, China, India and Latin America, millions of people are displaced as a result of the commodification of land and marketization of urban space as a result of rent-based urban transformation and gentrification. Scholars accentuate the significance of concepts such as accumulation by dispossession, accumulation by displacement, enclosures to understand the effects of urban transformation and gentrification in the examples of Global South and East (Doshi, 2013).

Turkey implemented aggressive urban transformation projects in the last decade as a result of state-led urban development (Bartu-Candan and Kolluoğlu, 2008; Kuyucu and Ünsal, 2010). One of the main targets of these urban transformation projects is squatter housing areas inhabited by low-income people that have benefited from the unregulated land market and incompletely commodified housing rights. These areas are particularly attractive for real estate investment and marketization as they possessed significant high rent-gaps due to their proximity to the city center, public transport hubs, and important commercial avenues. The case under examination here, the case of Kadifekale, is exemplary of these squatter housing areas transformed by urban renewal project by relocating its residents in another district in Izmir, Uzundere. Before its analysis, I will look into the urban transformation and urban poverty in Turkey in the next chapter in

order to demonstrate the urban transformation trajectory and urban poverty in Turkey with its distinct spatial, economic and social transformations.

CHAPTER 3

URBAN TRANSFORMATION AND URBAN POVERTY IN TURKEY

In this section, I will set the stage for understanding urban poverty in Turkey. I will begin by examining briefly the literature on urban poverty. Then, I will continue by discussing the urban poverty and the impact of recent neo-liberal urban transformation on urban poverty in Turkey showing some examples of urban transformation projects.

3.1. The Literature on Urban Poverty

As the urbanization increased at a rising speed in the world especially by rural-urban migration and changing patterns in agriculture, cities faced the pressure of providing shelter, basic infrastructure and social services for the new arrivals. While developed countries tackled the shelter problem more efficiently by constructing social housing; developing countries, unable to provide social housing, experienced the expansion of irregular housing areas as migrants were forced to handle housing problem on their own, often building ramshackle buildings enclosed in the public or private land. The fact that the population of slum areas grew in size and number, marked often by unsanitary conditions, called for further inquiry into reasons and solutions of urban poverty.

Poverty is a dynamic and multidimensional concept whose measurement and conceptualization evolve from the most absolute to the most relative (Piachaud, 1987). While the absolute poverty takes into account calorie intake and material consumption, the relative poverty considers the social aspect of poverty and its changing conditions in time and space (Macpherson and Silburn, 1998; Townsend, 1993). Conceptualizing poverty in terms of relative deprivation, Townsend (1979, 1993) introduced a more dynamic concept of poverty assessing the capability of being a full member of society

that adds the cost of providing resources for social participation into the concept of poverty. As Townsend notes:

> Individuals, families, and groups in the population can be said to be in poverty when they lack the resources to obtain the types of diet, participate in the activities and have the living conditions and amenities which are customary, or at least widely encouraged or approved in the societies to which they belong. Their resources are so seriously below those commanded by the average individual or family that they are, in effect, excluded from ordinary living patterns, customs, and activities… It may be hypothesized that, as resources for any family or individual are diminished, there is a point at which there occurs a sudden withdrawal from participation in the customs and activities sanctioned by the culture. The point at which withdrawal "escalates" disproportionately to falling resources could be defined as the poverty line. Poverty, I will argue is the lack of resources necessary to permit participation in the activities, customs and diets commonly approved by society (Townsend, 1979: 31-57-88).

While Townsend's argument is criticized for being too ambiguous and subjective (McLachlan, 1983), it was innovative as it introduced the subjective sense of deprivation and its comparative feature with regard to society. Studies on subjective deprivation delve into this sociological and psychological aspect of poverty concentrating especially on the sense of despair and frustration. The culture of poverty argument is significant in this respect as Lewis (1966a) detected similar socio-cultural patterns developed among the urban poor in their daily struggle with impoverishment and marginalization.

It is both an adaptation and a reaction of the poor to their marginal position in a class-stratified, highly individuated, capitalistic society. It represents an effort to cope with feelings of hopelessness and despair that arise from the realization by the members of the marginal communities in these societies of the improbability of their achieving success in terms of the prevailing values and goals. Many of the traits of the culture of poverty can be viewed as local, spontaneous attempts to meet needs not served in the case of the poor by institutions and agencies of the larger society because the poor are not eligible for such service, cannot afford it or are ignorant and suspicious (Lewis, 1966b).

While the culture of poverty argument was harangued for reducing poverty as a social pathology and ignoring the social, cultural, economic, political reasons underneath, Lewis was in effect coupling the structural reasons to cultural argument as he "held that cultural adaptations of the poor to economic disappointment and defeat, which were a response initially to the broader features of the economy, became a system of values and attitudes that the poor passed on to their children-a culture of poverty" (Flanagan, 2010: 279). The Culture of poverty was loathed for being resourceful and innovative in order to comprehend the positive adaptive mechanisms generated by the creative capacity of the poor:

These adaptive mechanisms are socially constructed, that is, collectively fabricated by the poor from the substance of their everyday lives, and they allow the poor to survive in otherwise impossible material and social conditions (Harvey and Reed, 1996: 466-467). Along with the change of political economy in the 1970s, studies on poverty went behind the arguments based on individual or group failure to provide their daily needs and highlighted the structural reasons behind the poverty related to the mechanisms of capitalism and world capitalist system (Castells, 1977; Gilbert and Gugler, 1982; Harvey, 1973; Molotch, 1976). The global economic restructuring and changing patterns of class division give rise to socio-spatial inequalities in the major cities of the world (Sassen, 1994). The ensuing impacts of globalization such as deregulation of the market, weakening of welfare policies, deindustrialization, and an increase of socio-spatial inequalities gave way to the rise of "new poverty," "underclass" and "concentrated poverty" locked in poverty and social exclusion. Due to socioeconomic polarization, in global cities, the poor are now secluded in fortified enclaves marked by social exclusion and excluded from the boundaries and opportunities of the city (Marcuse, 1997; Wacquant, 1993; Wilson, 1987). Based on the features of new poverty in Latin America, De La Rocha et al. (2004) stress that the new poverty has the risk of turning into a vicious cycle of poverty as it is marked by social exclusion that reduces the chance to upward mobility among the poor.

While structural adjustment policies are implemented with poverty reduction programs, conceptual and methodological debates on poverty divert their attention into a non-material aspect of poverty rather than income based analysis or relative income poverty lines (Nolan and Whelan, 2011; Ravallion et al., 2009). Amartya Sen introduced the concept of capability into the poverty studies considering the unequal access to opportunities among people. The capability is related to functioning which is "a combination of various 'doings and beings', with the quality of life to be assessed in terms of the capability to achieve valuable functionings" (Sen, 1993: 31). Functioning involves achievements and commodities that endow people with an extent of choices. The distinction between functioning and capability is "between the realized and the possible effects; in other words, between achievements on the one hand, and freedoms or valuable options from which one can choose on the other" (Robeyns, 2005: 95). Capability includes a material and non-material aspect of living such as being happy, being respected, participating in civic life, being free etc. He relates the development to the expansion of real freedoms as people will have to options to live the version of the life they select (Sen, 1999). The Human Development Index (HDI) developed by The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) takes into account capability approach as human development are assessed based on life expectancy, years of schooling and per capita income.

Studies on the asset-vulnerability framework look into the dynamic propelling conditions of poverty as not only the poor but also upper classes can fall into poverty if they are not resilient against external shocks. Poverty and vulnerable are interspersed and interwoven in urban context due to three distinctive characteristics of urban life: commoditization (integration cash economy), environmental hazard (inadequate environmental services, overcrowding, settlement on marginal or degraded land) and social fragmentation (inter-family and communitarian networks different from rural areas) (Moser et al., 1996). Moser (1998) looked into "what the poor have rather than what they do not have" focusing on their assets that make up their resilience of people to respond to external negative changes such as ecological, social, political or economic risks. As Moser puts:

“The more assets people have, the less vulnerable they are, and the greater the erosion of people’s assets, the greater their insecurity” (Moser, 1998: 3).

She defines five sets of assets distinguishing between tangible and intangible ones (Moser, 1996: 25; Moser, 1998: 4):

3.1.1. Tangible Assets

Labor is the main tangible asset either through generating income either wage employment, income through informal work or producing subsistence goods. In developing economies, an Informal sector that is characterized more by precarious and low wages can be the main source of income for the poor to make their ends meet.

The second tangible is human capital that is shaped by education, health, sanitation, environmental hazards that increase or hinder the capacity of people to be productive and develop their skills and knowledge (Moser, 1998: 38-43).

The third tangible asset is housing. As a fictitious asset, it does not provide the only shelter but also can be an instrument of capital accumulation through rent or of home-based production.

Household relations are an intangible asset. Its capacity to adjust to external shocks is dependent on its composition, structure, and cohesion of family members (Moser, 1998). Social capital based on networks of trust and reciprocity forms the other intangible asset. They affect the ability of the poor to resist external shocks and adapt to changing circumstances.

3.2. Urban Transformation and Urban Poverty in Turkey

3.2.1. From Early Republic Era to Pre-1980s Period

At the beginning of the Republic, the government carried an ardent modernizing and civilizing mission and intended to design an urban environment reflecting this modernizing spirit. In the face of economic depression and increasing migration from rural to urban areas before the Second World War, the state took an active role in urban transformation. The local authorities were endowed with wide authorities to deploy urban infrastructure and urban services, elaborate necessary planning requirements and construct social housing to religious and cultural services.

The period in which the Democratic Party ruled the country (1950-1960) coincided with increasing migration from rural to urban areas and intensified industrialization along with the retreat of the agricultural sector. Unplanned and uncontrolled migration generated housing problems for new migrants. Turkey did not develop a social housing system for the poor like it was the case in many Western countries. The provision of social housing remained limited to functionaries not to the new migrants. These migrants developed their own solution to accommodation problem by building houses overnight called as "gecekondu" in public or private lands with no land title or authorization. Illegal migrant settlements began to proliferate in this period at the edge of big cities such as in Istanbul and Ankara. Altındağ in Ankara and Kazlıçeşme and Zeytinburnu in Istanbul are among the first squatter settlements. Industrialization in the 1950s made them more visible especially in industrial areas and these areas were marked by the low quality of life (Keleş, 2004). The administration developed a tolerant approach toward squatter settlements as it was considered as a "social housing problem" in the 1950s. Squatters did not face harsh measures by local and central authorities. The indifference of urban authorities toward these areas turned into indirect support over time (Aslan, 2008).

The regulatory framework in this era also is formed by growing social housing problem for migrants and squatter settlement areas. 6188 law in 1953 known as "The Law About Encouragement of Housing Construction and Illegal Settlements" (Bina Yapımını Teşvik ve İzinsiz Yapılan Binalar Hakkında Kanun) was designed to stimulate housing construction by local authorities on local municipalities' lands and sell these houses to those whose squatter houses are destructed by local authorities or who live in low quality houses. Another law numbered 7367 entered into force in 1959 to accord treasury lands situated in local municipalities' boundaries to local municipalities. Nevertheless, these laws could not halt the construction of squatter settlements in urban land. Democratic Party also engaged in urban transformation in big cities destructing many historical areas.

New regulations and laws are implemented to regularize these illegal settlements in the 1960s. The vote potential of squatters increased with the Municipality Law numbered 307 that was put into force in 1960 stipulating the election of mayors by local voters. With this law, gecekondu residents turned into a significant actor with an increased voice on local politics and decision-making. After the 1960s, with growing pluralism in the political arena, parties engaged in vote-seeking and the urban land turned into a major instrument of distributing favors to the poor. Despite the preventive laws to halt the construction of squatter settlements, urban authorities continued to provide infrastructure and social services to sustain the livelihood of squatters. The law numbered 327 in 1963 authorized to provide social services to these squatter settlements only for once. The squatter law numbered 775 in 1966 was another regulation designed for the improvement, destruction, and prevention of squatter settlements. These laws were in effect covert attempts to legalize squatter settlements. Many squatter settlements that grew in number and in space during the 1960s and 1970s in big cities evolved into municipalities in this period (Keleş, 2004). In the 1970s, the clientelist relations between urban authorities and squatters were well established and the chain migration characterized by new migrants settling in areas where their relatives or kinds were already settled continued. Gecekondu neighborhoods associated with local affiliations

became commonplace. The 1970s were also marked by chronic political instability. Mass housing projects were implemented for the first time in this period (Tekeli, 1992).

The land tenure patterns and the developmentalism prevailing in the pre-1980 period set the conditions for the spectacular expansion of gecekondu settlements in Turkey based on the moral economy of housing (Buğra, 1998). On one hand, the abundance of large public land and labor-intensive industries allowed urban authorities to construct a public sympathy for squatter settlements recognizing their right to shelter. Not the urban land but the industrialization was the main driver of the surplus benefit of the urban bourgeoisie, thus, there was not an intensive competition for urban rent between different segments of society during this period (Buğra and Keyder, 2003). Squatters were not only a potential vote base provided cheap and docile labor for emergent urban bourgeoisie (Şenyapılı, 1982). On the other hand, gecekondu areas enabled new migrants' access to housing and job opportunities through family and kinship relations. It helped urban authorities to avoid potential social unrest due to their weak redistributive capacity. Through clientelist distribution politics, the residents of squatter settlements were also able to acquire full title to land. Nearly 10% of squatter settlements in Istanbul received the title to land by 1980 (Yönder, 1987).

The words of the president of Başıbüyük Embellishment, Revival, and Preservation Organization illustrate how the clientelist relations between gecekondu residents and the state shaped the evolution of these settlements:

The neighborhood was built in 1978. It was in the status of a village until 12 September 1980. Since the chief of the village (muhtar) was of military origin, 1984-1955 Özal government came here and delivered the title deeds (tashih belgesi). In every electoral period, the infrastructure; electricity, water, roads, schools, mosques, health centers developed and natural gas came here two years ago. But since we could not agree with the major of local municipalities and they did not take the votes they desired, they did not distribute the proprietorship titles (tapu).

3.2.2. Post-1980s Period

The economic liberalization in Turkey that started after the 1980 coup d'état can be considered as the beginning of a neoliberal urban transformation in Turkey (Öniş, 1991). 24 January 1980's decisions laid the foundation for the Turkish economy to pass from import substitution model to a free market economy. While the import-substitution model was protective of the national market, the free market model catalyzed the incorporation of Turkish economy into the global market and weakened the redistributive policies of Turkish state which were already insufficient in the pre-1980 period.

The terms of the implicit deal between squatters and urban authorities on gecekondu settlements began to crumble in this period. First of all, formal employment opportunities decreased due to the transition to a market economy with the retreat of the state from the economy. The public-sector employment was reduced with the privatization of state-owned enterprises. De-industrialization with the emergence of outsourcing and subcontracting opportunities decreased the number of stable jobs in the private sector. Thus, these factors decreased the number of stable jobs with social security which were also a mechanism of upward mobility for rural-urban migrants decrease (Boratav et al., 1998; Cam, 2002; Şenses, 1994). Secondly, the interest in urban rent intensified among different segments of society including the state. The Motherland Party (Anavatan Partisi, ANAP) (1983-1991) enlarged the power of local authorities in urban construction and land development and engaged in the commodification of urban land and land speculation. TOKİ was founded in 1981 by the Housing Development Administration Fund Law numbered 2487. It was charged with regulating public land, subsidizing the provision of low-income housing areas and regularizing squatter housing areas. A new regulation that was passed such as laws numbered 2805 in 1983 and 2981 in 1984 was a kind of squatter amnesties (gecekondu affı) to transform these single-house squatter settlements into multistorey buildings. The law numbered 2805 in 1983 on the actions for constructions that are built in contrary to regulations on constructions and squatter settlements (İmar ve Gecekondu Mevzuatına Aykırı Olarak Yapılan Yapılara

Uygulanacak İşlemler) categorized squatter settlements as those that will be improved (ıslah), preserved or destructed. These reconstruction amnesties in the mid-1980s opened the way of commercialization of squatter settlements and the increase of urban rent in gecekondu areas (Güvenç and Işık, 2002: 212). The squatter dwellings began to turn into multiple story building blocks with the regularization of squatter settlements. Many squatter settlements began to turn into municipalities in this period.

The incorporation of the Turkish economy began to change the façade of major cities in Turkey, especially of Istanbul in line with the global city (Keyder and Öncü, 1994). The interest of private business into real estate market increased as the cities began to change in line with the emergence of service sector with an increasing number of gated communities, business centers and shopping under the neoliberal logic. New emergent class began to take an interest in gated residencies in peripheral areas. The inflow of global capital and place marketing in favor of the touristic gaze intensified the land speculation in line with the urbanization of neoliberalism (Boratav et al., 1996). Thus, there was no longer abundant urban land for urban authorities to distribute or for a squatter to occupy. This created pressure on commodification and commercialization of urban rent. Along with district specialization and the retreat of manufacturing sector into peripheral areas, squatter settlements especially those close to job opportunities of the manufacturing sector in the city lost their previous productive utility for the city (Keyder, 2005: 130)

With the commodification and commercialization of urban land, new migrants who settle in big cities in the 1990s had no more chance to accede to housing constructing informal squatters in vacant land or job opportunities due to the shrunken labor market. The reciprocity relations of gecekondu neighborhoods was loosening in favor of new networks of solidarity based on cultural, political and religious divisions that became more spatialized relocating in different parts of the city (Güvenç and Işık, 2002: 212-213). The migration in the 1990s also had a distinctive ethnic character as Kurds composed the major part of this migration coming from Kurdish-majority provinces of

Eastern Turkey because of the war between the PKK (Kurdistan Workers' Party) and the Turkish state. It is estimated that residents of over 3,000 villages and hamlets were forcibly displaced by Turkish security forces mostly during the 1990s (Jongerden, 2007: 82). Scholars and non-governmental organizations estimate that the number of forced migrants change between one and three millions (see HÜNE, 2006; Jongerden, 2007; Kurban, Çelik and Yükseker, 2006). Most of those forced migrants moved into metropolitan cities like İstanbul, Izmir, Adana, Mersin and Bursa where they have their family or kinship ties. Those involuntarily flows of people to the metropolitan cities dramatically changed the social composition of the urban space and brought about some new urban social problems. In Izmir, Kadifekale was one of the first areas inhabited by forced migrants. Especially after the arrival of new comers, the presence of the Kurdish movement in Kadifekale and in the city started to increase which brought about a shift in the perception of Kadifekale by Izmirlis and city governors.

3.3. Neoliberal Urban Transformation under the AKP

The other major stimulus to neoliberal urban restructuring came with the Justice and Development Party (Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi, AKP). The 2001 economic crisis led to an economic crash in which Turkey's gross national product was downsized by 9.5 percent (Akyüz and Boratav, 2003). Under the constraints of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the coalition government led by the Democratic Left Party (Demokratik Sol Partisi, DSP)-ANAP-Nationalistic Action Party (Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi, MHP) was propelled to implement institutional reforms in line with neoliberal policies. The AKP that rose to power in 2002 accelerated these reforms. Turkey was able to reach high rates of economic growth, 7.5 percent per annum during the 2002-2006 periods (Öniş and Bayram, 2008). The growth revived and accelerated the hegemony of neoliberal politics on the urban landscape.

The inflow of international capital has brought about a new labor market with the reinforcement of finance, insurance, and real estate sectors, while the agricultural and

industrial sectors were backsliding. The new middle class is particularly based in the service sector and they have new consumptions habits (Kozanoğlu, 1993; Pınarcıoğlu and Işık, 2005; Şimşek, 2005). These new classes are endowed with high incomes and education and they are the potential clients of construction companies with new demands and expectations. The construction companies intensified the building of luxurious residencies in order to attract these new elites and transform their demands into investment opportunities. With the increasing socio-spatial segregation, a competition between upper classes for symbolic power also heightened (Bali, 2004; Erman, 2001; Kozanoğlu, 1993). Housing emerged as a status indicator and a new lifestyle (Töre and Kozaman Som, 2009).

The AKP government accelerated the commodification of land by the privatization of public properties, implementation of mega projects, gentrification in dilapidated neighborhoods and relocation of squatter residents into mass housing complexes developed by TOKİ (Bartu-Candan and Kolluoğlu, 2008; Kuyucu and Ünsal, 2010). Trembled by the repercussions of the 1999 earthquake, Istanbul turned into a major construction area with urban transformation projects. Luxurious gated communities and high-rise buildings began to transform Turkish cities' landscape with the support of TOKİ. Gated communities became attractive for the new middle class for its prestige, security, plan type, natural environment, perceived belonging to a community, fashion, accessibility, contemporary urbanization, and earthquake resistance (Baycan-Levent and Gülümser-Akgün, 2005). Neoliberal spatial transformation put its stamp as well on social fragmentation. On one side, high- income residents began to form luxurious gated communities with higher standards of infrastructure and private social services. On the other side, low-level income residents continued to live in the outskirts of squatter settlements or they moved into mass housing complexes developed by TOKİ as a result of urban transformation projects. A big discrepancy between these globalized elites and poor of old shantytowns emerges with different household income, socioeconomic preferences and material culture (Keyder, 2005).

The AKP government urban transformation in order to reproduce its hegemony mobilizing individual property claims, redistributing urban land in non-commodified urban land and avoid social and economic crises (Çavuşoğlu and Strutz, 2014). Urban transformation projects are implemented in many areas: the construction of new centers at the outskirts of the city, the renewal of dilapidated old neighborhoods, the transformation of squatter settlements and construction of new mass housing projects in vacant lands. In line with the neoliberal agenda, the institutional framework of urban governance in Turkey has been reshaped. The AKP enlarged the functions of the TOKİ especially by the law numbered 5162 Law on 5 May 2004. These enlarged functions are summarized by TOKİ as:

i. TOKİ is authorized to realize all kinds and scales of development plans, to have made all these types of plans and to alter these plans in areas determined as the mass housing settlement regions.
ii. TOKİ is authorized to expropriate all the annexes and buildings on or inside the lands and areas owned by real and legal entities, within the framework of its duties under Law.
iii. TOKİ is authorized to develop renovation of squatter areas for eliminating or regaining via rehabilitation to make construction implementations and to perform financial regulations. Also, in this framework, TOKİ is authorized to determine the construction prices under the realized construction costs, considering the income status of squatter areas regions' residents, current construction costs, natural disasters and current economic status of the provinces in which implementation are made. (TOKİ Corporate Profile, 2017)

Contrary to the previous governments' tolerance of squatter settlements, the AKP implemented a zero-tolerance policy towards them. The new Criminal Code in 2004 (Law No. 5237) made the construction of gecekondu a criminal offense with imprisonment of up to five years in prison. Between 2004 and 2010, 7,449 illegal settlements were demolished in Istanbul (ANKA, 2010).

The Law of Metropolitan Municipalities (2004, No. 5216) and the Law of Municipalities (2005, No. 5393) gave competencies to local municipalities regarding urban transformation. The article 73 of the Municipality Law numbered 5393 stipulates that:
A municipality can carry on urban transformation and development project in conformity with urban development to restore and reconstruct antiquated urban parts, to develop technology parks and social audits and to take precaution against earthquake risk or to preserve the historical and cultural tissue of the city. The areas which will be subject to urban transformation and development projects will be declared publicly by the majority of total parliament members.

The same article sets the principle of consensus as a requirement of urban transformation projects for the areas that will be evacuated, destructed or expropriated by the state:
The consensus is essential for the evacuation, destruction, and expropriation of constructions in urban transformation and development project areas. The lawsuits to be filed by property owners within the framework of the urban transformation and development projects are first discussed and settled in the courts.

The Municipality Law numbered 5393 associated urban transformation with physical transformation rather than social transformation. As the examples of urban transformation projects illustrate in the next part, this aspect also reflects on the agenda of urban transformation projects especially on those implemented in squatter settlement areas.

The law numbered 5366 on Preservation by Renovation and Utilization by Revitalizing of Deteriorated Immovable Historical and Cultural Properties in 2005 enlarged the competences of municipalities and the special administrations of municipalities (İl Özel İdareleri) for urban transformations projects in areas that are deteriorated and on the edge of losing its special quality and that are approved and declared as protected areas for its cultural and natural properties.

With these laws, TOKİ became the main authority to plan, demolish, construct and sell houses to low-income groups. TOKİ also engaged in facilitating the implementation of mega projects and privatization of public land. Urban transformation projects are popularized by the AKP government as projects to distribute housing to the poor at a low price and formalize urban land making the urban poor landowners by upgrading the socio-economic environment of neighborhoods. The AKP also changed the housing financing regime with the Law numbered 5582 in 2007 in order to change the low rate of housing credit use in Turkey. As the private credit market is revitalized, TOKİ facilitated the provision of state-subsidized credit to low-income people. This system (TOKİ) unburdened the state of the responsibility to provide social housing for the poor and served to normalize using the land-lease system as a commodity.

These laws empowered TOKİ and it 'became the sole agency for regulating the zoning and sale of almost all state-owned urban land (excluding military land)' (Kuyucu and Ünsal, 2010: 1486). In 2012, the law no 6306 on the transformation of a Natural Disaster area enlarged the state's role in urban transformation as the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization became the sole agency of planning authority bypassing local governments. Thus, the state acquired the right to bypass existing planning laws that take into consideration natural or historical preservation codes, citizen's right to oppose plans, the principle of consensus with citizens whose houses will be demolished ore built, the courts' authority to stop natural disaster area projects.

Turkish welfare regime that was traditionally based on an unequal corporatist regime in which unpaid family labor, self-employment, and informal employment practices were very important also changed during this period. The number of formal employment opportunities decreased and the support of family is weakened due to the spatial distance between relatives with the shift of industry into peripheral areas (Buğra and Keyder, 2006). New migrants are not able to enjoy the opportunity to build up gecekondu in public areas or find employment in public sector like the migrants of previous eras, thus, they are more vulnerable to unemployment and housing problem. Moreover, local or

kinship ties which were particularly strong in squatter settlements have been dissolving due to urban transformation projects that relocate residents into peripheral areas.

3.4. State-led Urban Transformation in Low-Income Neighborhoods and New Poverty in Turkey

Slum clearance programs are implemented in a wide variety of countries including Western Europe, China, India, Turkey, Latin American countries, South Africa in order to transform dilapidated areas into modern housing stocks and boost the real estate market with reinvestment in these areas. Especially the Global South provided large land stock for urban transformation projects as squatter and slum areas in the Global South contained a significant rent gap with the abundance of illegal housing areas and low-productive areas (Smith, 1987).

Squatter settlements and slum areas in inner-city areas of Turkey are among this large land stock that can be used for the commodification of land and real estate development. Those close to the city center and public utilities are even more attractive for real estate developers due to the high rent gap in these areas. Moreover, while the global cities are competing to create new financial, commercial areas and tourist centers, these areas are considered as disturbing city landscape. Precarious property rights and low socio-economic status of residents in these areas facilitate as well the process of bargaining with right holders (Kuyucu and Ünsal, 2010). Furthermore, the poor in gecekondu areas is no more of use for urban bourgeoisie due to the deregulation of the job market, deindustrialization in city centers and decrease of formal employment opportunities. Thus, the basis of legitimation of squatter residents is lost (Karaman, 2008: 521). In addition, while central and local authorities used a more inclusive discourse against the poor viewing squatter areas as a social housing problem in previous eras due to clientelist-populist policies, an exclusive discourse against the poor and slum areas emerged with the change in urban governance regime with neoliberal restructuring using aestheticization of poverty to legitimate urban transformation projects (Roy, 2004).

Squatter areas are branded as social decay zones and reprimanded as crime areas sheltering invaders, terrorists or looters. Squatters are depicted as lazy, occupiers of public land living off the taxes paid by the society and failing to adapt to modern urban life (Erman, 2001; Tok, 1999). In order to produce consent, not only brute police force but also the media is used with an accusatory and reproaching tone against those who resist urban transformation projects (Çavuşoğlu and Strutz, 2014).

The growth coalition in Turkey is formed by the collaboration of government with municipalities, interest groups, and real estate developers. Urban transformation projects are branded as "providing a house to the poor with installments" (Karaman, 2011), "free houses" (www.ensonhaber.com, 2015), "support to the house owner and the tenant" (Biter, 2013). With the empowerment of TOKİ as aforementioned, TOKİ designed and implemented urban transformation projects with the help of municipalities and the private sector. TOKİ defines the main purpose of urban renewal as:

The main purpose of urban transformation is to increase the life quality with urban projects, balance the increasing economic inequalities and global pressures, build up neighborhoods that privilege values such as eliminating social inequalities and housing stress in order to solve several problems (TOKİ Corporate Profile, 2017).

Three types of settlements are targeted: gecekondu areas established before 1985 that have mostly legal status as a result of gecekondu amnesties between 1983 and 1987, gecekondu areas established after 1985 and slum areas in historical city centers (Karaman, 2008: 521). The first type of squatter houses is those that turned into multistorey buildings due to gecekondu amnesties. The second type is those built by gecekondu dwellers that form mostly ethnically heterogeneous neighborhoods. The third type is derelict areas that need to be rehabilitated in historical centers (Karaman, 2008: 521)

TOKİ developed a financial model for urban transformation projects. After signing out a protocol with local governments, TOKİ declares the selected land as a regeneration area. Based on a public-private partnership model, TOKİ regenerates the area through a private company. Each stakeholder -TOKİ, local government, a private company, and citizens- take their share when the project is completed. TOKİ distributes housing rights unevenly to residents as tenants are excluded from house ownership while only, "right holders" are recognized as partners of the urban transformation project. If these right holders accept to pay the difference between the estimated value of their house and the new houses, they accede to right to resettlement in TOKİ mass housing areas. For those who are unable to pay the difference, TOKİ implements a mortgage system as they are able to take state loan and pay it in long-term based on monthly annulments or right holders can accept the estimated value of their house and sell these properties to the authority. TOKİ has the power to expropriate the property unless an agreement is reached.

These urban transformation projects do not in effect exclude the squatter owners from housing but seek to include them as "development partners" with the formalization and commodification of urban land (Karaman, 2013; Mukhija, 2003; Nijman, 2008). This is a way of self-responsibilization of the urban poor (Rose, 1999: 19) which attribute the right to housing to those with financial means. In this respect, the state is unburdened with its social function to provide housing for the poor and the market turns into the new medium of housing (Keyder, 2005: 130).

On one hand, the mobilization of individual property claims and redistribution of non-commodified space was instrumental in maintaining its hegemony (Çavuşoğlu and Strutz, 2014) and propelled people to look for a new modern house (Öncü, 1997). On the other hand, the implementation of an urban transformation project faced resistance by inhabitants. They form neighborhood associations, file lawsuit against private developers, TOKİ or local municipalities, withdraw their electoral support from local municipalities. Many NGOs, like the Chamber of Urban Planners and the Chamber of

Architects, also help residents to organize a resistance or upgrade urban transformation projects according to the residents' needs. However, inhabitants in these areas have in general precarious property rights with different tenure structures such as those who hold tapu-tahsis documents, "occupiers" occupying public and private land and tenants. This different tenure structure and individual bargaining with authorities in search of private gain serve to divide resistance movements and hamper local activism (Kuyucu and Ünsal, 2010). Moreover, the local capacity of neighborhoods to negotiate with local authorities and their past history of resistance affect their ability to form a cohesive resistance movement against urban transformation projects (Kuyucu and Ünsal, 2010; Lovering and Türkmen, 2011). Urban authorities also use an aggressive state force against resistance movements in order to make residents accept the terms of urban transformation projects.

3.5. Recent Urban Transformation Projects in Gecekondu Neighborhoods

As many studies point out, the poverty in gecekondu areas in the 1990s were distinguished from the poverty encountered in the Third World as extreme poverty was rare among squatters due to the fact that they were benefiting from public land, familial and kinship networks and formal employment opportunities in urban areas (Buğra, 1998; Buğra and Keyder, 2003; Keyder, 1999b; Pınarcıoğlu and Işık, 2001). Homeownership has a corrective impact on income distribution in Turkey (Başlevent and Dayıoğlu, 2005). In this respect, gecekondu ownership acts as a mechanism that pulls the poor out of extreme poverty. Moreover, gecekondu areas in Turkey are characterized by strong familial and kinship ties. Large families are living under the same roof as squatters build storey additions for the married children. The tenure structure of gecekondu areas is also variegated: there are those who had tapu-tahsis documents, those who had formal title deeds, tenants squatter built public land, squatter built on private land etc.

Recent studies on poverty in Turkey attract attention to the rise of new poor vulnerable to falling into extreme poverty as the new poor is deprived of opportunities to upgrade

its status due to the ensuing effects of neoliberal politics: rise of the informal sector, a decrease of the affordable housing market, dissipation of familial and kinship ties. Thus, this kind of poverty can evolve into extreme poverty encountered in the Western and Third World countries with its perverse effects: social exclusion, the growth of underclass, stigmatization of poor neighborhoods, street crime. Pınarcıoğlu and Işık (2008) demonstrate in their study on poverty in Sultanbeyli, a gecekondu neighborhood that developed into a district in Istanbul that the reciprocity networks which provided a mechanism of incorporation for previous migrants have been dissipating. The previous reciprocity networks and solidarity relations are being replaced by a market-based mentality that decreases the chance for upward mobility for the new poor embedded in the informal market and weak redistributive mechanisms. In their study in a squatter neighborhood, Erman and Türkyılmaz (2008) find that dependent on cash and help from government agencies, poor families are in competition to access to help from government agencies In addition, Turkish welfare regime which is traditionally based on family networks, reciprocity relations and transfer of resources among the family losing its previous significance due to ageing population, increasing spatial distance between relatives and growth of nuclear family (Buğra and Keyder, 2003; Kalaycıoğlu and Rittersberger-Tılıç, 2000). Social exclusion is a part of new poverty. In Western cities of Turkey, Kurds are vulnerable to seclusion and marginalization as they constitute a new underclass with low skills and opportunities for upward mobility (Kurban et al., 2007; Saraçoğlu, 2010). The survey by Adaman and Ardıç (2008) in gecekondu areas of six metropolitan cities in Turkey show that poverty is the main factor of feeling the sense of exclusion and poor people have difficulty to accede to basic social services. They highlight also Kurds who migrated to metropolitan cities due to displacement have a more acute feeling of social exclusion.

According to the data of Turkish Statistical Institute (Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu, TÜİK), there are 19.209.928 buildings in Turkey and 40% of them are illegal, while 67% of them are without housing permit (TOKİ Corporate Profile, 2017: 25). Regarding gecekondu areas and illegal housing in Turkey, TOKİ conducts 129 different urban renewal projects

in coordination with central and local authorities containing 236.366 houses (TOKİ Corporate Profile, 2017: 25). While the major focus of these urban renewal projects is big metropolitan cities of Turkey such as Istanbul, Ankara, Izmir, and Bursa; there are also urban renewal projects implemented in medium and small cities such as Denizli, Erzurum, Erzincan, Gaziantep, and Trabzon. Many studies on these projects consider them as forced eviction and relocation since they are implemented as a non-participatory process excluding an important part of inhabitants (tenants) from the project, imposing long-term mortgage loans on low-income population and displacing the residents of inner-city squatter settlements into the margins of the city (Baysal, 2010; Karaman, 2013; Kuyucu and Ünsal, 2010) that generate 'relocated poverty' (Bartu-Candan and Kolluoğlu, 2009) and 'robotic lives' (Karaman, 2013).

Istanbul has been the main façade of urban transformation projects in the last two decades. Many urban transformation projects are initiated in gecekondu areas such as Başıbüyük, Gülsuyu, Gülensu, Derbent, Kuştepe and Kazım Karabekir. Ergin & Rittersberger-Tılıç (2009)'s research on Güzeltepe urban transformation projects displays that it is far from addressing the needs and expectations of squatters so that a part of local residents moved into other areas. Moreover, it generated new problems for the residents such as difficulty in paying monthly installments, the increase in living expenses and the difficulty of transportation. Tarlabaşı and Sulukule projects came into public limelight as these projects are implemented in dilapidated historical neighborhoods and composed of ethnically heterogeneous communities. These areas were also stigmatized for being slum areas associated with street crime.

Gentrification and urban transformation in Tarlabaşı are realized by state-led cultural and tourism promotion activities in order to boost the real estate sector and land speculation (Sakızlıoğlu, 2007). The urban transformation that was planned for Tozkoparan Squatter Settlement risk impoverishing squatters as there is a large gap between residents' capacity to pay monthly annulments and the credit they have to pay for TOKİ houses. Öktem Ünsal (2015) displays rather than the common good of residents, stakeholders of

Tozkoparan urban transformation project such as TOKİ, the cooperative and municipalities acted in order to maximize their profit. The planning of urban transformation project was non-participatory. Zayim (2014) demonstrates differentiated urban citizenship implemented against residents of Tepeüstü-Ayazma district with the inegalitarian distribution of housing rights among squatters due to their tenure status. She argues that state replicates social inequalities building the supremacy of private property rights over all forms of tenure status. Thus, contrary to the agenda of TOKİ for facilities the homeownership for the poor, it reproduces inequalities and denies substantive housing rights to the disadvantaged. Another study on Bezirganbahçe which is a TOKİ social housing area for residents of Ayazma and Tepeüstü squatter settlements notes that the project failed in its agenda of the socio-economic betterment of gecekondu residents (Bartu-Candan and Kolluoğlu, 2008). Rather, residents are locked in urban captivity characterized by new forms of poverty, feeling of social exclusion, immobility in space and ethnic tensions.

Comparing Tarlabaşı and Başıbüyük resistance movements against urban renewal projects, Kuyucu, and Ünsal (2010) demonstrate that search for private gain, use of state violence, the inability of resistance organization to build an organized movement are structural impediments to form a cohesive resistance movement. Based on the comparison of Başıbüyük and Sulukule urban transformation projects, Karaman (2014) argues that grassroots mobilizations do not necessarily resist against neoliberalism but remain within the conceptual space of neoliberalism based on cost-benefit calculation. Urban transformation project in Sulukule was highly criticized for erasing the Romany tissue of the neighborhood. Residents are relocated into Taşoluk TOKİ houses which are constructed 40 km away. Many of these residents had to move out of this TOKİ since they could not afford to pay monthly annulments. Based on the comparison of Ayazma, Başıbüyük and Gülsuyu resistance movements against urban transformation projects, Lovering and Türkmen (2011) display that the urban transformation projects in Turkey is put into force in a chaotic and contingent way depending on the force of resistance movements despite the fact that they are all implemented with a highly centralized and

top-down approach of local and central authorities using police force and provocative discourse of media. While in Ayazma, urban authorities were able to implement rapidly urban transformation plan due to disorganization of its community; in Gülsuyu, they had to compromise due to the stringent opposition and in Başıbüyük, urban transformation project faced several interruptions due to spontaneous and disorganized resistance.

Urban transformation projects are also implemented in other big cities such as in Ankara and Izmir. Urban renewal in Dikmen Valley in Ankara is among the first urban transformation projects. This project aims to build a recreational center with commercial and cultural investment. The research of Yaman (2011) on Dikmen Valley Third Stage shows that the project was non-participatory and new houses built by TOKİ do not correspond to the demands and expectations of the inhabitant. Many residents lost their property since they could not pay monthly annulments or they could not afford increased housing expenses. A discrepancy between local inhabitants and newcomers occurred in time. Türker-Devecigil (2006) also demonstrates that rather than searching for a consensus, Ankara metropolitan government sought to dominate the decision-making process. Moreover, the project generated a social polarization between inhabitants as social housing areas are characterized by high residential density with limited parking, sport or playground areas while the high-rise luxury buildings designed for upper-income residents are donated with better social amenities. In the Northern Ankara Entry Project which is located in a strategic zone of Ankara, squatter settlements are replaced by high-rise buildings constructed by TOKİ. But this project was built upon a binary resident structure divided between new residents with higher income and education and residents of squatter houses with low income and education. While those built for new landowners were luxurious residencies with elegant hotels, villas, affluent restaurants and football, tennis and golf center; those built for squatter residents were of lower standards of construction and lower social arrangements for residents. The study of Kütük İnce (2006) on Northern Ankara Entry Project displays that inhabitants fell excluded and hold grief for their old houses. This project also lacked a participatory planning process for squatter residents' inclusion into urban transformation. Many residents of squatter houses ended

up moving into other areas. In Ferahlı neighborhood which is also an inner city neighborhood at a strategic location of Izmir, residents of squatter houses that are relocated into new TOKİ houses face the danger of displacement as they have difficulties in paying the monthly installments (Sekmen, 2007). This project also dissipated intimate neighborhood relations and feeling of belonging to a community that is exemplary of gecekondu areas.

Taking into consideration the strengths and shortcomings of urban transformation projects in Turkey, I will explore the impacts of urban transformation project in Kadifekale in Izmir on its residents. In the next section, I will introduce the methodology implemented in this study.

CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY AND THE RESEARCH

4.1. Scope and Aim of the Research

As many scholars point out, urban transformation projects in Turkey generate perverse effects by displacing the impoverished lower classes located in the inner city neighborhoods to mass housing estates built in the periphery rather than enabling their socio-economic betterment (Bartu-Candan and Kolluoğlu, 2008; Demirtaş-Milz and Saraçoğlu, 2011; Erman and Türkyılmaz, 2008; Kuyucu and Ünsal, 2010). As urban transformation projects aim the transformation of squatter settlements, it is supposed that not only the physical structure but also social, cultural, economic and political structure will change or is expected to change in Turkish cities. On the one hand, in line with neoliberal agenda and inter-city competition for global capital, growth coalitions are in search of revalorizing dilapidated areas that are generally inhabited by lower classes or communities that are left on the margins of society. On the other hand, this urbanization of neoliberal policies displaces and disperses these populations abandoning them in peripheral areas of the city. While gecekondu areas were visible in the city landscape showing it morally very distant and disturbing for its viewers, the living conditions of these areas' residents are now disguised in high-rise buildings of TOKİ. However, while urban transformation projects put these people out of sight in the city centers, they are lacking the policies of income distribution, employment, and social policy instruments that are necessary for the socio-economic betterment of the urban poor.

The negative consequences of urban transformation practices/projects are generally unexplored by their initiators and advocates (Shaw, 2009). While the new poor are vulnerable to lock into poverty being deprived of opportunities for upward mobility (Pınarcıoğlu and Işık, 2008), exploring the social impacts of relocation on the residents

of gecekondu neighborhoods are of significant importance to understand the current and future dynamics of poverty in Turkey. In this respect, the main purpose of this thesis is to understand the social impacts of urban transformations on relocated gecekondu residents not only in the short term but also in the long-term contextualizing its planning, implementation, and future consequences. Selecting the urban transformation project implemented in Kadifekale, this research aims to understand the current and potential consequences of the resettlement of the Kadifekale residents in Uzundere and their poverty conditions.

4.2. Methodology

Urban transformation projects has many names such as urban renewal, urban regeneration, urban revitalization, urban development as they aim to meet several goals: recover slum areas by reorganizing the social-physical environment, rehabilitate historical places by renovating them to sustain their viability, provide urban area with necessary physical-social infrastructure, revitalize the urban area by efficient and effective strategies, better the socio-economic condition of residents by regenerating the urban area. In the Kadifekale urban transformation process, the project intended to rehabilitate the slum area prone to disaster by relocating the residents to a safer and cleaner environment and upgrade their socio-economic conditions.

Transformation and planning are multidimensional concepts that require a socially and spatially integrated approach. Urban transformation not only alters the physical environment but also restructure the socio-cultural environment of residents. Bayraktar (2006) highlights that urban transformation projects should construct more developed, viable and secure places; conduct researches on sociological adaptation and develop necessary financial methods to implement these projects without bringing any additional burden on the public budget. The construction and development plans should also correspond to public needs and take into consideration the demands and expectations of residents. Galdini (2005) notes that urban transformation needs to accomplish a wide

variety of purposes: physical and ecological purposes by developing new green areas, improving physical infrastructure and rehabilitating the slum areas of the cities with new buildings of quality; economic purposes by creating new sectors of employment and drawing economic investors into the city; social purposes by improving neighborhood relations, integrating people into the urban area and by resolving the social disturbances in the urban area; cultural purposes by protecting the cultural-historical and natural richness and drawing touristic and academic investments to the relevant area.

The requirements for urban transformation according to Williams (2000) are:

i. effective coordination of all civil practices
ii. construction of integrated policies for particular spatial units
iii. the departure from a linear approach of space determinism and mechanical projects of spatial intervention to the involvement of overall concern for people and their needs
iv. the inclusion of historically neglected groups with an effective information gathering and managing system
v. development of policies to empower them especially economically
vi. strengthening of planning with continuity, evaluation, and redirection of policies.

This study analyses the social impacts of urban transformation on relocated gecekondu residents based on Kadifekale urban transformation project. While the empirical studies regularly neglected those who are displaced due to the difficulties of identifying, locating and contacting the displacees (Atkinson and Flint, 2001), the relocation of gecekondu residents in a district neighborhood in Turkey gives the opportunity to locate and contact the relocated squatters more easily.

Semi-structured questions are used to analyze how the urban transformation project has altered the spatial, social and economic environment of residents by comparing their situation in Kadifekale and Uzundere. This study also tries to understand the role and

perspective of urban authorities such as Izmir Metropolitan Municipality and TOKİ on urban transformation. The questions were mainly concentrated on seven dimensions:

i. The physical transformation of housing/space
ii. Change in the working condition of the household members
iii. Change in the family welfare
iv. Change in social space and socialization process
v. Change in the social network
vi. Change in the belonging and the sense of social exclusion
vii. Current problems

Urban transformation projects generate a spatial transformation that significantly alters the physical condition of the household. Especially for the poor, housing is an asset to the viability of the household. The demographic character is also affected by the spatial transformation decreasing or increasing the home space of families. Thus, the first questions are about physical transformation and delve into whether this transformation conforms to their demographic characteristics.

Secondly, the housing also affects economic opportunities of the household. Its centrality alters considerably the material conditions of households as they can minimize transportation expenses, accede more easily to public facilities or enjoy economic opportunities in the city center. Thus, I also posed questions about the changing economic conditions by evaluating the change in their employment, working conditions and change in the family welfare.

Thirdly, physical transformation brings about a social change with relocation to another physical area and social adaptation to the changing environment. During the resettlement process, many residents leave their social networks behind such as their neighbors, friends, fellow townsmen who provide them not only with material support but also with social support. As Ayata and Güneş-Ayata (1996) accentuates, gecekondu denotes more

than a residential space for the urban poor. It contains a social network that empowers the urban poor despite the low standards of living conditions.

> Gecekondu is surrounded by many relatives to help them the trouble of money, to solve the problems with state authorities, from finding a job to make a home, from marriage to moral support. In the light of this situation, the attraction of squatter settlements is considered to be the abundance of fellow townsmen (hemşehri) and relatives (Ayata and Güneş-Ayata, 1996: 76).

Thus, I also focused on social transformation under three headings: change in social space, change in the socialization process and change in the social network. Moreover, physical transformation transforms the sense of place attachment among residents. The bonds between people and spaces can give way to positive or negative associations of people with specific places. I sought to estimate the changing place attachment from Kadifekale to Uzundere. Hence, it will be possible to assess the change in the sense of belonging to the neighborhood.

I ended the interviews with questions that compare the overall satisfaction of Kadifekale residents in Uzundere compared to their prior satisfaction with Kadifekale in order to give overall information about whether this urban transformation project empowered the residents' physical, social and economic environment.

4.3. Sample

The sample of the research is drawn from Kadifekale residents who were resettled in Uzundere Mass Housing Area constructed by TOKİ in Uzundere/Izmir in or before 2010. Therefore, two filter questions firstly asked to define if the interviewees fit this criterion. According to the Izmir Metropolitan Municipality publishing, 1,095 right holders in the Kadifekale accepted a house in the Uzundere Mass Housing Area (Izmir Metropolitan Municipality, 2007). I interviewed 39 residents. It was also common that my interviews turned into a replica of focus group discussions since most residents I interviewed were sitting and chatting with their neighbors.

The mass housing estates of Uzundere are located in the north-west of Izmir, at the western side of Uzundere village, on the upper part of Izmir-Çeşme highway.

Figure 1: The Location of Kadifekale and TOKİ Uzundere on the Map of Izmir (Google Maps, 2018)

Figure 2: The Distribution of Buildings in TOKİ Uzundere (Google Maps, 2018)

The mass housing estates are composed of several blocks that contain 16-storey buildings with 3-5-6-8-10 units or 8-storey buildings with 6 units.

Most residents of Uzundere mass housing estates were composed of inhabitants who moved there as a result of Kadifekale urban transformation project. However, there are also blocs composed of people who bought their houses and moved there voluntarily. In my consideration, 70-80 percent of the mass housings come from Kadifekale. The structures of the buildings that are distributed to the residents are like this:

i. 3 bedroom, 1 living room in 16 storey buildings, 120 m²
ii. 2 bedroom, 1 living room in 16 storey buildings, 95 m²
iii. 2 bedroom, 1 living room in 16 storey buildings, 75 m²
iv. 2 bedroom, 1 living room in 8 storey buildings, 95 m²

Table 1: The Number of People Interviewed According to Type of Apartment

Type of Apartment	Number of People Interviewed
3+1 - 120 m², 16 storey buildings	13
2+1 - 95 m², 16 storey buildings	12
2+1 - 75 m², 16 storey buildings	7
2+1 - 95 m², 16 storey buildings	7
Total	**39**

I tried to reach out to inhabitants from these 4 types of apartments to reach a wide diversity of people for my sample and I paid special attention to reach an equivalent number of inhabitants from these 4 types of apartments. I interviewed at least 7-8 inhabitants from each type of apartments.

Moreover, I tried to provide well-balanced men-female participation and a wide diversity of ages for the composition of the sample population since the contribution of a wide diversity of people is important for the results of this research. In this respect, I reached well-balanced men-female participation (20 male and 19 female) although I cannot say

the same thing for people of different ages. The interviewees are mostly from middle ages or old ages and I could not reach the young people since they are mostly at work or I could not find them during my stay in the fieldwork area. However, I made some informal interviews with youth from 6 to 15-year-old since they were with their parents during my interviews.

Table 2: Some Demographic Characteristics of Interviewees

Question	**Answer**	**Number of People**
Gender	Male	19
	Female	20
Marital Status	Married	34
	Single	2
	Divorced	3
Education	Illiterate	6
	Literate	3
	Primary School	23
	Secondary School	3
	High School	4
Occupation	Retired	13
	Unemployed/House Wife	16
	Unemployed	7
	Low Qualified Worker	1
	Running His/Her Own Business	2
Age Distribution	18-25	1
	25-35	4
	35-45	9
	45-55	8
	55-65	8
	65-75	6
	>75	3

4.4. Field Research

45 in-depth interviews have been conducted in this study. 39 of those interviewees gave answers to all questions while the rest (due to rejection or being unwilling to be the part of the research) is conversations about their changing livelihood. I asked the interviewees whether they had any objection to the recording before the start of the interview. They

were recorded in case of acceptance, and in case of objection, the interviews were not recorded. I took notes on important points as much as possible during the course of the interviews. The research area was visited several times on various dates. I paid visits to Uzundere just for observations of the area and people in the beginning. Then I visited the area with a female researcher who lived in Kadifekale before destruction. The first access to Kadifekale residents was through her connections since her ex-neighbors and acquaintances were living in Uzundere. A couple of connections of the above-mentioned researcher are used on the first day of the interview in order to reach out to other Kadifekale residents via the snowball method. Most of the interviews were held with random individuals seen in the area. I observed during my fieldwork that Kadifekale residents were willing to engage in interviews but some of them did not want the interviews to be recorded. Moreover, I also observed social and economic relations in the area during the fieldwork. In the early days of my fieldwork, I understood that I would not be able to reach out to female interviewees alone as they were reticent to engage in conversations with me. Thus, I asked a female researcher who had experience in urban transformation studies to hold some interviews with me. Furthermore, I gained academic experience in Kadifekale urban transformation project as I worked as a project assistant in other studies on Kadifekale during the implementation of Kadifekale urban transformation project and observed the destruction of Kadifekale neighborhood. I deciphered the records of interviews held with the local community in the destruction area and with the representatives of various institutions and associations. These experiences endowed me with greater understanding to contextualize Kadifekale urban transformation project and assess its social, spatial, economic and cultural consequences.

CHAPTER 5

IZMIR, KADIFEKALE, THE KUTP, AND UZUNDERE

5.1. Urbanization in Izmir

Izmir, known historically as Smyrna, is built upon Bayraklı-Tepekule and it is surrounded by the bay of Izmir in the Aegean Sea. Its history harkens back to the Antique age. The city bears the traces of many civilizations that ruled the city such as İonia, Roman Empire, Byzantine Empire, the Knights Hospitaller, Genoese rule, the Seljuk. It became part of Ottoman territory in 1425. Along with Istanbul, Izmir was a critical trade center of the Ottoman Empire known for its multicultural character. It was incorporated into trade capitalism in the 17th century and turned into a critical port city of the Ottoman Empire connecting it to international trade routes. The city developed its commerce and industrial activities in the 19th century and its infrastructure was improved with new sea and transportation networks. The city was composed historically of Konak, Alsancak and Kadifekale districts but it was expanded through Karşıyaka, Bornova, Buca, Karataş, Güzelyalı, Göztepe with the establishment of railway networks (Atay, 1978). These areas became the new suburban developments for the wealthy Levantine families living in the city. In the 19th century, the city was known for its non-Muslim population composed of Catholics Greeks, Catholic Armenians, Orthodox Greeks, Catholic and Protestant Europeans and the epithet of Izmir as “Smyrna of the infidels” (Gavur Izmir) stems from this multicultural non-Muslim character of the city (Smyrnelis, 2016). While the population of Izmir was just approximately 2000 in the 17th century, it increased to nearly 100 000 in the second half of the 18th century, to 200 000 in the 19th century and reached out to 230.000 in the early 20th century (Smyrnelis, 2016).

Figure 3: The Position of Izmir on Turkey's Map (Izmir Metropolitan Municipality Department of City Planning and Urban Development Directorate of City Master Plan, 2009)

Figure 4: The Boundaries of Izmir Metropolitan City (Izmir Metropolitan Municipality, 2014)

With the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire, the city remained under the occupation of Greek Army for three years which led to the emigration of Turkish families into the inner provinces of Anatolia. After the foundation of the Turkish Republic in 1923, an agreement on population exchange between Greece and Turkey was thrashed out by Greek and Turkish governments. Greeks of Anatolia were forced to immigrate to Greece while the Turks of Greece to Turkey. Nearly 400 000 Turkish population settled in Izmir from Greece and Balkans especially in Buca and Bornova (Arkon, 1989: 11; Karadağ, 2000: 55). They moved into houses left by Greek families or formed new settlements in Izmir. The city was composed of Konak, Alsancak and Güzelyalı districts and Karşıyaka was a sub-center connected to Izmir's center by sea transportation and it was possible to reach out to Bornova and Buca by railway transportation.

The new Republican regime set the modernization based on Westernization as one of the main pillars of the Turkish Republic and sought to transform the cities according to Western approaches and modern outlook. The first plans of the city, the Danger-Prost Plan, were elaborated by French engineers with an aim to turn the city into an economic center, endow it with a modern façade and erase the destruction of the war from the city's landscape (Kaya, 2002: 93). In 1930, the city municipality enlarged its borders to new districts such as Karşıyaka, Bayraklı, and Turan on the north and northeast of the bay. Alsancak continued to be a major commercial port and recreational center of the city.

As the import-oriented model was implemented by the new regime to boost industrialization in Turkey, Izmir developed its infrastructure and industrial capacity in the 1950s with the help of Marshall and foreign aids such as the construction of Bandırma-Izmir motorway, the establishment of a cement factory in Kokluca (Altındağ), a silo in Alsancak (Kaya, 2002: 117). The city grew with the formation of new neighborhoods along Halkapınar, Mersinli and Salhane directions. The city was also attracting migrants with its growing industrial capacity since the 1930s with the formation of early gecekondu neighborhoods in Kadriye, Yeni İstiklal, Zeytinlik, Yeşildere neighborhoods along Basmane-Buca axis and Cumhuriyet and Naldöken neighborhoods along Basmane-Çiğli axis between 1928 and 1935. These gecekondu

settlements grew with the increasing industrialization in the 1950s over Kadifekale, 1st and 2nd Kadriye, Istiklal, Zeytinlik, Yeşildere, Cumhuriyet, Naldöken, Kuruçay, Kançeşme, Boğaziçi, Gültepe, Ferahlı. In this period, the city was not only receiving migrations from the Aegean region which Izmir is part of but also from Balkans with the emigration of Turkish and Muslim families who settled into the environs of Hatay and Buca districts. In order to eradicate the squatter problem, the municipality was to supply low-cost dwellings based on Decree No: 5218 (5218 nolu Kararname). This decree intended to sell the lands transferred from National Estate to municipalities to low-income groups to be paid in ten or twenty years. However, this ideal did not realize and squatter problem continued with the accumulation of migrants in Konak and its environ hills. In this period, the sea view symbolized the "finer distinctions of financial worth and symbolic hierarchy" (Öncü, 1997: 65) between low-income and high-income families. Upper income families were living in Alsancak, Konak, Karşıyaka and Göztepe along the Izmir bay. Moreover, luxurious apartments were built in Göztepe, Güzelyalı and Karşıyaka with the construction of Mustafa Kemal Coast Boulevard.

In the 1960s, the urban landscape of Izmir was characterized by low-density residential areas with one or two-storey dwellings with gardens. Urban density was concentrated in Konak, Alsancak, Karşıyaka, and Balçova districts and there was a significant share of agricultural areas in Buca, Çiğli, Gaziemir, Karabağlar, Güzelbahçe and Narlıdere districts (Hepcan et al., 2013). In 1965, the Legislation on Flat Ownership (Kat Mülkiyeti Kanunu) entailed a significant impact on the urban landscape of Izmir as it authorized the construction of high-rise buildings with 11-12 storey blocks composed of individual housing units. Gecekondu settlements continued to grow in areas close to industrial and commercial centers of Konak and Alsancak. By 1960, 23% of dwellings in Izmir were of gecekondu type and the population living in gecekondu areas composed 34% of the total population in Izmir (Karpat, 1976). The city continued to develop beyond municipal boundaries in the 1970s. The 1972 master plan envisaged the industrial development of the city on the North-South Axis while residential development was designed for the

East-West axis (Yücel-Young and Datta, 2007). Summer houses were developed in the outer fringes of the city such as in Narlıdere, Seferihisar, and Urla.

In the early 1980s, Turkey left import-oriented industrialization model and embarked on export-oriented industrialization model especially after the so-called "stability decisions" of 24 January 1980. This was the formal beginning of neoliberal policies liberalizing the trade through the free market economy. In line with structural adjustment programs of the IMF and the World Bank, Turkey implemented neoliberal policies downsizing its public sector and liberalizing foreign trade and financial markets. The tradition of urban planning through master plans left its place to top-down decisions implemented by the central government in collaboration with municipal authorities and private investors (Kaya, 2002: 170). The urban land turned into an important resource of profit-making strategy and surplus extraction for national and global capital. During this period and with an accelerating pace after the 1990s, the region of origin of immigrants to Izmir changed from the Aegean region into the South-eastern regions of Turkey that contributed as well to the multicultural character of the city with a notable size of Kurdish migrants. The rate of immigration into the city which was 27% in 1965 rose to 37.9 in 1980 (Mutluer, 2000) and the squatter population rose to 44.7% by 1986 (Karadağ and Mirioğlu, 2011). The Mass Housing Legislature was adopted in 1984 instituting TOKİ to eradicate gecekondu problem and supply low-cost housing for the urban poor. The first large-scale housing projects were implemented in this era but they were not unable to correspond to the needs and expectations of the gecekondu population. Moreover, the implicit consent of municipal authorities toward the gecekondu population continued during this period. The stagnant construction industry was bolstered by large-scale housing projects composed of several apartment blocks known as "site" in Turkish that was designed more for middle-class and upper-middle-class residents. In line with the backsliding of the state with regard to the provision of social services, these apartment blocks were providing their own private social facilities such as children parks, garages, and gardens. Izmir developed as well its touristic facilities during this period in order to

attract global capital. With the construction of Izmir-Çeşme highway, Çeşme became one of the famous touristic locations.

Table 3: The Rate of Gecekondu Population to Overall Population of Izmir

Year	**1965**	**1970**	**1980**	**1986**
Rate (%)	29,7	36,7	40	44,7

Source: Ayan, 1973; Karadağ and Mirioğlu, 2011; Keleş, 1972; Sevgi, 1988

"Urbanization of capital" (Şengül, 2003) intensified in Izmir with private investment into the real estate sector in the 1990s. In 1994, private investment in Izmir increased sharply (Altınçekiç and Göksu, 1995). Luxurious sites in the form of detached villas were constructed in Narlıdere, Güzelbahçe, Seferihisar, Zeytinalanı, Çeşmealtı, and Urla as summer houses. Immigration into Izmir also continued reaching out to %42.7 in the 1990s (Mutluer, 2000) that perpetuated the problem of a housing shortage for the urban poor. As neoliberal policies accelerated under the AKP governments that have been in power since 2002, inter-city competition in search of global capital intensified. Izmir lagged behind Istanbul in relation to its incorporation into neoliberal globalization (Kaya, 2010) whiles the so-called Anatolian tigers (Gaziantep, Denizli, Kayseri, and Konya) took a leap in neoliberal economic development. Izmir Metropolitan Municipality put emphasis on tourism and cultural projects as a strategy of neoliberal urbanization. The urban growth in Izmir is driven by the built up of a railway network connecting remote districts, construction of industrial zone in the northern regions and construction of the Izmir International Airport (Hepcan et al., 2013).

Table 4: The Rate of Rural-Urban Immigration to Izmir

Year	**1950**	**1965**	**1980**	**1990**
Rate (%)	17,1	27	37,9	42,7

Source: Mutluer, 2000

With the neoliberal restructuring, the spatial and social façade of the city also changed. Between 1999 and 2001, 17 shopping centers were built using 543,232 m² area (Özbek-Sönmez, 2001). The definition of the ideal home also changed with neoliberal policies and became identified with closure, security, and segregation. Luxurious apartments in the form of gated communities intensified in Bayraklı, Urla, Seferihisar, Mavişehir, and Narlıdere. The urban landscape of Izmir in the 2000s presented a very different picture compared to that of the 1960s. Low-density residential areas of the 1960s left its place to high-density residential areas with the increase in built-up areas from 8.18% in 1963 to 28.88% in 2005 and the erosion of agricultural land from 13.65% in 1963 to 5.19% of the total area in 2005 (Hepcan et al., 2013). The city became more congested with a connection to Urla to the West and Karşıyaka to the north and enlargement of built-up areas in Buca and Bornava at the expense of its previous agricultural character (Ibid.). Izmir is today the third metropolitan city of Turkey as it is the third largest city of Turkey with a population 4,223,545 after Ankara (5,346,518) and Istanbul (14,804,116) according to 2015-2016 statistics (Turkish Statistical Institute, 2017). It surpasses Ankara in population density as it is the second city with 352 people following Istanbul (2849) according to 2016 statistics (Turkish Statistical Institute, 2017). The city is composed of 30 districts including Aliağa, Balçova, Bayındır, Bayraklı, Bergama, Beydağ, Bornova, Buca, Çeşme, Çiğli, Dikili, Foça, Gaziemir, Güzelbahçe, Karabağlar, Karaburun, Karşıyaka, Kemalpaşa, Kınık, Kiraz, Konak, Menderes, Menemen, Narlıdere, Ödemiş, Seferihisar, Selçuk, Tire, Torbalı ve Urla and covering 11.906,85 km² area (Izmir Metropolitan Municipality, 2014).

Table 5: The Population of Izmir

Year	**1975-1980**	**1980-1985**	**1985-1990**	**1995-2000**	**2007-2008**	**2015-2016**
Population	1 685 725	2 000 733	2 366 343	3 078 981	3 795 978	4 223 545

Source: Turkish Statistical Institute (2017)

The urban development projects in Izmir turned into "hegemonic projects for the production of space" not only by dominating discourses and developing collaborative relations among central and municipal authorities, private investors, academicians, NGOs, but also enforcing coercive-legislative mechanisms (new laws, amendment laws, project-based laws, decree-laws, etc.) (Penpecioğlu, 2012). In line with place-marketing strategies, a number of urban transformation projects were designed for Izmir in order to valorize the urban land. The implicit consent of municipal authorities toward gecekondu areas began to disappear. The Master Plan for Metropolitan Region of Izmir (Izmir Kentsel Bölge Nazım İmar Planı) was passed in 2007 and revised in 2009. The Master Plan for Metropolitan Region of Izmir revised in 2009 at 1/25000 notes that 4.310 ha area of the entire 11.102,8 ha settlement area in the central city of Izmir is composed of gecekondu areas and lands that are developed as a result of gecekondu amnesties and these areas compose 39% of dwellings in the central city. The plan envisages 15 renovation-improvement areas that cover 4328 ha area in the central city (Izmir Metropolitan Municipality Department of City Planning and Urban Development Directorate of City Master Plan, 2009: 124). Among these renovation-improvement areas, it intends to rearrange Kadifekale Historical Park and generate a recreational area in Kadifekale-Yeşildere area. As I will dwell on the impact of Kadifekale Urban Transformation Project (KUTP) on inhabitants in Uzundere, I will give the next a detailed outline of this project.

5.2. Kadifekale: An Old Inner-city Gecekondu Settlement

Kadifekale is situated on an upfront hill at 186 meters and its historical name is Pagos. The land has a very high commercial value as it is located at the center of Konak and has one of the best sea views of Izmir. It is surrounded as well by Kadifekale Castle and an archaeological site built upon the remains of Hellenic, Roman, and Byzantine Empire. Kadifekale contained parts of nine neighborhoods: Kadifekale, Imariye, Kosova, Altay, 1st Kadriye, Hasan Özdemir, 19 Mayıs, Vezirağa, and Yeşildere. Among these

neighborhoods, Kadifekale includes Imariye neighborhood entirely. As a district, it is included within the boundaries of Konak Municipality.

Kadifekale is an old squatter area as it received migrants who escaped from Balkan Wars and settled in Ballıkuyu, Eşrefpaşa and Degirmendere neighborhoods of Kadifekale in the early 20th century (Mutluer, 2000: 68). During the interwar years (1939-1948), new squatter areas, such as 2nd Kadriye, Gürçeşme, Boğaziçi, Gültepe, and Ferahlı neighborhoods were formed (Mutluer, 2000: 69). The density of Kadifekale district increased after 1950 with legal and illegal dwellings in Yeşildere, 2nd Kadriye, Istiklal, Cumhuriyet, Gültepe, Ferahlı, Zeytinlik, Naldöken, Kuruçay and Boğaziçi neighborhoods.

Figure 5: The Map of Neighborhoods Demolished in the KUTP (Akdağ, 2009)

The area was characterized by close kinship and fellowship ties. After the 1980s, as the origin of migration to Izmir diverted from the Aegean region to the South-eastern region, Kadifekale received Kurds from South-eastern Turkey, notably from the city of Mardin.

After the 1990s, the migration of Kurds to Kadifekale accelerated due to the forced displacement of Kurds from South-eastern Turkey. The area is known as well for its Kurdish identity and it was one of the strongholds of Kurdish movement in Izmir. The area resembles the slums in Latin America and it was constructed as “dangerous” in the eyes of many Izmirlis. The area is attractive for tourists due to its historical character but many people from Izmir do not frequent this area because of its bad reputation.

The research of the Izmir Chamber of Commerce on the socio-economic profile of Kadifekale displays that 50% of dwellings in the area are gecekondu (Karayiğit, 2005). The area has a very young population as one-quarter of the overall population is composed of children. The average population by a dwelling is 4,1 which is above the national average. The majority of residents in the area are working in the informal sector without social security. 9% of workers are officer-laborer, 4% are artisan-trader, 25% are housewives, 6% are retired and 41% are defined as others. The area is undereducated as nearly 5500 people, one-sixth of the population do not know reading and writing. There are 7654 children at the age of primary education and 780 of them are not able to go to school. 2420 young people do not go to high school. The report indicates the problems of Kadifekale as construction and infrastructure, transport, education, health facilities, the walls of Kadifekale Castle, security and lack of order in neighborhoods and schools, insufficient infrastructure for sports, social and cultural activities and lack of marketplace and parking areas (Karayiğit, 2005: 19–22).

5.3. The Kadifekale Urban Transformation Project (KUTP)

Izmir entered into a rapid neoliberal urban transformation process, especially in the mid-2000s. In this context, the first large-scale project implemented and completed in Izmir is the Kadifekale Urban Transformation Project (KUTP). The project was carried out on the region literally known as Kadifekale, which covers 9 neighborhoods (Imariye, Ondokuz Mayıs, Vezirağa, Hasan Özdemir, Yeşildere, Kosova, 1. Kadriye, Altay and Kadifekale) within the boundaries of the Konak Municipality. The master plan of the

Metropolitan Planning Office in 1973 highlighted the necessity of slum clearance in Kadifekale (Kaya, 2002). The area was promulgated as a “land exposed to disaster” (landslide) in 1978, 1981, 1998 and 2003 with the decisions of the Council of Ministers, based on the ground survey studies prepared periodically between 1962-2005 (Izmir Metropolitan Municipality, 2018). However, according to professional organizations, the landslides in the area have been active since 1923 and in that occurred in 1977, 800 of the approximately 5,000 houses in the region were found to be uninhabitable (Chamber of Geology Engineers, 2012). In spite of all these events and facts, the situation has not been intervened until the beginning of the 2000s due to clientelist-populist policies. After many years of negligence and indifference toward the slum character of the area by central and municipal authorities, the commercial and touristic value of the area came into the limelight especially with the rise of neoliberal urban policies in Izmir in the 2000s. Within this context, Izmir city governors decided to eliminate the risk of disaster with a project that had foreseen the evacuation of people who were living in the region. The number of people affected by the project is estimated to be 20,000 (Mutlu Kılıç and Göksu, 2018). Demirtaş-Milz and Saraçoğlu (2011) consider the KUTP as an example of ‘internal displacement’ since it displaced lots of inhabitants from their inner-city place of living and relocated them into the outskirts of the city. In this thesis, I also accept and use this conceptualization of displacement for the KUTP.

The KUTP started with a protocol signed on 04.02.2005 between TOKİ, Izmir Metropolitan Municipality, and Konak Municipality. According to this protocol, the aim of the project is defined as (1) demolition of the slum and illegal buildings in Kadifekale and (2) allocation of the residential units in the Uzundere Mass Housing Area built by TOKİ to the right holders in Kadifekale (Ministry of Environment and Urbanization, 2012). For this purpose, TOKİ produced 3,080 units of houses in Uzundere and Izmir Metropolitan Municipality purchased 2,688 of them with a purpose of allocation of 1,764 units for Kadifekale residents and 924 units for the other urban transformation projects (Izmir Metropolitan Municipality, 2010).

TOKİ and Izmir Metropolitan Municipality signed a long-lasting "Izmir Konak Uzundere Slum Transformation Sales Protocol" on 25.08.2006 and an additional protocol on 02.06.2008 according to which 2,688 of 3,080 houses were transferred to the Izmir Metropolitan Municipality with a repayment period of 180 months (15 years) (Ministry of Environment and Urbanization, 2012).

On the other hand, on 20.07.2006, the Izmir Metropolitan Municipality has taken the decision of expropriation for 1,968 houses located in the region covering an area of 42 hectares (Izmir Metropolitan Municipality, 2007). However, only 1.095 of right holders accepted the house offer of the Municipality in Uzundere (Izmir Metropolitan Municipality, 2007), and the rest rejected the offer which caused them to be sued by the Municipality for a resolution. As to some of interviewees and representatives of civil society organizations, most lawsuits resulted in favor of residents and they got important levels of value increases, in some cases about 100-200%, for their properties in Kadifekale.

However, if you look at the narratives of the Municipality you may think that the KUTP is one of the perfectly implemented projects on behalf of the residents. For instance, the Mayor of the Izmir Metropolitan Municipality, Aziz Kocaoğlu, who was one of the architects of the project from the beginning says just before most of the people accepted the offer of the Municipality that:

> We do not ignore the social dimension of the case. In any case, we have to produce the formula that will enable people to continue their work and maintain their livelihood. The issue is not solved by just saying 'I did this house for you, come and live here.' The important thing is how those people will maintain their lives. We very well know that urban transformation is actually a social transformation while moving people who came from Anatolia and used to live in one-story orchard houses into the 10-13-storey apartment buildings. Urban transformation is not just demolishing unhealthy buildings and constructing new apartment buildings. Creating social reinforcement areas and introducing new green spaces to the city should form the essence of this project. In Uzundere; in addition to sterile mussel production facilities all kinds of social

facilities such as a marketplace, a multi-purpose hall, sports areas, and computer - library area will be available. (Izmir Metropolitan Municipality, 2007)

Table 6: Some Information about Buildings Demolished by the KUTP

Number of Storey	Number of the Buildings	Area of the Buildings
1 storey	822	63.873
2 storey	774	85.323
3 storey	325	58.201
4 storey	41	26.754
5 storey	5	7.428
6 storey	1	2.844
Total	1.968	244.423

Source: (Akdağ, 2009: 761)

The demolitions that started in September 2007 were completed in the first quarter of 2013 (Izmir Metropolitan Municipality, 2013). In the meantime, as of April 2011, afforestation activities were started in the region (Izmir Metropolitan Municipality, 2011).

Izmir Metropolitan Municipality announced that the area will be transformed into a recreational area as a result of the KUTP that will "render the area with a new face" (yeni yüzüne kavuşturacak) (Izmir Metropolitan Municipality Department of City Planning and Urban Development Directorate of City Master Plan, 2009). By arranging the landscape this recreational area will include:

i. A visual and functional value for the whole city,
ii. Walking, running and bicycle paths, seating units, viewing terraces, playgrounds, picnic terraces, promenades, outdoor sports fields, multipurpose green amphitheater, kite hill, and children's play areas,
iii. New areas for exhibiting and sharing of local production, artistic activity, training, etc. in addition to the installation of seating units, resting areas, and exhibition stands.

Figure 6: The Layout Plan of Recreational Project of Kadifekale Landslide Site (Akdağ, 2009: 762)

5.4. Uzundere Mass Housing Area: High Rise Appartments as New Homes

Uzundere was a village located in the past in the periphery of Izmir. However, with the construction of Izmir-Aydin highway in 1998, it turned into an area closer to Izmir. Some of my elderly interviewees among the relocated squatters also stated that they were coming to Uzundere for hunting in the past. Today, Uzundere is located in Karabağlar district. According to my interviews with urban authorities, Uzundere was selected since there was no other place to relocate such a high number of squatter residents in other places of Izmir. Thus, during the implementation phase of the KUTP, residents were told that they would be relocated into Uzundere if they accepted the relocation and approved the terms of their new housing contracts.

Figure 7: The Layout Plan of Uzundere Mass Housing Estate Built by TOKİ (Akdağ, 2009)

According to the Izmir Metropolitan Municipality, the design and transfer of right owners have been realized as such: according to the of "Regulation on the Disposal of Immovable Properties and Housing Sales in the Areas Prone to Disaster in Izmir ", a "value appreciation commission" set the values of buildings and lands and a "Rights Determination Commission" determine those who are right owners. Then, based on the principle of "consensus" that was loathed by Izmir Metropolitan Municipality during the transformation process, a "Reconciliation and Allocation Commission" thrashed out the details of the agreement with right holders and allocated and sold the houses in Uzundere (Izmir Metropolitan Municipality, 2006).

TOKİ constructed 3080 houses in Uzundere and Izmir Metropolitan Municipality purchased 2688 of these to relocated residents of squatter settlements including Kadifekale squatter settlement. It allocated 1744 of these houses to residents of

Kadifekale. It began to relocate Kadifekale residents in these houses in Uzundere in 2010. (Izmir Metropolitan Municipality, 2010)

In addition to 3,080 housing units the following facilities were also built and transferred to the Izmir Metropolitan Municipality by TOKİ (Ministry of Environment and Urbanization, 2012):

i. A primary school with 44 classrooms (44 classrooms + 6 laboratories + gym)
ii. A high school with 38 classrooms (38 classrooms + 9 laboratories + gym)
iii. A mosque + fountain
iv. A trade center (15 shops)

Although there were 3 municipal service areas, 1 social facility area, 1 outdoor market area and 2 sports areas in the zoning plan of the Uzundere Mass Housing Area, TOKİ did not build those facilities and transferred the land of those planned facilities to Izmir Metropolitan Municipality and Konak Municipality (Ministry of Environment and Urbanization, 2012):

i. The land designed as an open market area with cadastral information of 11249 island 1 parcel was transferred to the Konak Municipality on 31.10.2007.
ii. The land designed as municipal service areas with cadastral information of 11250 island 1 parcel, 11257 island 1 parcel and 11262 island 1 parcel were transferred to the Izmir Metropolitan Municipality on 31.10.2007.
iii. The land designed as a social facility area with cadastral information of 11257 island 2 parcel was transferred to the Izmir Metropolitan Municipality on 31.10.2007.
iv. The land designed as sports areas with cadastral information of 11258 island 1 parcel and 11259 island 1 parcel were transferred to the Izmir Metropolitan Municipality on 31.10.2007.

Those facilities had not been built yet even when I conducted the field research in June/July 2012. According to the Municipality, TOKİ was responsible to build those facilities while TOKİ representatives were saying the opposite.

The first “move-ins” to the houses in the Uzundere Housing Area took place in 2010. However, although it was known that the people will move there and the houses had been transferred to the Municipality by TOKİ in 2008, the interviewees stated that the region was lacking even basic social reinforcement areas and crucial facilities, which significantly affect residents daily life, such as schools, a health center, a mosque, a coffee house (kahvehane), shopping markets, etc. It is stated by the interviewees that some but not all of the lacking facilities had been built after 1-2 years of settling. In this regard, even a prefabricated portable mosque which was built in the region for people to use during Ramadan was reported on the Municipality's website as an example of the sensitivity of the Municipality towards the region (Izmir Metropolitan Municipality, 2010b). It is also stated that the student population in the region which increased with the settlements in the region in 2010 was taken to the schools in the nearby neighborhoods for 1.5 years with the school services provided by the Municipality.

TOKİ Uzundere is located in a peripheral district of Izmir that is ten kilometers away from the city center. It is designed as blocks of high-rise apartments with the vertical planning of housing units that are totally incompatible with the previous habitat of Kadifekale residents (see Eranil-Demirli et al., 2015). Apartment blocks share also small children parks, common gardens and parking areas surrounded by sitting benches. It is built on a hilly area, thus, residents, especially those living at lower ends of the hills; have to use cars or transportation vehicles to reach a destination. TOKİ Uzundere bears the hallmarks of capitalist socio-spatiality. A shopping mall in which there is a coffeehouse, a shopping center, a gaming cafe, a restaurant, a pharmacy, and some shopping stores are located at the center. The apartment blocks at the entry of TOKİ Uzundere are allocated to residents who bought these houses voluntarily and they are close to social services and basic amenities such as mosque, shopping mall, pharmacy,

health center. Residents living at lower ends of the hills have to use transportation vehicles in order to reach these facilities. There are no metro stations only one bus line to a transit bus station and minibusses run by private enterprises connecting TOKİ Uzundere to other areas. The peripheral location of TOKİ Uzundere is not considered as a problem according to our interviewees in Municipality since a single ticket gives residents the possibility to have long journeys within 90 minutes. However, residents have to use at least two transportation vehicles that are by and large uncomfortable and inconvenient to reach out to central districts.

CHAPTER 6

FINDINGS: THE IMPACT OF URBAN TRANSFORMATION PROJECT ON RELOCATED KADIFEKALE RESIDENTS IN TOKİ UZUNDERE

The relocation of Kadifekale residents into TOKİ Uzundere not only brought about a change in the spatial structure of the neighborhood but also in its social, cultural and economic characteristics. Previous studies on the KUTP looked into the planning and implementation of the KUTP (Saraçoğlu and Demirtaş-Milz, 2014), the use of informality in the conduct of the project (Demirtaş-Milz, 2013), the use of disasters as an ideological narrative to legitimize neoliberal urban transformation projects (Saraçoğlu and Demirtaş-Milz, 2014) and the socio-spatial incompatibilities between Uzundere and Kadifekale in neighborhood scale (Eranıl-Demirli et al., 2015). While these studies examined the implementation process of the KUTP, this study is distinguished from them with its focus on relocated inhabitants in TOKİ Uzundere and its research that analyzes the impact of the KUTP on people's livelihood and on changing conditions of poverty in TOKİ Uzundere.

Kadifekale has a long tradition of being a 'melting pot' for migrants absorbing successive waves of migration. Concerning the interviewees' characteristics, I interviewed 19 women and 20 men. 5 of them are aged between 18-35 years old, 17 of them between 36-55 years old and 17 of them more than 55 years old. 34 of them were married, 2 of them were single and 3 of them were a widow. 23 of them were primary school graduates, 3 of them were middle school, 4 of them were high school while none of them was university graduate. While the interviewees were hesitant to give information about their income, most of them were low-income families. 13 of them were retired while 16 of them were housewives, 7 of them were unemployed, one was a laborer and 2 of them had their own shops. 17 of interviewees were from Mardin while the rest from Konya,

Izmir, Sinop, Gümüşhane, Yozgat, Tokat, Afyon, Uşak, Manisa, and Şanlıurfa. Their responses to the question on the reason of settlement in Kadifekale reflect the chain migration in Turkey (Erder, 1999) as they migrated to Izmir with limited financial resources and they chose to settle in Kadifekale because of a common universe-their prior networks of fellow townsmen (hemşehri) or the settlement of their relatives in Kadifekale before.

6.1. The KUTP as a Non-Participatory Urban Transformation Process

Contrary to the inclusion of gecekondu residents into urban development due to the clientelist relations between urban authorities and gecekondu residents in Turkey in the past, the urban transformation in gecekondu areas Turkey is undertaken as an exclusionary process with little or no community participation.

One of the main shortcomings of the KUTP has been its uncertainty and precariousness. Kadifekale residents were used to living with housing stress as the danger of sliding in the area was commonly known and the rumors about a potential eviction that would be carried out by the municipality had been propagated for years. Since these hearsays did not come true for so long, they became ignorant of them. While the real project was underway in parallel to neoliberal concerns over the image of Izmir and its marketization, the discourse of disaster has been used widely by urban authorities to legitimize this urban transformation project dissimulating its underlying neoliberal ideology (Saraçoğlu and Demirtaş-Milz, 2014). Interviewees indicate that they had not been informed properly by relevant authorities and they just took notice of it by the note on their doors or by their neighbors. As a resident describes: "I heard it 15-20 years ago, and it was spread by word of mouth. Lastly, the municipality left its card." (Interviewee 25, female, 37-year-old, housewife) Another one states: "I have been hearing about it since my childhood." (Interviewee 39, female, 41-year-old, temporarily works as housekeeper)
Demirtaş-Milz (2013) draws attention to the widely-used tactic of informality by the municipal authorities to convince residents about relocation. The informality has two

layers: informality in the laws and regulations characterizing property relations in squatter settlements and informal codes of conduct used by municipal authorities. Due to amnesties granted in the 1980s to squatter settlements, they have a complicated and diverse ownership structure. Informality put the residents of squatter settlements into an "ever-shifting urban relationship between the legal and the illegal, legitimate and illegitimate, authorized and unauthorized' (Roy, 2011: 233). They were able to negotiate collectively with local authorities for their basic amenities such as water, education, health centers in the past. But when it had to do with relocation, these complicated property rights acted as a hindrance in generating a collective voice restraining them from participating more actively in the urban transformation project since they had to negotiate individually with local authorities for their resettlement based upon their particular property rights and usage of land. While some residents, generally those who possessed formal property rights, viewed this resettlement as a mean to sell their houses to the state with higher prices, those who did not have formal property rights were reticent to communicate with local authorities for fear of being evicted or losing their would-be gains from demolition. Most residents had tapu tahsis documents which are not a formal title deed but a personal right to possession according to Law no. 2981. The tenants in Kadifekale were an invisible part of the project as they could not claim a house as a result of the KUTP. As Kurds composed the significant proportion of tenants in Kadifekale (Saraçoğlu and Demirtaş-Milz 2014), they had to find another house in the competitive land market of Izmir. Thus, relocation enabled community displacement in their case as they were dispersed in different parts of the city. The interviewees from Mardin mostly noted that their relatives and neighbors who were not entitled to a house in TOKİ Uzundere sought to find a house in other squatter settlements.

Interviewees complain that local authorities did not engage in concerted efforts to include their concerns in the planning process of the KUTP. To the question whether local authorities asked their opinion about the project and its implementation, 4 of them answered positively while 34 negatively and 1 of them did not give any answer. A meeting with municipality was held in which urban authorities promised that the interests

of residents would be promoted not damaged as a result of the urban transformation project. In this process, individual settlements with authorities were also negotiated and completed, thus, residents were seeing their neighbors moving out of Kadifekale day by day. Moreover, the ability of residents to raise a collective voice to participate in urban transformation project was also tamed by the disinvestment of the municipality in Kadifekale as the urban authorities already began to cut down the basic facilities such as decrease of the bus schedule, closing health centers or moving the schools outside etc. Thus, the residents felt squeezed between negotiating a settlement and being dislodged in a competitive market with very limited affordable housing. Furthermore, they were in a precarious situation as they did not know whether they would benefit from opening a lawsuit or they could afford a litigation process.

> They gave us 3 options: (1) you choose the house (apartment in Uzundere), (2) you get the money (3) you will open a case in the court. So you have three options, you will get out of here. We chose here instead of striving in the court. (Interviewee 13, male, 70-year-old, retired)

> They said 'you have to', if you do not get out of the house, we will demolish your house. They cut the electricity and water so we had to move out. (Interviewee 15, female, 60-year-old, retired)

On the other side, the residents note how the municipality and TOKİ officers also benefited from the poor conditions of residents as they used a wide range of informal practices to convince them about resettlement. There was not a standard script of allocating due rights to residents but a messy account of daily negotiations or exchanging words and promises between residents and local authorities rather than written formal documents that elaborate on the conditions of new houses in Uzundere or their due rights. This contingent nature of negotiations put the residents in a continuum of vulnerability, invention, and opportunities. The messy accounts of residents about their negotiations with local authorities beset with false promises and incomplete deals display a non-transparent and precarious process of setting an agreement:

They just gave information. They did not ask what we want. I came here because of fear. I said, even I go to the court, I cannot win. I did not open a case because of fear. They gave me 39 thousand TL. After I accept the offer, they reduced it by 5 thousand. They said you misunderstood. But we were 3 people there, there was no misunderstanding. They did the same to our neighbors. Several people experienced the same thing. Obligatory, I accepted again. (Interviewee 3, female, 40-year-old, housewife)

Twenty years ago, they declared there a landslide zone. When they came for the last time, they said 'you have a right to a house at TOKİ, we will be very helpful, beneficial, you will not have any problem'. During the signature of the contract, they said 'you will pay according to the public officers' wage increase; you will not have any other problems. When we came (in Uzundere), we were pleased because it was calm, then we agreed. My house got 56 thousand TL, 3 storey, 145 m² (110 m² house + 35 m square garden). A neighbor went to the court and (they) gave him 163 thousand TL. We pay (monthly installments), we pay, it is not ending. They put a clause in the contract that we did not know then. Thanks to this clause, our debt is increasing every year. They dragged us into a trap. They gave me an apartment, and they gave my son the price of an apartment. They told us that they would help us, but they did not keep their promises. They said that your monthly installments will increase according to the public officers' wage increase, but it did not. They did as they knew (bildikleri gibi yaptılar). As you understand, they dragged us into a trap. (Interviewee 12, male, 57-year-old, a market seller (pazarcı)

They gave us the contract; they said that you will sign in 10 days. The mayor came, we complained. I could not deal with the state ... We did not want the first offer and they said that your right to a house would be annulled with an announcement in the newspaper. We did not see anyone. We were left with no water, no electricity. (Interviewee 39, female, 41-year-old, temporarily works as housekeeper)

I would take the money (offered by the municipality) and go to my hometown (memleket). My grooms tricked me, they said that they (the municipality) are giving 2-3 houses, I came here. We regretted afterward but it was then concluded. Aziz Kocaoğlu said with his own mouth, he said that we will not make you a victim. Then we went to the president of the district and said: "Aziz Kocaoğlu promised us that we would not make you a victim". The president of the district said 'Is Aziz Kocaoğlu your father that you trust him'. This is the state if you cannot trust the state, who will you trust? We tried for so long but we could not get anything out of it. Those who do not have any debt are in good mood (Borcu olmayanların keyfi yerinde). (Interviewee 6, male, 58-year-old, retired, owner of a grocery store in Kadifekale)

The fact that Kadifekale residents are low-educated and low-income gave more room to TOKİ and municipality officers to convince Kadifekale residents. Being low-educated, many residents did not also comprehend the articles of their contracts of resettlement. In effect, Kadifekale residents were used to communicating with municipality officers and had their issues handled by the municipality. Thus, they became convinced by the words of municipality officers rather than written contracts in their hands. Some interviewees also complain that the municipality showed different apartments from other blocs to convince them for relocation. But when they moved, they found different apartments which were further away and smaller compared to these showcases. Moreover, they were hesitant about their ability in affording a litigation process. Many residents considered opening a case but abstained from it for various reasons. Some did not think of achieving their agenda without the participation of other residents, some could not afford a litigation process, some was fearful of opening a case against the state, some believed in the words of municipality to compensate their damages, some were fearful that if they declined the offer, they would not be able to secure any accommodation in Izmir due to tightening real estate market. In addition, many interviewees were complainant about their inability to comprehend the terms of their contract and incapacity to understand how compound rate (bileşik faiz) impacts their monthly installments. The remarks of interviewees display their sense of frustration as they use words such as "falling into a trap", "being fooled" as a result of this contingent nature of negotiations and agreements:

> I have diabetes because of grief. This is the top of a mountain. They showed us a house in another building, they gave us this. They said 'we will give you a house of 95 m²' but they gave 75 m²… I did not think about opening a case. The man in the municipality said that they would compensate... I gave not only my home but also 10 thousand extra-money. The house (in Uzundere) is very small, the central heating, water is leaking, and the house is damp. I complained to the municipality, they have not come for one year. Mr. Hasan did not talk like this (Hasan Bey böyle konuşmamıştı). (Interviewee 23, male, 77-year-old, retired)

> The state does not take care of us (devlet bize sahip çıkmıyor). There is a condition of debt in the contract. They put the contract in front of you, come and sign it. Even the lawyer does not understand what it is. (Interviewee 9, male, 58-year-old, a worker in patisserie)

For 20 years there were (rumors about demolition). The front side (of Kadifekale) was destroyed 15 years ago. No authorities came here then. 1, 5-2 years ago, they sent cards and began to take measures. They sent invitations and the contracts were done. Firstly, we did not accept the house and we would go to the court...The neighbors around accepted, everybody accepted. Then I understood that I would not be able to do it alone. (Interviewee 25, female, 37-year-old, housewife)

They asked (our opinion) but they said 'we will take your house away from your hand anyway. We will deposit the money whether you go to the bank or not and take it or leave it'. (Interviewee 10, male, 29-year-old, working in furniture stores)

Firstly, they came from the municipality and they said that this was the landslide region so that it would be demolished. They said that they marked the houses that would be demolished. They did not say '3 houses for 1 (TOKİ) apartment'. They did not say this at first. If there was such a thing anyway, nobody would settle here. Then, TOKİ staff made a common work with municipality staff and came here. They took photos, etc. By talking, by some imaginary things, they tried to attract people to themselves. 70% of people here are illiterate anyway. This means, they worked, they get retired but they remained illiterate. It started with brochure signing. They gained a certain degree of confidence, they gained people's trust. There were people whose minds' were working in Kale. They said, let's not sign it, let's act together, let's not destroy our Kale. Then these people received two apartments instead of one. Why? Because the municipality and TOKİ put these people at the front. Did you understand? You come and be my man, I give you one more apartment, direct these people's minds in different directions. When this happened, 60-70% of Kale started signing. When they signed, what happened, brother? For example, if 1,800 households from 3,000 households come here (in Uzundere), what the rest 1,200 households will do? They were forced to agree, they came here. While half of them came here like this, the other half came by force, this you should know. They did not come here voluntarily. They said 'I will demolish your house, what will you do when it is demolished, where will you take shelter?' They give you a dream, you will shelter into this dream. You are gambling, either you win or you lose. When 80% of them come here, what rests for 20%? It's only an empty space. They resisted for a while, it did not happen because they did not resist. They went even to the court. Those who went to the court were more advantaged. For example, I gave 3 houses, I received 41 370 TL. It was hard to get one apartment here with 41 370 TL. I became indebted for 15 000 TL. We established an association here TOKİ Development Assistance Solidarity Association, 7 months later we were closed. People did not support. (Interviewee 21, male, 40-year-old, unemployed, ex-commissioner buying and selling cars)

> They told us 'You will move there, efe tüfe (producer price index, consumer price index)' I said 'Look, my friend, I am ignorant (cahilim). Tell me from the start, I do not understand these papers'. I said 'I do not understand these papers. Tell me from your mouth what is happening'. He said 'when retirees receive wage increases, we will also raise also your debt, thus, 4 thousand will be 5 thousand. Tomorrow and the day after tomorrow, this will be as cheap as the price of your appetizers (çerez parası)'. Now, my brother, we went to learn our debt that we have been paying for 3 years. We had 26 thousand TL debts, it became 28 thousand. Why is this happening? (Interviewee 11, male, 41-year-old, working in textile)

> No lawyer remained we did not go to. They all said that this contract was in your favor. With 5-6 people, we said 'let's go to the bank together and withdraw the loan, so at least we will know what we are going to pay'. We went to the bank and they said that we cannot work with you, you have to settle with the municipality. Why? They said 'because you are renters'. We asked what it is, they said 'they are implementing compound interest for you. You will pay interest for 6-7 years, and then the main money (ana para) will decrease'... Kale keeps entering into my dream; I wish we had never come here. (Interviewee 6, male, 58-year-old, retired, owner of a grocery store in Kadifekale)

> 5 years ago, the municipality arranged a commission. Landowners, inheritors heard first. We did not accept it at first and we opened a case. They gave 43 thousand TL for our house, we sued and then they gave 43 thousand to our 3-storey house. Since we knew that we would not be able to buy a house with this price, we feared that we would be homeless and accepted. (Interviewee 27, female, 45-year-old, housewife)

Saraçoğlu and Demirtaş-Milz (2014) argue that the dense presence of Kurdish migrants in Kadifekale, the use of disaster to justify the KUTP and the high level of tenancy and poverty in the area as a consequence of forced migration also prevented the rise of a strong collective resistance against the KUTP. Those who stayed in Kadifekale employed a variety of strategies to "stay put" in and around Kadifekale (Newman and Wyly, 2006). They declined the offer of Izmir Municipality and opened cases they settled elsewhere in Kadifekale surroundings in order to be close to Izmir center.

6.2. Kadifekale vs. Uzundere as a Spatial Change: Decreasing Opportunity for Contact and Exchange with Family, Neighbors and the City

TOKİ Uzundere mass housing complexes have a completely different spatial structure from Kadifekale squatter settlement. First and foremost, TOKİ Uzundere complexes are designed as high-rise apartment buildings with closed space arrangements while Kadifekale squatter settlements were composed of two-three storey houses with open space living arrangements. Uzundere mass housing estates are composed of several blocks that contain 16-storey buildings with 5-6 or 8-10 units. In Kadifekale, there was no planning process as squatter houses were just added as fait accompli creating narrow passageways and a disorderly outlook. Uzundere has a more 'modern' outlook with concentrated building estates, planned pathways and orderly roads. Eranıl-Demirli et al. (2015) draw attention to the difference between the horizontal structure of Kadifekale and vertical planning of Uzundere as horizontal planning generates more communal spaces for Kadifekale residents while vertical planning of Uzundere creates boundaries limiting interaction with the outer world.

While TOKİ complexes are based on the motto of gated communities that promote global elites' aspirations for security and private lifestyle with high-rise buildings, Kadifekale squatter settlement was like a small village with detached houses that bring about communal living arrangements. This change of setting from Kadifekale to Uzundere also affected the quality of relations between neighbors and families. Many interviewees noted that they did not have to ask for permission to visit someone in Kadifekale whereas, in Uzundere, they now have to give prior notice to visit someone. Thus, they now have to be more discrete and planned in their relations. Some interviewees also indicate the disturbance between neighbors because of rumors, gossip or jealousy since people do not know each other in Uzundere as they do in Kadifekale.

> We are not visiting each other here (Uzundere). I do not know the reason; maybe because the houses were detached there, we were visiting each other. Here, the question of whether the man is available or not comes to my mind. You were

> seeing people when you passed the door there. You were sitting together and having tea. Here, you will call to see whether he is available or not. It is not quite easy...Being detached is something else. It was not quite luxury like here but it was your house, you had the freedom. You can sit in front of the house; you can go out and wander around. You can also wander around here but it is not like there. There was maybe a habit that was given by living there for 47 years, you are familiar with there. To give an example, I am from Gümüşhane. I feel like a stranger when I go to my village because I am here for 47-50 years. There are now people I do not know. I know all the people in Kale. I was greeting and greeted by people. I mean, I knew there in general. (Interviewee 13, male, 70-year-old, retired)

> Here you will phone and ask whether you are available. It is possible if she agrees. The people whom I meet there (Kadifekale) very often do not accept here without phoning. (Interviewee 24, female, 33-year-old, housewife)

> We were visiting each other every hour there. Here you cannot go without calling. (Interviewee 31, female, 51-year-old, housewife)

Concerning the spatial structure of apartments, TOKİ apartments are composed of 2 or 3 bedrooms designed for small families while squatter houses in Kadifekale were two or three storey buildings that generated enough space for large families composed of children and elderly. Thus, apartment-style living in Uzundere generated a problem of overcrowding for Kadifekale residents. While these families had enough spaces for large families with the added storey in Kadifekale, they now have to live in TOKİ apartments composed of 2 or 3 bedrooms with a maximum of 120 m². Moreover, building units in Uzundere have one common small garden and each flat has small balconies not appropriate for these large households. In Kadifekale, most houses had large balconies and small gardens. Thus, these households not only lost their garden space but also large balconies with relocation in Uzundere.

The physical setting of Kadifekale squatter settlement also provided for the residents the opportunity to develop close relations as side-by-side detached houses in narrow roads, their large balconies and gardens were giving more opportunity for face-to-face contact and meetings. Large gardens and balconies of Kadifekale were providing physical space to hold social gatherings for inhabitants. In addition to gardens and balconies, narrow

streets were also public spaces in which especially women would sit in front of their door and engage in small talks with their neighbors. These gardens, balconies, and streets were also spaces to alleviate daily stress as these low-income residents were deprived of means to pay for restaurants or cafes for social gatherings or for vocations. In Uzundere, each apartment has a small balcony not appropriate for large households and each building has a small common garden that serves as a common space for everyone. Thus, with relocation, the inhabitants lost their social space to hold gatherings. Neighbors are also more hesitant to sit in the streets to talk with their neighbors since they have now neighbors they do not know and apartment life pushes them into a more private style of living. In Kadifekale; these gardens, streets and large balconies were even more precious for the eldest and the women. For the eldest, gardens were providing an alternative occupation to relax and enjoy. For the women, gardens, balconies and sitting in front of the door were not only a mechanism of socialization but also a way of independence because being a housewife; they were at their home but not forced to stay in walls. As residents note:

> Here's advantages are that the houses are nice, for example, the heating infrastructure is good, we are comfortable but it is like entering a prison. We cannot sit even on the balcony. You can sit with two or three people (in balconies) not more than that. If they had built balconies in apartments, it would be nice. They built a balcony for two people. It is not possible to hang your staff, to sit down. When you have two guests, you cannot sit with them on the balcony. (Interviewee 6, male, 58-year-old, retired)

> I would spend my day in the garden; I had trees (in Kadifekale). (Interviewee 16, female, 62-year-old, retired)

> We were cultivating fruits and vegetables in the garden. I was washing my staff in the garden. I was in the garden all day. I had every kind of trees... It was very hard to leave there. We were not separated there. Here it does not exist. We are like a bird put in the cage. (Interviewee 29, female, 37-year-old, housewife)

> People are more used to living in detached houses. There is not even balcony here, we had there terraces like a highland. Eat, drink there. My son had a pool; I was even entering it sometimes. I am thinking of closing the balcony here, it

> is cold. But I am then thinking I will stay without balcony afterward. (Interviewee 25, female, 37-year-old, housewife)

> I had a very beautiful garden. We would cook barbecue, I had trees, and we were sitting. (Interviewee 26, female, 63-year-old, housewife)

> We were together in the day and night. We were drinking our tea, coffee, eating our fruits in front of our house until the two o'clock in the night. Neighbors were very good...Here it does not exist. In the summer we are sitting with our neighbors during the daytime. (Interviewee 30, female, 76-year-old, housewife)

> We were in the streets all day. In this hour of the day, it is like a prison here, we cannot go out. You were not feeling like this there, neighbors were good. We are also spending time in the streets here but some people are disturbed by this. Since we do not know the language (Turkish), we go to our people and talk with them. (Interviewee 16, female, 62-year-old, retired)

> Here (Uzundere), people go down and sit in chairs so that they get to know each other. Otherwise, they do not go to each other's houses. (Interviewee 6, male, 58-year-old, retired)

> Here you do not see anybody. You get in the elevators and go up. (Interviewee 34, male, 73-year-old, retired)

Interviewees complain that the authorities did not put into practice what they promised about apartments, its physical and social infrastructure. Many had to change the equipment used in their apartments due to its low quality. Some interviewees note the unfinished infrastructure of TOKİ Uzundere buildings. Especially the residents of the building complexes situated at the downside of TOKİ Uzundere houses complained that their houses were inundated with water due to pipe burst of TOKİ buildings since the pipe capacity could not carry the water pressure of building complexes situated at the upper side of Uzundere. However, TOKİ officers did not do anything to compensate for their damages.

Kadifekale residents also note the differences between their buildings and the blocs at the entry of Uzundere which are accorded to people who buy these houses voluntarily.

The inhabitants of these blocs are more advantaged since they are close to basic services such as mosque, supermarket, pharmacy, a health center that is all concentrated around the center of TOKİ Uzundere complexes. In addition, many inhabitants indicate that these houses are endowed with better physical and social equipment. These blocs not only possess larger parks for children but also sports parks which are wanted by people in other building complexes.

> Look at these greens (referring to TOKİ buildings at the entry). We are paying and these greens are eating them. They gave there a sports area, hospital, park. They gave us one park which is shared by 5 blocs. (Interviewee 4, female, 49-year-old, housewife)

> The park is not enough. Those at the downside have even sports equipment. Those blocs of TOKİ are named as private blocs, as building estate (site). (Interviewee 6, male, 58-year-old, retired)

> We do not have coffeehouses. The houses at the entry are more beautiful because they buy there on their own. They have trees and sports areas. (Interviewee 7, male, 72-year-old, retired)

> The infrastructure here is not considered. Why is it not considered? The blocs in the upside are 8 storey, ours are 16 storey. The water that is given upside is maybe normal but for us, it is too high. That's why there, in every building, there has been a pipe burst. Firstly, it happened in this building. (Interviewee 27, female, 45-year-old, housewife)

Concerning the location of Kadifekale and Uzundere, Kadifekale is located in the center of Izmir close to Konak, Alsancak. This central position of Kadifekale was playing a social function for Kadifekale residents as they were able to integrate into urban life with no or little cost. Kadifekale inhabitants could walk to the city center or could take a bus, minibus to go to the city center. However, Uzundere is situated far from the center, 45 minutes by bus. They now have to change the bus twice in order to go to the city center that requires not only additional effort and energy but also extra money. While 22 of respondents note that they would go to Konak, Alsancak, Eşrefpaşa often in Kadifekale, this number decreases to 6 in Uzundere. Especially, female interviewees indicate that

they lost the opportunity to go out walking with children or elderly of the family. They now have to stay at home in Uzundere more than they have to in Kadifekale. Especially, old-age interviewees complain about the distance of Uzundere from the city center as this distance hindered their capacity to go to the city center. Family visits to the city center also decreased since going to the city center requires paying for tickets for all members of the family.

> I would take my children to Konak once in a week or at least once every two weeks. I was even taking my mother because it was below 10 TL and my husband was working. But here let me take a taxi. It is not possible. (Interviewee 27, female, 45-year-old, housewife)

Moreover, the centrality of Kadifekale was also a vital economic resource for Kadifekale residents affecting every part of their lives. Firstly, since Kadifekale was situated at the center of the city; it was easy for inhabitants to reach out to their workplaces. Secondly, this centrality was sometimes a bread maker as it made Kadifekale residents close to job opportunities. As Uzundere is significantly distant from the commercial and manufacturing districts, it renders the access to employment more difficult especially for those working in the informal sector. It generated additional spending for low-income families as they now have to pay for their arrival and return from the city. Some interviewees noted that they lost their job because of the resettlement in Uzundere. Some gave up on their jobs evaluating the costs of transport. For those who lost their jobs, this job loss generated a significant impact on their life as some of them had difficulty for a long time to find another job due to the distance of Uzundere for the city center. In Uzundere, since the bus passes every thirty minutes and it is not possible to reach out to a minibus in all building complexes of TOKİ, the transportation turned into a major burden for residents. These vignettes illustrate the important role of centrality for Kadifekale residents in Uzundere:

> People arrive at Manisa, we cannot arrive at Konak. (Interviewee 16, female, 60-year-old, retired)

> There are lots of people who lost their jobs. I am working in furniture atelier. I need to pay 8 TL per day. (Interviewee 10, male, 29-year-old, working in furniture stores)

> You go down (in Kadifekale) for two minutes, you arrive at Eşrefpaşa. You walk down and come to Konak. For these people, that was creating a good way for employment opportunities. Now, people need to spend 1-1,5 hour to arrive at Çankaya. In this situation, the men here need to get up at 6. I mean while it was possible to get up at 7-7.30 and make breakfast for 10 minutes and arrive there in 5 minutes, this is not possible here. He has to take the bus. In the past, it was once an hour, now it is once every half an hour but it is not good, my brother. Why is it not good? Because he needs to make a transit passage. Why are not they giving us a direct transport to Konak? Why? In order to go to a job, he needs to go to Üçkuyular, he needs to spend half an hour on the way. He needs to take a transit vehicle and arrive at Çankaya. My business potential is damaged. There is a saying who is out of sight is out of mind (gözden uzak gönülden uzak). I was buying and selling cars, I cannot do this here. There I have a certain (social) environment. I was hanging around Eşrefpaşa day and night, we were seeing people around and say 'I will buy this car, does it exist or not?' I was getting involved and doing my job but here we are having troubles. (Interviewee 21, male, 40-year-old, unemployed, ex-commissioner buying and selling cars)

> I cannot go to a job because of its distance. My children also sleep in their job place, they come home once a week. When my son comes home, he is stuck in the road when there is snow and cannot arrive home. There is the problem of transport. (Interviewee 12, male, 57-year-old, unemployed)

Furthermore, this centrality and its ensuing social-economic integration prevented the rise of a sense of exclusion and isolation among residents in Kadifekale. Many inhabitants indicate the sense of exclusion and deprivation describing Uzundere as a cage or prison along with a feeling of "being thrown away" with this relocation process. This sense of exclusion is particularly felt by elderly residents who live major difficulties to access to basic social services in central districts or have to use several transport vehicles to visit their relatives or neighbors in other areas that are in general uncomfortable and take too much time. Relocated Kadifekale residents are now living far from the Izmir center and especially those living in lower hills of TOKİ Uzundere have to use several transport vehicles to reach out to basic services such as schools (primary school and high school), coffeehouses, health center, and pharmacy, grocery/bazaar, mosque,

marketplace, shopping centers located at TOKİ Uzundere center or in other central districts.

> We are very bored; there is nothing here in this top of the mountain (dağın başı). I did not work for 2-3 months, I go to this side and that side, there are no coffeehouses. If I go to the bazaar, I need to pay for the way. We had many troubles at first. (Interviewee 10, male, 29-year-old, working in furniture stores)

> We are not content at all. Its conditions are not good. What is the relation between 17 (referring to the bus numbered 17 that work between TOKİ Uzundere complexes and Üçkuyular) and Kale? Give us here Konak and Basmane. What do we have to do with Üçkuyular? Did we lose our minds? We have to use transport in order to go for groceries, the market here. We did not have to use a vehicle there. They put people here so far away. Ok, we do not have anything to say about the weather. My God, it is very good. But everyday life here is bad. (Interviewee 4, female, 49-year-old, housewife)

> I can say this, this is an open prison. I go to Eşrefpaşa once a month, that's all. I would go there to Konak, Eşrefpaşa whenever I want. It was the center of the city, there. I do not say a thing but the state took us from the center and put us in this top of the mountain. In addition, it made us indebted. There was the center. I had a house of 150 m². With its land, let alone the house, you can buy 10 houses here. (Interviewee 13, male, 70-year-old, retired)

> Now, when you exit here, you go to below this door. You give a prayer and say 'protect me, my God, from any accident and trouble until I arrive there'. You get on the bus from here, my brother. The bus puts you in Üçkuyular in half an hour. Then you wait for the bus that should take you depending on the place you want to go. You spend 10-15 minutes waiting for the bus. You get on, it takes 40-45 minutes from there to Konak, 30 minutes to Eşrefpaşa along with your waiting. It takes easily 1,5 hour overall. Literally, it is an open prison. Clearly, this is it. I mean seriously, this is an open prison. (Interviewee 21, male, 40-year-old, unemployed, ex-commissioner buying and selling cars)

> We are content here but when we think of these troubles, we are not. If they had given us the means (mosque, market etc.) like the blocks upside, why did they make us deprived? We feel frankly like orphan here. We do not have a mosque. Ramadan is coming; we are not able to hear the prayer from here. There is no shopping, no bus, no minibus. I take them as non-existent because it takes half an hour. If you miss (the bus), you will wait for half an hour. The other takes 1,5 hour. I want to send my child to Yeşilyurt, for example, to activities there but I cannot. Why can I not? Because he needs to change 3 vehicles. He can't,

> then, the child stays at home. I have to pay for service (private school bus), but the service asks too high because of the distance. It goes normally everywhere for 100 TL, it comes here for 200 TL. (Interviewee 25, female, 37-year-old, housewife)

> The municipality threw us here and went away. (Interviewee 37, male, 76-year-old, retired)

6.3. Kadifekale vs. Uzundere as a Social Change: Erosion of Social Capital

Kadifekale was a slum area that conveyed a negative image of its dirtiness and criminality. Kadifekale residents also acknowledge that it was not a neighborhood that can be romanticized as it was a precarious neighborhood where people sometimes experience criminality and violence.

> There were thieves, gamblers. There was fighting and sometimes the gunshots. There was the smell of mussels, its dirtiness and all kinds of vermin. (Interviewee 13, male, 70-year-old, retired)

> Kadifekale was a beautiful place; it was the apple of Izmir's eye. But it has become so dirty in the last 10 years. It was ruined by those migrants coming from villages. There was cannabis, heroin, mussels, stabbing. Everything was happening. (Interviewee 17, female, 50-year-old, retired)

> There was the danger of sliding, incidents (olaylar), dirtiness. (Interviewee 18, male, 41-year-old, working in textile)

> People were looking down on you, condescending. When we say 'from Kadifekale', people were thinking, they were not even employing us... There was the smell of mussels, cracked walls, the danger sliding; incidents (olaylar), the columns of houses were imploding. (Interviewee 24, female, 33-year-old, housewife)

However, this negative image of Kadifekale which is also used by Izmir Metropolitan Municipality to justify urban transformation project dissimulates the community resilience in Kadifekale with solid social networks that provided endurance to difficult conditions for the urban poor. As a source of social capital; family, neighbor, fellowmen

ties produce in itself an array of social contacts generating socio-economic opportunities for squatters. Based on the works of some scholars (Bourdieu, 1986; Coleman, 1988; Lin, 2000; Putnam, 2000; Putnam et al., 1993), social capital can be defined as the formal and informal networks that produce social ties and opportunities. A growing body of studies displays that social capital plays a vital role in the survival strategies of the urban poor (Isham et al., 2002; Saegert et al., 2001). Since most immigrants settle in squatter settlements due to the presence of these ties, they are simultaneously embedded in bonding and bridging ties. These ties provide the information and solidarity that new migrants need during the settlement process and facilitate new migrant's access to housing, job opportunities and social services (Kalaycıoğlu and Rittersberger-Tılıç, 2000; Pınarcıoğlu and Işık, 2001). Thus, squatter settlements are producing a 'moral economy of housing' (Buğra, 1998) that protect them from reducing to an "underclass" in the city.

As described by many studies on poverty in Turkey, squatter settlements are not "slums of despair" (Eckstein, 1990) but incorporate dynamic and fluid communities with intricate family, neighbor, fellowmen ties. These informal social institutions play a vital role in migrants' adjustment to urban life (Abu-Lughod, 1961). The responses of Kadifekale residents to the question on the reason of settlement also reflect this situation as the majority of my interviewees (27 of them) chose to settle in Kadifekale because of 'family/social ties' while 6 of them because of its 'cheapness' and 4 because of its centrality in Izmir. These family, neighbors, fellow townsmen ties also enforce norms of solidarity and trust between migrants. Especially for Kurdish residents who moved into Kadifekale as a result of forced displacement from Southeast Turkey, these ties had an additional significance as they recreated their lost village in the middle of Izmir and founds the means to create solidarity relations and practice their culture. The poor of squatter settlements in Turkey do not have the culture of poverty that lay down on the sense of isolation and alienation as described by Lewis (1966a) for American ghettos. They have a certain sense of identity and belonging to a community (Güneş-Ayata,

1991). Kadifekale residents also describe their neighborhood with solid social networks as a replica of their family or their village:

> It was like our hometown (memleket). (Interviewee 16, female, 62-year-old, retired)

> We've been in Kale for 30, 40 years. It was like our hometown. It was our second hometown. Everyone knew each other, visit each other. Here's (referring to Uzundere) conditions are not for us. (Interviewee 6, male, 58-year-old, retired, owner of a grocery store in Kadifekale)

> We stayed there for 33 years, it was like our village. (Interviewee 38, female, 50-year-old, housewife)

In Kadifekale, these networks were also creating a form of social control over its members and helped to prevent the neighborhood turn into criminality (Karpat, 2004).

> They always present Kadifekale as dirty but people in Kale do not act against their people. They can act against the outsiders (dışarıya karşı) but they absolutely do not act against their people. For example, there are many thieves, drug sellers (hapçı) but there are not their people. If something like that occurs, they immediately exclude them. (Interviewee 14, male, 33-year-old, laborer)

> We are pining for Kale (burnumuzda tütüyor), I would even lick its land. I miss everything about there. Let me tell you something, I even miss Kadifekale's thief. The thief of Kadifekale would come and ask 'My mother, my father, how are you?' But here do you know what he is doing? He comes there, opens the door, grabs, and leaves. (Interviewee 21, male, 40-year-old, unemployed, ex-commissioner buying and selling cars)

The co-locals in squatters also form associations, clubs, and organizations institutionalizing their social capital. These formal institutions help these co-locals to reach out to politicians through patronage mechanisms that provide them with public services and basic amenities in exchange for electoral support (Erder, 2002; Karpat, 2004; Özler, 2000) and produce a sense of civic participation. In Kadifekale, there were also associations like Mardinliler Derneği (Association of people from Mardin). In addition, the Kurdish political movement had a strong political support.

Migrants in Turkey are able to maintain dense kin networks and solidarity relations in an urban setting and transfer economic capital as well as cultural and moral values across generations (Kalaycıoğlu and Rittersberger-Tılıç, 2000). Squatter areas were also spaces for co-locals to practice their local traditions such as weddings, funerals etc. Kadifekale accorded especially to Kurdish residents whose cultural practices were forbidden and suppressed for years a relatively free environment to practice their customs. They were able to celebrate Newroz and organize their traditional weddings and funerals.

Large families that were living together in multistorey houses in Kadifekale had to break apart with the transition to apartment life in Uzundere. Out of our 39 interviewees, 30 of them note that they have relatives who do not move into Uzundere or continue to live in neighborhoods close to Kadifekale. Some family members, especially the young ones, did not want to move to Uzundere due to its distance from the city center. Some old age interviewees note that in some families, the younger ones' were forced to move with them as they are not able to reach out to health centers, market, and bazaar without somebody's help in Uzundere. Even the family members who moved to different apartment buildings in Uzundere have difficulty to gather together since living in different apartment buildings in different blocs decreased family contacts. Among our interviewees who had relatives of first degree in Kadifekale (34 of our interviewees), 28 of them note that they were seeing/meeting each other every day or often whereas, among our interviewees who had relatives of first degree in Uzundere (20 of our interviewees), only 4 of them indicate that they were seeing/meeting each other every day or often.

> We see each other less for sure. Most of our relatives stayed in Çimentepe. In the past, they were visiting us almost every week. They cannot come right now. Neither we can go there nor can they come here because of its distance. The weather here is cool. We do not want to go there either because of the hot weather. (Interviewee 8, male, 52-year-old, retired)

> The house of my son is here but since reaching out to here is difficult, he stays with his father-in-law and does not come here. (Interviewee 12, male, 57-year-old, unemployed)

> I see my brother-in-law who moved here but visiting each other is not like Kale. (Interviewee 13, male, 70-year-old, retired)

> My connection with my brother is reduced to zero. We came here; each of us became more stressed. There is a disconnection, I mean. Right now, if someone says that they are beating my brother, I cannot go. I am serious, I am not kidding. (Interviewee 21, male, 40-year-old, unemployed, ex-commissioner buying and selling cars)

> We fell out with my brother; we are cross over the issue of housing. We do not even talk here although we are living in the same apartment building... I cannot go to see my children since here is far from there. (Interviewee 37, male, 76-year-old, retired)

Not only family ties are dissipated with relocation, but neighborhood ties are also weakened in Uzundere. Many Kadifekale residents describe their relations with neighbors as a family. With the relocation, neighbors moved into separate blocs of Uzundere or different neighborhoods of Izmir. Thus, Kadifekale residents lost their previous contacts. Dissolving neighborhood relations is a major complaint among our interviewees. All of our interviewees state that they had very good/good neighborhood relations in Kadifekale while in Uzundere, 29 of them note that they have very good/good neighbor relations in Uzundere. 29 of our interviewees note that they cannot meet anymore their previous neighbors. To the question how often you were seeing/meeting your neighbors, 37 of them note that they were seeing their neighbors every day or often in Kadifekale while none of them states that they are seeing their neighbors every day or often in Uzundere. The majority, 18 of them, state that they are not seeing their neighbors in Uzundere.

> We were almost 24 hours together, with our neighbors, our relatives. (Interviewee 30, female, 76, housewife)

> We were like a family with neighbors, we were sorry while leaving. (Interviewee 12, male, 57-year-old, unemployed)

> We cried, we were very sorry, my blood pressure heightened. We spent 35 years in the same neighborhood. Think about that, we were like brothers with our neighbors. (Interviewee 27, female, 45-year-old, housewife)

> It (relations with neighbors) was very good. My neighbors were from Mardin, we were together for 47 years. My dialogue with my neighbors was very good. When I go to them, they were showing hospitality. (Interviewee 13, male, 70-year-old, retired)

> I did not have relatives there. But I was living there for 50-60 years. They (neighbors) become relatives. (Interviewee 34, male, 73-year-old, retired)

> These close family and co-local ties and the ensuing solidarity among them were also enhancing their capacity to cope with difficulties they were facing. This help was crucial in the case of elderly people that are more vulnerable to hardship due to health reasons. While 35 of my interviewees state that they had people who could help them when they were in urgent need of Kadifekale, this number decreases to 13 in Uzundere.

> I miss the neighborliness, helping each other. We stayed in the hospital, neighbors handled my house, my staff, everything. When we went out of the hospital, I came home and my house was squeaky clean. (Interviewee 30, female, 76-year-old, housewife)

> We also get along (with neighbors) here but we do not talk to them. There are 20-30 houses here, we support each other. Because we are from the East... The others (neighbors) are not coming. They are not giving a hand even if you die. (Interviewee 15, female, 60-year-old, retired)

Accordingly, Uzundere TOKİ is still lacking social instruments such as coffeehouses or large children parks. In my last visit to Uzundere, I find that a coffeehouse was built in the entry of TOKİ Uzundere complexes. Coffeehouses play a significant role in men's socialization in Turkey as they serve as a buffer institution for new citizens of urban space to involve in social networks and break down their isolation (Aytaç, 2005). In Uzundere, especially male interviewees complain about the loss of their friends with the relocation and the lack of coffeehouses in Uzundere that deprive them of the opportunity to socialize with their new neighbors. Furthermore, children complain about the insufficiency of children parks. Even though buildings complexes have children parks,

they are not large enough for children of these high-rise apartment buildings. When one considers the demographic character of building complexes, these small children parks do not correspond to the needs and aspirations of children.

> We see each other when I go to the coffeehouse (in Kadifekale) once or twice per month… There (Kadifekale) was better. For example, neighbors were sitting in front of their door in the neighborhood and would chit chat. Especially the women. Women would sit in front of their door in every street. We were in the coffeehouses. They (women) are now getting bored. (Interviewee 8, male, 52-year-old, retired)

> I cannot see my friends here. Our friends forgot us. I cannot go out of the house. (Interviewee 10, male, 29-year-old, works in furniture stores)

> We were seeing each other in coffeehouses. Houses were also close, we were going as well to their houses. (Interviewee 23, male, 77-year-old, retired)

Apartment life and distance in neighborhood networks also affect the problem-solving and conflict-management among residents. While in Kadifekale, they were able to solve problems among themselves, there are now intermediaries like an apartment manager or gatekeeper who are involved in problem-solving.

> We would gather together and talk to each other (in Kadifekale). Here there are apartment managers, doormen. We tell them and they handle. (Interviewee 29, female, 37-year-old, housewife)

> There (Kadifekale) we were solving altogether when a problem arises. Many problems come up since our people there are not used to living in apartments. For example, these apartment managers? The apartment manager is like sitting in the chair of the prime minister. (Interviewee 5, female, 42-year-old, housewife)

> My relatives come once in a week or in a month here. We get crowded when they come. Our neighbors are complaining about the noise. (Interviewee 16, female, 62-year-old, retired)

> You cannot even grow a tree here. Someone planted a tree in the garden. The other said this was the front of my window and swore. (Interviewee 8, male, 52-year-old, retired)

> We were solving our problems with neighbors there. Here we make a meeting and deal with it. (Interviewee 12, male, 57, unemployed)

> Here people are a little more peevish, a little more aggressive. One does not tolerate the other's temper, voice, noise. Because there are old people here, everybody came from different places. Their people knew each other for a long time. (Interviewee 27, female, 45-year-old, housewife)

> There, turn on the music at its highest point, nobody would say something to you, why are you turning it on. Here, turn it on, people beat the ceiling and shout "enough", rightfully. Why? Because walls, concretes are thin. Each noise gets out to the flats in the downside (Ne ses olsa aşağıya gidiyor). (Interviewee 21, male, 40-year-old, unemployed, ex-commissioner buying and selling cars)

6.4. Kadifekale vs. Uzundere as an Economic Change: Increase of Livelihood Costs

Relocation to Uzundere did not improve the economic conditions of residents as the planning process of KUTP should have envisaged but put more pressure on the income of Kadifekale residents for various reasons. First of all, Kadifekale residents had to pay for relocation and the difficulties associated with it. Some respondents complained that their houses were unfinished when they moved in and the quality of these houses was not good so that they had to pay for their repairs:

> I had the door steel-made. I had the wardrobe remade that cost me lots of money... The parquets cost me 1200 TL. Everything is cheesy (dandik) including the plugs, they are on the blink and they get out by themselves. Sockets get out by themselves. They are all spoiled. The doors are not good, they are swinging. Wherever there is cheesy equipment, they used it. All the people are changing inside, its painting, its woods, its windows. I mean, a lot of costs was imputed on people. (Interviewee 8, male, 52-year-old, retired)

> I had the kitchen remade, I put parquet, I had the door steel-made. (Interviewee 11, male, 41-year-old, working in textile)

> Since the equipment is of poor quality, we had the kitchen, bathroom, parquet, marble. We had, 4-5 thousand TL extra-payment. (Interviewee 20, male, 56, accountant)

> I had the electric infrastructure of the house remade. They were spoiled. (Interviewee 1, male, 66-year-old, retired)

> I had parquet and door steel-made. Even in goods that are made in China, it is stamped "Chia", this, this is not even stamped. (Interviewee 11, male, 41-year-old, working in textile)

In Kadifekale, the squatter houses were providing in itself an economic capital for the inhabitants. They were able to add additional floors into their buildings for several reasons such as to build a flat for their married children, to give them for rent or open a store. Due to the resettlement in Uzundere, most of the residents who put up additional floors lost these economic opportunities as the municipality did not take these additional floors into account if these floors did not have an additional title deed. For example, if the landowner has a five-story building with no title deed for each flat, it is counted as one sole house and given price accordingly. Moreover, the authorities did not also take into account the price of gardens or stores while evaluating the overall price of the houses.

> With the money that came from the store, we were saving my retirement pension. (Interviewee 6, male, 56-year-old, retired owning a grocery store in Kadifekale)

> They did not give anything to trees. You have to accept. We give this money now, if you delay this, you cannot even receive this money. (Interviewee 11, male, 41-year-old, working in textile)

As a result of integration into real estate market, the residents of Kadifekale now have to pay monthly installments in Uzundere ranging from 100 to 300 TL per month depending on their paying schedule in exchange for their houses in Kadifekale. But since the majority of Kadifekale residents are low-income families, these monthly installments generate an impact of impoverishment. In case residents miss three successive monthly

installments, they are given a notice about a possible eviction and the required payment. Moreover, they have to pay additional interest rates over monthly installments due to delays in payment. Furthermore, the residents complain about the ensuing consequences of compound interest rate implemented on their payments alerting that the municipal authorities did not elaborate on this before the signature of the initial contract.

While the municipality promised to open a mussel-production area for the mussel-sellers which was one of the main activities of the residents from Mardin, it did not fulfill this promise. In addition, Kadifekale residents now have to pay for the requirements of a gated community such as central heating, elevator, and gatekeeper. As most Kadifekale residents work in the informal sector; these additional expenses are hard to bear. It can be even observed that gatekeepers in Uzundere have more economic security than their residents as they are working with social security and a stable income. Furthermore, the costs of the basic needs such as transport, heating, kitchen expenses, water increased with the resettlement in Uzundere. While they were able to reach to the city center by walking or with one ticket in Kadifekale, they now have to change the bus twice and spend at least 6 TL for a round trip. For heating, they were paying between 0-300 TL in Kadifekale using wood or coal; they now have to pay for central heating between 600-900 TL in Uzundere. Kitchen expenses also augmented for various reasons. For those who had gardens they cultivated, they lost their opportunity to collect vegetables and fruits. Kadifekale was also endowed with open bazaars and street vendors which were providers of low-cost shopping. In Uzundere, a supermarket called “Barış Gross” is opened at the entry of TOKİ complexes but it remains very distant for TOKİ building complexes that are located further from the TOKİ entry. Inhabitants have to use transportation to reach out to this supermarket. Moreover, the prices of goods in this supermarket are expensive compared to the kitchen expenses in Kadifekale as some interviewees indicate. These products are of quality and they cannot afford to pay for the prices of a supermarket. Against this commodification of their basic needs, there are mobile sellers, street

vendors, car shops who satisfy the basic needs of Kadifekale residents that are considered as “tactics of the weak” in the sense of De Certeau (1984) by (Eranıl-Demirli et al., 2015: 152).

> We came here since we were pleased? We are ruined here. There is payment for coal, maintenance fees, monthly installments, which one will we afford? I am illiterate; we have to change two vehicles in order to go to Konak. We go to Üçkuyular from here, I ask there to 50 people ‘my son, where is this vehicle going?’ ‘my son, where is this vehicle going?’. For example, we have relatives in Kale. From here to Üçkuyular, from Üçkuyular to Konak, from Konak to Kale, we change 3 vehicles. The result is we have torn away from our lineage (sülale). A new market is opening, Barış Grocerie, we will not be able to go, it is expensive. We need cheapness. When one peddler comes and says tomatoes are for 50, we all run to that, we are not interested in quality. We bother with cheapness. We receive 500-600 TL, we pay for coal, we pay for the gatekeeper, we pay for water, for this and that. You look into your hands and see 300-400 TL. (Interviewee 15, female, 60-year-old, retired)

> We had a two-storey house with 50 m² and garden. We had at least 80 trees. Olives, pomegranate, walnut...Those who sit there would not want to leave. We collected their fruits every year. They gave us 15 thousand. They did not pay for trees. They set us a day and either you accept or open a case in the court, you cannot get the house. My mother accepted it for me. (Interviewee 11, male, 41-year-old, working in textile)

> Here, the weather is nice. If you have lots of money in your pocket, here is beautiful...We hardly make our ends meet until the month’s end. Believe me, it is hard. Pay the monthly installment, pay the maintenance fee, pay the electricity, pay the water. It makes almost 600-700 TL, my sister. Where is your food, your telephone, your children in that? (Interviewee 3, female, 40-year-old, housewife)

> While you were able to buy one-kilo tomatoes for 100 TL (in Kadifekale), you buy it here for 250 TL. While we were paying for kitchen expenses 250-300 TL there, 500 TL does not suffice here. (Interviewee 23, male, 77-year-old, retired)

> We were managing on by ourselves excellently. Now, sorry to say, we are half full half hungry. Because like birds, we had built our nest. We had a certain job and certain income...We cannot do this here, our hands are tied. Whatever you wage is, if it is sufficient, it is OK. If it is not, you borrow a debt if you could find. Now, everybody is poor. For example, this guy is retired. Do you get 1000

> TL? At least 500 of it are paying for monthly installment, maintenance fees, coal etc...When you buy 4-5 bread, it does not suffice. Another issue is our monthly installments keep increasing. They increase by 4%, 5%. In the first year, they set it by 8%. (Interviewee 6, male, 58-year-old, retired, owner of a grocery store in Kadifekale)

Besides, basic amenities such as mosque, supermarket, pharmacy, health center are all concentrated around the center of TOKİ Uzundere housing estates which means that the inhabitants distant from there have to use transportation of any sort to reach out to these places. Kadifekale was riven by transport opportunities such as bus, minibus, collective taxi (dolmuş) or taxi facilitating the transportation to all the areas of Izmir including social services such as health centers and schools. They were able to walk or arrive there with one single bus or minibus. In Uzundere, the fact that transport vehicles are few and rare, once in 25 minutes, renders it more difficult to reach out to social services. Furthermore, no taxi station is found in TOKİ Uzundere housing estates so that any inhabitant without a car will have great difficulties in case of emergency. Reaching hospital and pharmacy has become very hard especially for the elderly due to its distance and the need to pay for several transport vehicles. One interviewee states that it cost 5-6 TL to reach out to the hospital in Kadifekale by taxi, it costs now more than 20 TL in Uzundere which considerably is significant for these households who live with minimum wage. Concerning the schools, some interviewees indicate the difficulty of school transfer because of this relocation process. One school is built for the inhabitants of TOKİ Uzundere housing estates which some interviewees find very insufficient and they complain about the overcrowding of school classes. In addition, children have to get on transportation to reach out to this school which brings extra-cost for the inhabitants.

> If the vehicle of municipality comes once in every two hours, I can go. If it does not come, God bless me (Allah beni rahmet etsin). I cannot arrive at the hospital. If I have a heart attack here, three hours pass before an ambulance comes here. The state does not take care of us, these people. (Interviewee 9, male, 58-year-old, a worker in patisserie)

> The vehicles of transport were close, everybody would complete his job by walking (in Kadifekale). Here, if you need to do some stuff, you can complete

> only one thing but cannot complete the second thing. It is far away. There (in Kadifekale), you could do 5 6 things in one day and come home. Here you cannot do. For example, we went, my brother-in-law has a heart attack. We took him to Yeşilyurt. We went to Yeşilyurt from here. We went to Köstence bridge. Then we get in the vehicle to Yeşilyurt and we could catch up like this. This takes so much time. (Interviewee 6, male, 58-year-old, retired, owner of a grocery store in Kadifekale)

> There are people here who do not have cars, unemployed. This is an appropriate place for people who want to rest his head. But if you do not have a car...For example, since we came here, we could take our mother outside only when the husband of my aunt died, we took her by taxi. (Interviewee 27, female, 45-year-old, housewife)

A major point that was ignored by central and local authorities during the planning process of KUTP is the community-based approach as the existence of social networks in Kadifekale was in itself a provider of economic capital for its inhabitants. Squatter settlements in Turkey worked like an informal welfare regime in Turkey (Keyder, 2005) facilitating the integration of rural migrants into urban life as migrants were able to access to social services, job opportunities, housing based on ties of kinship and reciprocity. As Ayata and Güneş-Ayata (1996) describe, squatter settlements were empowering urban poor connecting them to a large social network:

> Gecekondu is surrounded by many relatives to help them the trouble of money, to solve the problems with state authorities, from finding a job to make a home, from marriage to moral support. In the light of this situation, the attraction of squatter settlements is considered to be the abundance of fellow townsmen (hemşehri) and relatives. (Ayata and Güneş-Ayata, 1996: 76)

Family ties are an important part of social welfare regime in Turkey protecting the poor of squatter settlements against the worsening of their poverty (Buğra, 2001: 23). Kalaycıoğlu and Rittersberger-Tılıç (2001) identify this phenomenon as "family poor model" since the family is a "crucial resource, a form of capital, which provides them (the individual members) with a socio-economic frame within which they can develop viable life-plans". Moreover, fellow townsmen ties help the poor for inward mobility profiting from the preexisting resources of their co-locals (Güneş-Ayata, 1991;

Kalaycıoğlu and Rittersberger-Tılıç, 2001). The stories of Kadifekale residents also depict this informal welfare regime as the solidarity between relatives and neighbors provided socio-economic help when they were in need:

> Three months ago, my aunt died. She had a heart attack at 5 o'clock in the night. They asked the neighbor, the young man on the first floor, could you take us there? He said 'No, I am not available, I came late, I am sleepless, I cannot take you'. Think about this. In Kadifekale, they would definitely take you there. You would find also taxi in the corner. In addition, it takes more than 25 TL from here to the hospital. It was 10 TL in Kadifekale. (Interviewee 27, female, 45-year-old, housewife)

> We were helping our friends whoever in need without hesitation. We can only ask for help here from our old friends. (Interviewee 13, male, 70-year-old, retired)

> There, we were living peacefully in the house of our mother and father. Here there is the trouble whether you can afford or not. I feel like living in the street. (Interviewee 26, female, 63, housewife)

The centrality of Kadifekale and these tight social networks played a considerable impact on the employment of women who are traditionally in Turkey responsible for taking care of children and elderly based on patriarchal hierarchy. Due to the centrality of Kadifekale, the husbands, who have the role of head of the family, were letting them work outside. Moreover, they were able to leave their children or the elderly to their extended family or their neighbors.

> My income is reduced by 90%. Even those who had excellent jobs were damaged, they were dismissed. My wife was working at Tansaş as a store assistant. We were going there together in Kale but here I do not let her work because of transport. (Interviewee 21, male, 40-year-old, unemployed, ex-commissioner buying and selling cars)

> I was working in a factory in Kadifekale. Now I cannot leave my old mother because of its distance. (Interviewee 27, female, 45-year-old, housewife)

6.5. Kadifekale vs. Uzundere as a Psychological Change: Relocation Stress and Tenure Insecurity

Scholars who examine place attachment delve into the interaction between people, their social world, and physical setting and explore the social construction of place based on their relations and experiences with the environment. Although Kadifekale residents were not proud of the bad reputation of the neighborhood, the smell of mussel, the fear from the danger of sliding, they developed a "rooted sense of place" (Hay, 1998) and in-place identities as they constructed their houses, improved the land and they were in close relations with their relatives and neighbors. As aforementioned, Kadifekale residents shared a "place attachment" to their neighborhood describing it as a "family", "beyond family", "village". Deprived of prior family and neighborhood ties, some residents describe the feeling of being a stranger or feeling unrooted in Uzundere living through emotional damage due to their loss of sense of community, neighborhood, and belonging. As in the case of displaced workers of West End of Boston (Fried, 1963), many Kadifekale residents describe the grief and stress of relocation and express their feeling of loss and mourning for the areas and lives they left behind. This could be identified in the following accounts:

> There (Kadifekale), people were closer, we knew each other, there was respect...Here because of being a stranger, they get mad at you even when you are sitting. It is far away from the center, there is nothing here... We knew our surroundings there, this is why Kale was better. Here because of strangers, you are afraid of letting your children out. (Interviewee 39, female, 41-year-old, temporarily works as housekeeper)

> I do not know anyone here. There, I know everyone...Here I do not know people like Kale. People think I am rich and show envy. I am disturbed by that. (Interviewee 23, male, 77-year-old, retired)

> Brother, my childhood is gone. We cried sobbingly…I grew up in Kale, I grew older in Kale...I would die there. I wish I died there. What the landslide! They put us here, I do not want to come downside when I go upside, I do not want to come up when I go downside. (Interviewee 11, male, 41-year-old, working in textile)

> I cried till I came here. (Interviewee 16, female, 62-year-old, retired)

> We were there since our childhood. I was not upset when my house was demolished but when the house of my mother was demolished, my eyes were filled with tears…My children were stressed; they kept saying why we came here. This also happened to us. I was depressed since I was in Kale since my childhood. (Interviewee 18, male, 41-year-old, working in textile)

> I even broke my teeth as I was gritting my teeth because of anger and stress during my sleep. Besides, I went to the psychiatrist two months ago. There is a thing like a hallucination, I was experiencing it. I was hitting the walls, I was shouting at children. I always miss there. They stole my 40 years here. (Interviewee 21, male, 40-year-old, unemployed, ex-commissioner buying and selling cars)

> I was very upset because I did there with my hands, my nails. I want there once or twice after I came here. I saw there demolished, I was upset. I got sick for one month. Since then, I did not put my feet there. (Interviewee 23, male, 77-year-old, retired)

> I miss there but I like my house here. I was born there, I grew up there. I have a past there but the house you live in is also important. (Interviewee 25, female, 37-year-old, housewife)

The social setting has a significant role in the feeling of safety (Carro et al., 2010; Dallago et al., 2009). Decreased place attachment and dissipation of social ties alter the feeling of safety (Ferguson and Mindel, 2007; Rountree and Land, 1996). The number of social ties can lessen the feeling of insecurity (Kanan and Pruitt, 2002; Rountree and Land, 1996). Although TOKİ Uzundere complexes are designed on the motto of a gated community protected by fences and walls, regarding the perceived security in Kadifekale and Uzundere, there is not much difference among my interviewees as 28 of them note that they felt secure in Kadifekale while 27 of them state they feel secure in Uzundere. Although Kadifekale had a bad reputation for its perceived disorder, some residents stated that they were feeling safer and secure in Kadifekale compared to Uzundere since they knew each other for a long time and were in close relations with their neighbors. In Kadifekale; family, neighbor relations, and local ties were contributing to their feeling of safety reinforcing cross-cutting ties among them. These ties were also very valuable

for housewife women and elderly as they spent most of their time in the neighborhood and did not feel isolated. In TOKİ Uzundere, many do not know their neighbors and have very limited opportunity to develop close relations with their neighbors due to limited common space and the privacy of apartment life. As many women are housewives and spend more time in TOKİ Uzundere, they feel more isolated in their new neighborhood due to not knowing their neighbors and not appropriating the neighborhood space as they did in Kadifekale. This bolsters their sense of socio-spatial isolation and insecurity. Residents note:

> We were giving keys to our neighbors there (in Kadifekale). (Interviewee 3, female, 40-year-old, housewife)
>
> We were feeling safe in Kale. It was ours. (Interviewee 5, female, 42, housewife)
>
> There was thievery in Kadifekale. Here we have our door steel-made. There is a camera on every floor. (Interviewee 8, male, 52-year-old, retired)
>
> Here I feel safer then Kale. (Interviewee 12, male, 57-year-old, market seller (pazarcı)
>
> I was feeling safer; the doors were open (in Kadifekale). Kids were more comfortable there, it was a neighborhood. Here if you are sick, the neighbors will not reach out to you until your mother, father come. There is more gossip here like they changed their washing machine, they did this like that. There is much gossip here. (Interviewee 24, female, 33-year-old, housewife)

The dissipation of social ties and the additional expenses as aforementioned put an additional layer of insecurity on Kadifekale residents endowing them with a housing stress about a potential eviction in case they miss their monthly installments. In case residents miss three successive monthly installments, they are given a notice about a possible eviction and the required payment. Integrated into the financial market, they now have to pay additional interest rates over monthly installments due to delays in payment. Although Kadifekale residents should feel more secure about their housing as

they are now entitled to formal property rights, they express constant anxiety and the feeling of being a “renter” because of their difficulty of paying in due time.

> I was not in debt in Kale. I was content with my house, I was not in debt. I receive 600 TL pension, pension for the veteran. I give 380 TL for the debt. What remains for me? 220 TL. I also smoke. If I give this to a cigarette, what will I eat? You can count the rest. (Interviewee 9, male, 58-year-old, a worker in patisserie)
> My wife is worried sick, I have also high blood pressure and diabetes. We spent everything in our hands. Our wage was sufficient for us there, now we have lots of expenses, it does not suffice. (Interviewee 1, male, 66-year-old, retired)

> They wrecked us here. They took our house; they put us in the position of the renter. They kept a part of our money; they made us in debt for the rest. Pay, it will not end for a lifetime. Neither can I finish it nor my children. Does it end, this debt? (Interviewee 6, male, 58-year-old, retired, owner of a grocery store in Kadifekale)

> While I was working in Kadifekale, I have 50 thousand TL saving. I come here with 60 thousand. The money in my hands now is 7 thousand. This is the money I spend out of my pocket. All our savings finished here. It arrives at everybody here. That’s why you have to. I have to make my boy work. I could not let this happen but we were forced to do something here. My hair turned white when we come here. (Interviewee 21, male, 40-year-old, unemployed, ex-commissioner buying and selling cars)

> There are 5- 6 installments we did not pay. Since the two of us are working, it helps us more. Here one laborer is not enough. Now, it is not possible everywhere you go. Here we became renter; it was not like this before. It would be better if they gave us on a par. (Interviewee 5, female, 42-year-old, housewife)

> They gave us houses. Although they should give us houses on par with our houses, he put us in debt...Which one will I pay? Monthly installments, maintenance fee, electricity, children? Forgive me but sometimes, it is not even possible to buy a bread. Really, it arrived at me. (Interviewee 4, female, 49-year-old, housewife)

> We are paying; it is neither decreasing nor ending. How will it end? They say 15 years. But will we pay 1,5 thousand or 2 thousand in 15 years? Will our wage suffice or not? We do not know...We are in deficit now. I am now paying 175

> TL. 150 TL became 175 TL in two years. I am not able to pay this right now. How will I pay it today or tomorrow? This is at their hands right now, they can take our houses. (Interviewee 6, male, 58-year-old, retired, owner of a grocery store in Kadifekale)

In conclusion, the KUTP brought about a differentiation between the 'haves' and the 'have-nots'. First of all, many residents who are embedded in the informal market are under stress since they are anxious about long-term ability to sustain their housing. Zayim (2015) and Bartu-Candan and Kolluoglu (2008) also note similar findings in case of Ayazma residents who are relocated into Bezirganbahce mass housing estate. They argue that these projects generate a social stratification among residents as they are incompatible with the socio-economic means of squatter residents and risk displacing the poorest of the poor. Secondly, as Kadifekale residents are now under obligation to pay their monthly installments in the long-term to sustain their housing, they turned into consumers of the commodified housing market. Kuyucu and Unsal (2010) and Lovering and Turkmen (2011) argue that the transformation of squatter dwellers into consumers in the real estate market enforced the functioning of the privatized land market and enabled the displacement of squatters from their homes in central or peri-central districts. Some scholars view this displacement as 'relocated poverty' (Bartu-Candan and Kolluoğlu, 2009). Thirdly, as low-income residents, particularly those who feel under pressure of housing stress and of immobility in their new environment due to the peripheralization, explain their feeling of socio-spatial exclusion, the KUTP risks generating 'urban captivity' and 'new forms of poverty' that are intertwined with socio-spatial exclusion (Bartu-Candan and Kolluoglu, 2008). As a contribution to the growing literature on urban transformation projects in Turkey, this study shows that there has been a community displacement from Kadifekale to TOKİ Uzundere as Kurds, the majority of whom were tenants and forced migrants, had to find themselves in another house in the competitive housing market of Izmir and were dispersed in other areas of the city. This is similar to the case of Roma community living in Sulukule that ended up as community displacement with their relocation into Tasoluk mass housing estate (Lelandais, 2014). However, as Kadifekale was a politicized settlement different from

Roma community in Sulukule, it also enabled the socio-political exclusion for the Kurdish community living in Kadifekale.

This study also speaks to the literature on slum dwellers in the Global South. Similar to Ghannam's study (2002) that reveals that the relocation from a squatter settlement in the central Cairo to modern apartments changes the relations among neighbors from close to distant, it shows that neighbor relations have changed from squatter settlement into a mass housing estate. Low-income residents are made consumers of the private land market and involved in the scheme of homeownership (Salcedo, 2010). In the end, it risks entailing the displacement of the poor into the margins of the city (Lelandais, 2014; Roy, 2009) and generating 'differentiated inclusion' between slum dwellers who have the means to sustain apartments and those who have not Roy (2009).

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

> Eviction from the neighborhood in which one was at home can be almost as disruptive of the meaning of life as the loss of a crucial relationship. Dispossession threatens the whole structure of attachments through which purposes are embodied because these attachments cannot readily be re-established in an alien setting. (Marris, 1986: 57)

Squatter settlements in Turkey had an empowering impact on urban poor as they provided housing and employment for new migrants based on kinship and neighborhood reciprocity (Keyder, 1999a). Kadifekale squatter settlement was no different as residents describe their neighborhood as a tight-knit community with close family, neighbor, and fellow townsmen ties. While Izmir is being redesigned according to the neoliberal agenda, Kadifekale squatter settlement was disturbing its landscape as a dilapidated area which has a significant rent gap due to its closeness to Izmir city center and its bird's-eye view of almost Izmir. Adopting a slum clearance policy, urban authorities relocated Kadifekale residents into TOKİ Uzundere estates. This relocation not only disciplined a socio-spatial contradiction in Izmir city center replacing a squatter settlement with a recreational touristic area that can boost capital accumulation but also included the urban poor into "global" moral and aesthetic evaluation placing the urban poor into high-rise mass housing areas.

From the perspective of dynamics of poverty, while KUTP was effective in moving a part of Kadifekale residents into a safer and secure environment, it failed in providing them with affordable housing, adequate in size, with a supportive neighborhood and socio-economic betterment. KUTP deteriorated the living conditions of inhabitants from several perspectives. First of all, KUTP was designed as an exclusionary project against

the tenants who were in effect an integral part of the inhabitants of Kadifekale, thus, it was not built upon a planning process with community participation. The fact that tenants are excluded from the KUTP is in itself a denial of the right to housing to the poorest.

Secondly, the right of Kadifekale residents to transparency and information about the space they lived or experienced as Lefebvre calls it "espace vécu" was curtailed by informal negotiations and unfulfilled promises made by urban authorities. Relocated squatters also express feelings of injustice over their right to housing and anxiety over their long-term ability to afford monthly installments.

Thirdly, KUTP not only generated the marketization and commodification of Kadifekale neighborhood but it also commodified the basic needs of Kadifekale residents since their ability to housing, education, healthcare, nutrition depend on their capacity to pay now in TOKİ Uzundere, especially in case of residents living in lower hills of TOKİ Uzundere. While Kadifekale residents were able to provide food and shelter based on incompletely commodified housing rights, unregulated informal market and social networks in Kadifekale squatter settlement; these needs are now channeled into market-oriented and consumption-oriented practices under the logic of economic domination. Their ability to sustain the new apartments hinges on their ability to pay their long-term leases; their ability to access to education, healthcare, and nutrition is predicated on their ability to pay at least for transport. Therefore, Kadifekale residents are now incorporated into the logic of consumerist citizenship and market practices (Christopherson, 1994).

Moreover, while kinship and fellowship ties played a significant role in the livelihood of the squatters mediating the negative impacts of poverty in Turkey (Kalaycıoğlu and Rittersberger-Tılıç, 2000; Pınarcıoğlu and Işık, 2001), the KUTP could not produce a supportive living environment that could cultivate the social capital and place attachments which were community assets of Kadifekale residents in Kadifekale squatter settlements. With relocation in Uzundere, large families broke apart and neighbor and fellow townsmen ties are eroded deprived of social spaces for socialization. This

dissolution of social ties is likely to damage the cultural and political practices of Kadifekale residents, especially for Kurds as Kadifekale squatter area was providing a favorable arena for their cultural and political practices. During my research, I observed on-going solidarity ties between Kurdish residents in Uzundere but to what extent these ties are able to form social capital, increase their political agency and intermingle with bridging social capital should be examined in the long term. The dispersion of social networks and inconvenient spatial properties of Uzundere to generate social networks (Eranıl-Demirli et al., 2015) sacrifice the "priority of use value" in urban space (Lefebvre, 1996: 158) in favor of exchange value based on the logic of capitalist domination.

Furthermore, displacing Kadifekale residents away from Izmir city center, KUTP curtailed their mobility and centrality as Kadifekale residents now have great difficulties to reach out to the city center. In addition, relocation tamed their leisure and activities since they now have to spend a considerable amount of time and energy during transportation as they live away from the city center. Relocated squatters' ability to access social services and workplaces in central districts now depends on the survival of the fittest-those who have enough time, energy and financial capabilities can make it.

Consequently, and most importantly, while squatter settlements were providing for the urban poor to opportunity to be persistent and creative in findings ways out of poverty based on its informal welfare system fed by social networks, these urban transformation projects like KUTP limit the capacity of the urban poor to be productive and creative socially, economically, culturally. Constraining the capacity of urban space for mutual exchange and regulating the very spatial practices of the urban poor, the KUTP contributed to their marginalization in the city. This effect is even more significant for women who benefited from community support and intimate social relations in squatter settlements (Erman, 1996). Many relocated squatters use metaphors such as 'open prison', 'coop' 'top of the mountain' 'cage' to describe their new habitat coupled with increased feelings of deprivation and socio-spatial exclusion.

Considering these aspects; from the perspective of critical urban theory, KUTP can be counted not only as an example of capitalist enclosure (De Angelis, 2007) transforming Kadifekale into a touristic center but also an example of accumulation by dispossession (Harvey, 2008) by forcing Kadifekale residents to move out of Kadifekale and resettle in TOKİ Uzundere. These kinds of urban transformation projects devoid of community planning and developments prospects like the KUTP abandons the urban poor at the mercy of the market and risks of involving the urban poor into impoverishment adrift as the urban poor enmeshed in informal economy has little or no access to credit, savings or insurance that can safeguard them from unexpected crisis. Moreover, the limited capacity of Turkish welfare system in terms of proving decommodified social services for people increase the vulnerability of the urban poor to external shocks and limit their capabilities to invest in human capital and sustain upward mobility in the long term. Hence, these new neighborhoods risk turning into decaying neighborhoods with institutional isolation and territorial segregation in case of unexpected disasters. Stripped out of the safety net provided by squatter settlements and displaced to the outer areas of cities, Turkey can face the expansion of new poverty secluded in mass housing areas with little assets to climb out of poverty.

Sustainable urban transformation advances knowledge and understanding around a range of objects particularly: governance and planning, innovation and competitiveness, lifestyle and consumption, resource management and climate mitigation and adaptation, transport and accessibility, buildings, and social interaction and public space (McCormick, Neij, Anderberg, Coenen, 2011). Here I underline social policy recommendations that arise from this study in line with these objects:

i. *Participatory governance and planning:* A participatory urban transformation process is key to the success and sustainability of urban development projects. It is even more important for marginalized communities that suffer from cumulative challenges to make a sustainable livelihood. The active participation of residents

should be ensured not only during the planning phase but also during the decision-making process and the implementation phase.

ii. *Relocation mitigation and adaptation:* There should be measures to facilitate the relocation and adaptation process of low-income residents in urban transformation projects. These measures should integrate human, economic, social perspectives and prevent several issues that may arise during the relocation phase such as the mobilization of child labor, decaying income, worsening health conditions and dissipation of social networks.

iii. *Inclusive urban development:* Urban transformation projects that remain limited to physical upgrading cannot be successful unless they have a social project that aims at improving the residents' lives at the neighborhood level. Sustainable urban development should work on a comprehensive plan to develop the human, ecological, social and economic capital of relocated slum residents. This research shows that families mobilize their children to work in case they cannot manage the housing expenses. This is likely to have worse consequences on their upward mobility in the long-term and on their ability to build a sustainable livelihood.

iv. *Lifestyle and consumption:* There should be consultation with residents to develop the planning and implementation of urban development projects. The planning should be designed according to their needs and aspirations. This study shows that urban transformation projects that privilege market-based processes and consumption (mortgage loans, maintenance fees, provide basic needs through a mall) are not sustainable in the long term in case of low-income residents.

v. *Transport and accessibility:* Urban transformation projects should generate accessible neighborhoods with a sustainable urban transport. This study shows

that the peripheralization generates perverse impacts on people's income sources and capacity of income management.

vi. *Buildings:* The challenge for urban transformation projects is to create affordable, comfortable and sustainable buildings that correspond to the needs, lifestyles, and aspirations of their residents and help the residents to adapt to changing environmental conditions. This requires an effective stakeholder engagement that does not only include urban authorities but also experts, residents, and private stakeholders.

vii. *Social interaction and public space:* Urban transformation projects should create social spaces that facilitate the encounter and exchange between residents to build social networks. This study shows that the lack of social spaces in the new mass housing estate is one of the main complaints voiced by relocated residents and it is one of the reasons for the rising feeling of socio-spatial exclusion. Urban transformation projects should develop welcoming social spaces that integrate green spaces and ecological development into residents' livelihood.

REFERENCES

Abu-Lughod J (1961) Migrant Adjustment to City Life: The Egyptian Case. American Journal of Sociology 67(1). University of Chicago Press: 22–32.

Adaman F and Ardıç OP (2008) Social Exclusion in the Slum Areas of Large Cities in Turkey. New Perspectives on Turkey 38. Cambridge University Press: 29–60.

Akdağ C (2009) Dönüşüm Sürecinde Kentler, Afetler Ve Kentsel Projeler. In: TMMOB İzmir Kent Sempozyumu, Izmir, 2009, pp. 757–766. Available at: http://www.tmmobizmir.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/200871.pdf (accessed 19 August 2018).

Akyüz Y and Boratav K (2003) The Making of the Turkish Financial Crisis. World Development 31(9): 1549–1566.

Altınçekiç F and Göksu S (1995) Kentsel Mekanın Üretimini Anlamada Toplumsal Ekonomi Kuramı Merkezli Sermaye Birikim Süreci Yaklaşımının Sağladığı Olanaklar - II. Planlama 95(3–4): 62–67.

Amin A (1994) Post-Fordism: Models, Fantasies and Phantoms of Transition. In: Amin A (ed.) Post-Fordism: A Reader. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, pp. 1–39.

ANKA (2010) İstanbul'da 6 Yılda 7 Bin 500 Kaçak Bina Yıkıldı. Available at: http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/istanbulda-6-yilda-7-bin-500-kacak-bina-yikildi-14384155 (accessed 16 August 2018).

Arkon C (1989) İzmir'in Kısa Özgeçmişi. İzmir: Unpublished Research Prepared By Dokuz Eylul University, Department Of City And Regional Planning.

Aslan Ş (2008) Türkiye'de Gecekondular ve Yasalar. Available at: http://v3.arkitera.com/h30889-turkiyede-gecekondular-ve-yasalar.html (accessed 16 August 2018).

Atay MÇ (1978) Tarih İçinde Izmir. İzmir: Yaşar Eğitim Ve Kültür Vakfı Yayınları.

Atkinson R (2000) Measuring Gentrification and Displacement in Greater London. Urban Studies 37(1). Sage Publications: 149–165.

Atkinson R (2002) Does Gentrification Help Or Harm Urban Neighbourhoods?: An Assessment of the Evidence-base in the Context of New Urban Agenda. Bristol: ESRC Centre for Neighbourhood Research.

Atkinson R and Bridge G (2005) Gentrification in a Global Context: The New Urban Colonialism. London: Routledge.

Atkinson R and Flint J (2001) Accessing Hidden and Hard-to-reach Populations: Snowball Research Strategies. Social Research Update (33).

Ayata S and Güneş-Ayata A (1996) Konut, Komşuluk Ve Kent Kültürü. Ankara: T.C. Başbakanlık Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığı.

Aytaç Ö (2005) Kimlik, Kamusal Alan ve Toplumsal Cinsiyet Bağlamında Kahvehaneler. Journal of Academic Studies 6(24): 15–40.

Bailey N (2012) How Spatial Segregation Changes over Time: Sorting Out the Sorting Processes. Environment and Planning A 44(3). Sage Publications: 705–722.

Bali RN (2004) Tarz-ı Hayat'tan Life Style'a: Yeni Seçkinler, Yeni Mekanlar, Yeni Yaşamlar. 6th ed. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Bartu-Candan A and Kolluoğlu B (2008) Emerging Spaces of Neoliberalism: A Gated Town and a Public Housing Project in İstanbul. New Perspectives on Turkey 39: 5–46.

Başlevent C and Dayıoğlu M (2005) The Effect of Squatter Housing on Income Distribution in Urban Turkey. Urban Studies 42. Sage Publications Ltd.: 31–45.

Baycan-Levent T and Gülümser-Akgün AA (2005) Gated Communities From The Perspective Of Developers. ERSA Conference Papers. European Regional Science Association.

Bayraktar E (2006) Gecekondu ve Kentsel Yenileme. Ankara: Ekonomik Araştırmalar Merkezi Yayınları.

Biter K (2013) Ev Sahibi Ve Kiracıya 5 Müthiş Destek! Available at: http://emlak.haber7.com/emlak-gundemi/haber/1053250-ev-sahibi-ve-kiraciya-5-muthis-destek (accessed 19 August 2018).

Boddy M and Parkinson M (2004) City Matters: Competitiveness, Cohesion And Urban Governance. Bristol: Policy Press.

Boratav K, Türel O and Yeldan E (1996) Dilemmas of Structural Adjustment and Environmental Policies Under Instability: Post-1980 Turkey. World Development 24(2): 373–393.

Boratav K, Kepenek Y, Taymaz E, et al. (1998) Kamu İşletmeleri Ve Özelleştirme Deneyimi: Sorunlar Ve Politika Seçenekleri. Toplum ve Bilim (77): 100–134.

Boterman WR, Karsten L and Musterd S (2010) Gentrifiers Settling Down? Patterns and Trends of Residential Location of Middle-Class Families in Amsterdam. Housing Studies 25(5). Taylor & Francis Group: 693–714.

Bourdieu P (1986) The Forms of Capital. In: Szeman I and Kaposy T (eds) Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education. New York: Greenwood Press, pp. 241–258.

Brenner N and Theodore N (2002a) Cities and the Geographies of ‘Actually Existing Neoliberalism’. Antipode 34(3): 349–379.

Brenner N and Theodore N (eds) (2002b) Spaces of Neoliberalism. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.

Buğra A (1998) The Immoral Economy of Housing in Turkey. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 22(2). Blackwell Publishers Ltd: 303–307.

Buğra A (2001) Ekonomik Kriz Karşısında Türkiye’nin Geleneksel Refah Rejimi. Toplum Ve Bilim Yaz(89): 22–30.

Buğra A and Keyder Ç (2003) New Poverty and the Changing Welfare Regime of Turkey. Ankara: UNDP.

Buğra A and Keyder Ç (2006) The Turkish Welfare Regime In Transformation. Journal of European Social Policy 16(3). Sage Publications: 211–228.

Butler T (1997) Gentrification and the Middle Classes. Ashgate Publishing.

Butler T and Hamnett C (2009) Walking Backwards to the Future - Waking Up to Class and Gentrification in London. Urban Policy and Research 27(3). Taylor & Francis: 217–228.

Butler T and Lees L (2006) Super-gentrification in Barnsbury, London: Globalization and Gentrifying Global Elites at the Neighbourhood Level. Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers 31(4). Blackwell Publishing Ltd: 467–487.

Buzar S, Ogden P, Hall R, et al. (2007) Splintering Urban Populations: Emergent Landscapes of Reurbanisation in Four European Cities. Urban Studies 44(4). Sage Publications: 651–677.

Cam S (2002) Neo-Liberalism And Labour Within The Context Of An 'Emerging Market' Economy - Turkey. Capital & Class 26(2). Sage Publications: 89–114.

Cameron S (2003) Gentrification, Housing Redifferentiation and Urban Regeneration: 'Going for Growth' in Newcastle upon Tyne. Urban Studies 40(12). Sage Publications: 2367–2382.

Carro D, Valera S and Vidal T (2010) Perceived Insecurity In The Public Space: Personal, Social And Environmental Variables. Quality & Quantity 44(2). Springer Netherlands: 303–314.

Castells M (1977) The Urban Question: A Marxist Approach. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Çavuşoğlu E and Strutz J (2014) Producing Force And Consent: Urban Transformation And Corporatism In Turkey. City 18(2). Routledge: 134–148.

Chamber of Geology Engineers (2012) Kadifekale Heyelanı İle İlgili Basın Açıklaması Düzenlendi. Available at: http://www.jmo.org.tr/genel/bizden_detay.php?kod=5471&tipi=2&sube=7#.V7AZrvmLTI (accessed 18 November 2018).

Christopherson S (1994) The Fortress City: Privatized Spaces, Consumer Citizenship. In: Amin A (ed.) Post-Fordism: A Reader. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, pp. 409–427.

Clay PL (1979) Neighborhood Renewal: Middle-Class Resettlement and Incumbent Upgrading in American Neighborhoods. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Coleman JS (1988) Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. American Journal of Sociology 94. The University of Chicago Press: 95–120.

Dallago L, Perkins DD, Santinello M, et al. (2009) Adolescent Place Attachment, Social Capital, and Perceived Safety: A Comparison of 13 Countries. American Journal of Community Psychology 44(1–2). Springer US: 148–160.

Davidson DZ (2007) France After Revolution: Urban Life, Gender and the New Social Order. Boston: Harvard University Press.

De Angelis M (2007) The Beginning Of History: Value Struggles And Global Capital. London: Pluto Press.

De Certeau M (1984) The Practice of Everyday Life. Rendall S (ed.). California: University of California Press.

De La Rocha MG, Perlman J, Safa H, et al. (2004) From the Marginality of the 1960s to the New Poverty of Today: A LARR Research Forum. Latin American Research Review 39(1). University of Texas Press: 183–203.

Demirtaş-Milz N (2013) The Regime of Informality in Neoliberal Times in Turkey: The Case of the Kadifekale Urban Transformation Project. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 37(2): 689–714.

Demirtaş-Milz N and Saraçoğlu C (2011) The Urban Transformation in Kadifekale, İzmir: The Crossroads of Neoliberalism and Internal Displacement. MiReKoc Research Projects 2009-2010.

Doshi S (2013) The Politics of the Evicted: Redevelopment, Subjectivity, and Difference in Mumbai's Slum Frontier. Antipode 45(4): 844–865.

Eckstein S (1990) Poor People Versus The State And Capital: Anatomy Of A Successful Community Mobilization For Housing İn Mexico City. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 14(2). Blackwell Publishing Ltd: 274–296.

Ellen IG and O'Regan KM (2011) How Low Income Neighborhoods Change: Entry, Exit, And Enhancement. Regional Science and Urban Economics 41(2): 89–97.

Eranıl-Demirli M, Tuna-Ultav Z and Demirtaş-Milz N (2015) A Socio-Spatial Analysis of Urban Transformation at a Neighborhood Scale: The Case of the Relocation of Kadifekale Inhabitants to TOKİ Uzundere in İzmir. Cities 48: 140–159.

Erder S (1999) Where Do You Hail From? Localism and Networks in Istanbul. In: Keyder Ç (ed.) Istanbul: Between the Global and the Local. Lanham: Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Erder S (2002) Urban Migration and Reconstruction of the Kinship Networks: The Case of Istanbul. In: Liljestrom R and Özdalga E (eds) Autonomy and Dependence in the Family: Turkey and Sweden in Critical Perspective. İstanbul: Swedish Research Institute, pp. 117–137.

Ergin NB and Rittersberger-Tılıç H (2009) Kentsel Yenilemeye Karşı Taban Direnişleri: İstanbul, Güzeltepe Örneği (2009). In: 6. Ulusal Sosyoloji Kongresi Bildiri Kitabı, Aydın, 2009. Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi.

Erman T (1996) Women and the Housing Environment: The Experiences of Turkish Migrant Women in Squatter (Gecekondu) and Apartment Housing. Environment and Behavior 28(6). Sage Publications: 764–798.

Erman T (2001) The Politics of Squatter (Gecekondu) Studies in Turkey: The Changing Representations of Rural Migrants in the Academic Discourse. Urban Studies 38(7): 983–1002.

Erman T and Türkyılmaz S (2008) Neighborhood Effects and Women's Agency Regarding Poverty and Patriarchy in a Turkish Slum. Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space 40(7). Sage Publications: London: 1760–1776.

Fainstein SS (2001) The City Builders: Property Development In New York And London, 1980-2000. Kansas: University Press of Kansas.

Ferguson KM and Mindel CH (2007) Modeling Fear of Crime in Dallas Neighborhoods. Crime & Delinquency 53(2). Sage Publications: Los Angeles, CA: 322–349.

Finney N and Jivraj S (2013) Ethnic Group Population Change and Neighbourhood Belonging. Urban Studies 50(16). Sage Publications: 3323–3341.

Flanagan WG (2010) Urban Sociology: Images and Structure. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Fothergill S, Gudgin G, Kitson M, et al. (1986) The De-industrialisation of the City. In: Martin R and Rowthorn B (eds) The Geography of De-industrialisation. London: Macmillan Education UK, pp. 214–237.

Freeman L (2005) Displacement or Succession? Residential Mobility in Gentrifying Neighborhoods. Urban Affairs Review 40(4). Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA: 463–491.

Freeman L and Braconi F (2004) Gentrification and Displacement New York City in the 1990s. Journal of the American Planning Association 70(1). Taylor & Francis Group: 39–52.

Fried M (1963) Grieving For A Lost Home. In: The Urban Condition: People and Policy in the Metropolis. Duhl, Leon. Basic Books.

Galdini R (2005) Urban Regeneration Process - The Case Of Genoa, An Example Of Integrated Urban Development Approach. ERSA Conference Papers. European Regional Science Association.

Gilbert A (2007) The Return of the Slum: Does Language Matter? International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 31(4). Blackwell Publishing Ltd: 697–713.

Gilbert A and Gugler J (1982) Cities, Poverty and Development: Urbanization in the Third World. Oxford University Press.

Glass R (1964) Introduction: Aspects of Change. In: Centre for Urban Studies (ed.) London: Aspects of Change. London: MacGibbon & Kee, pp. xiii–xlii.

González I (2010) El Centro Histórico De Querétaro: Gentrificación Light Y Vida Cultural [The Historic Centre Of Querétaro: Light Gentrification And Cultural Life]. In: Coulomb R (ed.) México: Centralidades Históricas Y Proyectos De Ciudad [Mexico: Historic Centralities And City Projects]. Quito: Olacchi, pp. 282–304.

Güneş-Ayata A (1991) Gecekondularda Kimlik Sorunu, Dayanışma Örüntüleri Ve Hemşehrilik. Toplum Ve Bilim (51–52 (Güz 1990–Kış 1991)): 89–101.

Güvenç M and Işık O (2002) A Metropolis at the Crossroads: The Changing Social Geography of Istanbul Under the Impact of Globalization. In: Marcuse P and Kempen R Van (eds) Of States and Cities: The Partitioning of Urban Space. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 200–220.

Hackworth J (2007) The Neoliberal City: Governance, Ideology, and Development in American Urbanism. Ithaca And London: Cornell University Press.

Hackworth J and Smith N (2001) The Changing State Of Gentrification. Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie 92(4). Blackwell Publishers Ltd: 464–477.

Hall T and Hubbard P (1998) The Entrepreneurial City And The 'New Urban Politics'. In: Hall T and Hubbard P (eds) The Entrepreneurial City: Geographies Of Politics, Regime And Representation. Wiley, pp. 1–23.

Hamnett C (1994) Social Polarisation in Global Cities: Theory and Evidence. Urban Studies 31(3). Sage Publications: 401–424.

Hamnett C (2003) Gentrification and the Middle-class Remaking of Inner London, 1961-2001. Urban Studies 40(12). Sage Publications: 2401–2426.

Harris A (2008) From London to Mumbai and Back Again: Gentrification and Public Policy in Comparative Perspective. Urban Studies 45(12). Sage Publications: 2407–2428.

Harvey D (1973) Social Justice and the City. London: Edward Arnold.

Harvey D (1989) The Urban Experience. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Harvey D (2008) The Right to the City. New Left Review 53: 23–40.

Harvey DL and Reed MH (1996) The Culture of Poverty: An Ideological Analysis. Sociological Perspectives 39(4). Sage Publications: 465–495.

Hay R (1998) Sense of Place in Developmental Context. Journal of Environmental Psychology 18(1). Academic Press: 5–29.

Hepcan Ş, Çoskun-Hepcan Ç, Kılıçaslan Ç, et al. (2013) Analyzing Landscape Change and Urban Sprawl in a Mediterranean Coastal Landscape: A Case Study from Izmir, Turkey. Journal of Coastal Research 287. The Coastal Education and Research Foundation: 301–310.

Herrera LMG, Smith N and Vera MÁM (2007) Gentrification, Displacement, and Tourism in Santa Cruz De Tenerife. Urban Geography 28(3). Taylor & Francis Group: 276–298.

Isham J, Kelly T and Ramaswamy S (2002) Social Capital And Economic Development: Well-being in Developing Countries. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.

Izmir Metropolitan Municipality (2006) TOKİ Konutları Tanıtımı İçin İrtibat Bürosu. Available at: http://www.izmir.bel.tr/HaberDetay/2113/tr (accessed 19 August 2017).

Izmir Metropolitan Municipality (2007) Kentsel Dönüşüm İçin ‘İlk Neşter’ Vuruldu. Available at: https://www.izmir.bel.tr/tr/Haberler/kentsel-d0nusum-icin-ilk-nester-vuruldu/2993/156 (accessed 19 November 2018).

Izmir Metropolitan Municipality (2010) … Ve Uzundere'de Hayat Başladı. Available at: https://www.izmir.bel.tr/tr/Haberler/…-ve-uzunderede-hayat-basladi/6448/156 (accessed 1 November 2018).

Izmir Metropolitan Municipality (2011) Kent Dönüşümü İşte Budur! Available at: https://www.izmir.bel.tr/tr/Haberler/kent-d0nusumu-iste-budur/8042/156 (accessed 20 November 2018).

Izmir Metropolitan Municipality (2013) Başkan'dan 'Dönüşüm Manifestosu'. Available at: https://www.izmir.bel.tr/tr/Haberler/baskandan-d0nusum-manifestosu/9272/156 (accessed 20 November 2018).

Izmir Metropolitan Municipality (2014) Izmir Metropolitan Municipality Border Map. Available at: https://www.izmir.bel.tr/tr/BuyuksehirSinirHaritasi/125/212 (accessed 26 April 2018).

Izmir Metropolitan Municipality (2018) Kadifekale ve Yeşildere Kentsel Yenileme Projeleri. Available at: https://www.izmir.bel.tr/YuklenenDosyalar/file/KENTSEL_DONUSUM/konut_proje/kadifekale_yesildere_12mb.pdf (accessed 18 November 2018).

Izmir Metropolitan Municipality Department of City Planning and Urban Development Directorate of City Master Plan (2009) 1/25000 Ölçekli İzmir Kentsel Bölge Nazım İmar Planı Revizyonu Açıklama Raporu. İzmir. Available at: http://izmimod.org.tr/docs5/IKBNIPR_PLANACIKLAMARAPORU.pdf.

Kalaycıoğlu S and Rittersberger-Tılıç H (2000) Intergenerational Solidarity Networks Of Instrumental And Cultural Transfers Within Migrant Families In Turkey. Ageing & Society 20(5): 523–542.

Kalaycıoğlu S and Rittersberger-Tılıç H (2001) Evlerimizdeki Gündelikçi Kadınlar / Cömert Ablaların Sadık Hanımları. İstanbul: Su Yayınevi.

Kanan JW and Pruitt M V. (2002) Modeling Fear of Crime and Perceived Victimization Risk: The (In)Significance of Neighborhood Integration. Sociological Inquiry 72(4). Blackwell Publishers Inc.: 527–548.

Karadağ A (2000) Kentsel Gelişim Süreci, Çevresel Etkileri Ve Sorunları İle İzmir. İzmir: Titizler Baskı Hizmetleri.

Karadağ A and Mirioğlu G (2011) Bayraklı Kentsel Dönüşüm Projesi Üzerine Coğrafi Değerlendirmeler. Türk Coğrafya Dergisi (57): 21–32.

Karaman O (2008) Urban Pulse-(Re)Making Space for Globalization in Istanbul. Urban Geography 29(6). Taylor & Francis Group: 518–525.

Karaman O (2013) Urban Neoliberalism with Islamic Characteristics. Urban Studies 50(16): 3412–3427.

Karaman O (2014) Resisting Urban Renewal In Istanbul. Urban Geography 35(2). Routledge: 290–310.

Karaman Y (2011) TOKİ, 225 lira taksitle ev satacak! Kaçırmayın! Available at: https://www.emlaktasondakika.com/haber/toki/toki-225-lira-taksitle-ev-satacak-kacirmayin/7694 (accessed 19 August 2018).

Karayiğit A (2005) Kadifekale'nin Sosyo-Ekonomik Profili Ve Sorunları. İzmir Ticaret Odası: İzmir.

Karpat KH (1976) The Gecekondu: Rural Migration And Urbanization. Cambridge University Press.

Karpat KH (2004) The Genesis of the Gecekondu: Rural Migration and Urbanization (1976). European Journal of Turkish Studies (Online). Available at: https://journals.openedition.org/ejts/54#tocto1n1 (accessed 27 August 2018).

Kaya AY (2010) 19. Yüzyıldan 21. Yüzyıla Izmir Ekonomisinde Süreklilik Ve Kırılmalar. In: Yıldırım D and Haspolat E (eds) Değişen İzmir'i Anlamak. Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi, pp. 42–105.

Kaya N (2002) Analysis of the Interaction Between Theory and Practice in Urban Planning: Understanding İzmir Experience. Unpublished PhD Thesis: Izmir Institute of Technology.

Keleş R (2004) Kentleşme Politikası. Ankara: İmge Yayınevi.

Kennedy M and Leonard P (2001) Dealing with Neighborhood Change: A Primer on Gentrification and Policy Choices. Washington, DC.

Keyder C (1999a) A Tale of Two Neighborhoods. In: Keyder C (ed.) Istanbul: Between The Global And The Local. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., pp. 173–186.

Keyder C (1999b) The Housing Market from Informal to Global. In: Keyder C (ed.) Istanbul: Between the Global and the Local. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., pp. 143–160.

Keyder Ç (2005) Globalization and Social Exclusion in Istanbul. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 29(1). Blackwell Publishing Ltd: 124–134.

Keyder Ç and Öncü A (1994) Globalization of a Third-World Metropolis: Istanbul in the 1980's. Review (Fernand Braudel Center) 17(3): 383–421.

Kozanoğlu H (1993) Yuppieler, Prensler Ve Bizim Kuşak. 3rd ed. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Kurban D, Yükseker D, Çelik AB, et al. (2007) Coming to Terms with Forced Migration: Post-Displacement Restitution of Citizenship Rights in Turkey. İstanbul: TESEV Publications.

Kuyucu T and Ünsal Ö (2010) Urban Transformation as State-led Property Transfer: An Analysis of Two Cases of Urban Renewal in Istanbul. Urban Studies 47(7). Sage Publications: 1479–1499.

Kütük İnce E (2006) Kentsel Dönüşümde Yeni Politika, Yasa Ve Eğilmlerin Değerlendirilmesi Kuzey Ankara Girisi (Protokol Yolu) Kentsel Dönüşüm Projesi. Unpublished MA Thesis: Department Of Urban And Regional Planning, Gazi University.

Lees L (2003) Super-gentrification: The Case of Brooklyn Heights, New York City. Urban Studies 40(12). Sage Publications: 2487–2509.

Lees L, Shin HB and López-Morales E (eds) (2015) Global Gentrifications: Uneven Development and Displacement. Bristol: Policy Press.

Lefebvre H (1996) The Right To The City. In: Lefebvre H, Kofman E, and Lebas E (eds) Writings On Cities. Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers, pp. 63–184.

Lefebvre H (2003) The Urban Revolution. Bononno R (ed.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lewis O (1966a) La Vida: A Puerto Rican Family in the Culture of Poverty-San Juan and New York. 13th ed. New York: Random House.

Lewis O (1966b) The Culture of Poverty. Scientific American 215(4): 19–25.

Ley D (2003) Artists, Aestheticisation and the Field of Gentrification. Urban Studies 40(12). Sage Publications: 2527–2544.

Lin N (2000) Inequality in Social Capital. Contemporary Sociology 29(6). American Sociological Association: 785.

Lovering J and Türkmen H (2011) Bulldozer Neo-liberalism in Istanbul: The State-led Construction of Property Markets, and the Displacement of the Urban Poor. International Planning Studies 16(1). Routledge: 73–96.

Macpherson S and Silburn R (1998) The Meaning and Measurement of Poverty. In: Dixon J and Macarow D (eds) Poverty: A Persistent Global Reality. London: Routledge.

Maloutas T (2004) Segregation and Residential Mobility Spatially Entrapped Social Mobility and Its Impact on Segregation in Athens. European Urban and Regional Studies 11(3). Sage Publications: 195–211.

Marcuse P (1986) Abandonment, Gentrification, and Displacement: The Linkages in New York City. In: Smith N and Williams P (eds) Gentrification of the City. London: Unwin Hyman, pp. 1–25.

Marcuse P (1997) The Enclave, the Citadel, and the Ghetto: What has Changed in the Post-Fordist U.S. City. Urban Affairs Review 33(2). Sage Publications: 228–264.

Marris P (1986) Loss and Change. Revised Ed. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Mayer M (1994) Post-Fordist City Politics. In: Amin A (ed.) Post-Fordism: A Reader. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, pp. 316–337.

McKinnish T, Walsh R and White TK (2010) Who Gentrifies Low-Income Neighborhoods? Journal of urban economics 67(2). NIH Public Access: 180–193.

McLachlan H V. (1983) Townsend and the Concept of 'Poverty'. Social Policy & Administration 17(2). Wiley/Blackwell: 97–105.

Ministry of Environment and Urbanization (2012) İstanbul Milletvekili Sayın Mahmut Tanal'ın TBMM 7/13308 Esas Sayılı Yazılı Soru Önergesine Ait Sorular Ve Cevabı. Available at: www2.tbmm.gov.tr/d24/7/7-13308c.pdf (accessed 1 November 2018).

Molotch H (1976) The City as a Growth Machine: Toward a Political Economy of Place. American Journal of Sociology 82(2). University of Chicago Press: 309–332.

Moser CON (1996) Confronting Crisis: A Comparative Study of Household Responses to Poverty and Vulnerability in Four Poor Urban Communities. Washington, DC.: The World Bank.

Moser CON (1998) The Asset Vulnerability Framework: Reassessing Urban Poverty Reduction Strategies. World Development 26(1). Pergamon: 1–19.

Moser CON, Gatehouse M and Garcia H (1996) Urban Poverty Research Sourcebook Module I: Indicators of Urban Poverty. Urban Management and Poverty Reduction 5. Washington, DC.

Mukhija V (2003) Squatters As Developers? Slum Redevelopment In Mumbai. Gateshead: Ashgate Publishing.

Mutlu Kılıç E and Göksu AE (2018) Bir Kentsel Dönüşüm Deneyimi: Kadifekale-Uzundere İkileminde Bireysel Öyküler Üzerine Düşünmek. Planlama 28(2): 201–217. Available at: http://www.planlamadergisi.org/jvi.aspx?pdir=planlama&plng=tur&un=PLAN-76476 (accessed 19 November 2018).

Mutluer M (2000) Kentleşme Sürecinde İzmir'de Toplu Konut Uygulamaları Ve Sorunlar. Ege Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları. İzmir: Ege Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi.

Newman K and Ashton P (2004) Neoliberal Urban Policy and New Paths of Neighborhood Change in the American Inner City. Environment and Planning A 36(7). SAGE Publications UK: London, England: 1151–1172.

Newman K and Wyly EK (2006) The Right to Stay Put, Revisited: Gentrification and Resistance to Displacement in New York City. Urban Studies 43(1). Sage Publications: 23–57.

Nijman J (2008) Against The Odds: Slum Rehabilitation In Neoliberal Mumbai. Cities 25(2): 73–85.

Nolan B and Whelan CT (2011) Poverty and Deprivation in Europe. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Öktem Ünsal B (2015) State-led Urban Regeneration in Istanbul: Power Struggles between Interest Groups and Poor Communities. Housing Studies 30(8): 1299–1316. DOI: 10.1080/02673037.2015.1021765.

Öncü A (1997) The Myth of the Ideal Home - Travels Across Cultural Borders to Istanbul. In: Öncü A and Weyland P (eds) Space, Culture And Power: New Identities In Globalizing Cities. London and New Jersey: Zed Books, pp. 56–72.

Öniş Z (1991) The Evolution of Privatization in Turkey: The Institutional Context of Public-Enterprise Reform. International Journal of Middle East Studies 23(2). Cambridge University Press: 163–176.

Öniş Z and Bayram İE (2008) Temporary Star or Emerging Tiger? Turkey's Recent Economic Performance in a Global Setting. New Perspectives on Turkey 39: 47–84.

Özbek-Sönmez İ (2001) Yapısal Dönüşümler Sürecinde Yerel ve Yerel Üstü İlişkilerin Mekansal Yansımaları - Tüketim Mekanları. Ege Mimarlık 32–36(40–41).

Özler Şİ (2000) The Politics of Gecekondu in Turkey: The Political Choices of Urban Squatters in National Elections. Turkish Studies 1(2). Taylor & Francis Group: 39–58.

Peck J and Tickell A (2002) Neoliberalizing Space. Antipode 34(3): 380–404.

Penpecioğlu M (2012) The Political Construction Of Urban Development Projects: The Case Of Izmir. Unpublished PhD Thesis: Middle East Technical University.

Pınarcıoğlu MM and Işık O (2001) 1980 Sonrası Dönemde Kent Yoksulları Arasında Güce Dayalı Ağ Ilişkileri: Sultanbeyli Örneği. Toplum Ve Bilim (89): 31–61.

Pınarcıoğlu MM and Işık O (2005) Nöbetleşe Yoksulluk: Sultanbeyli Örneği. 4th ed. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Pınarcıoğlu MM and Işık O (2008) Not Only Helpless But Also Hopeless: Changing Dynamics of Urban Poverty in Turkey, the Case of Sultanbeyli, Istanbul. European Planning Studies 16(10). Routledge: 1353–1370.

Piachaud D (1987) Problems in the Definition and Measurement of Poverty. Journal of Social Policy 16(2). Cambridge University Press: 147.

Putnam RD (2000) Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital. Culture and Politics. New York: Palgrave Macmillan US: 223–234.

Putnam RD, Leonardi R and Nanetti RY (1993) Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Ravallion M, Chen S and Sangraula P (2009) Dollar a Day Revisited. The World Bank Economic Review 23(2). Oxford University Press: 163–184.

Rérat P (2012) The New Demographic Growth of Cities - The Case of Reurbanisation in Switzerland. Urban Studies 49(5). Sage Publications: 1107–1125.

Robeyns I (2005) The Capability Approach: A Theoretical Survey. Journal of Human Development 6(1). Taylor & Francis Group: 93–117.

Rose NS (1999) Powers Of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rountree PW and Land KC (1996) Perceived Risk Versus Fear of Crime: Empirical Evidence of Conceptually Distinct Reactions in Survey Data. Social Forces 74(4). Oxford University Press: 1353.

Roy A (2004) Transnational Trespassings: The Geopolitics of Urban Informality. In: Roy A and AlSayyad N (eds) Urban Informality: Transnational Perspectives from the Middle East, Latin America and South Asia. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, pp. 289–317.

Roy A (2011) Slumdog Cities: Rethinking Subaltern Urbanism. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 35(2). Blackwell Publishing Ltd: 223–238.

Sabatini F, Sarella Robles M and Vásquez H (2009) Gentrificación Sin Expulsión, O La Ciudad Latinoamericana En Una Encrucijada Histórica. Revista 180: 1–24.

Saegert S, Thompson JP and Warren MR (eds) (2001) Social Capital and Poor Communities. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Sakızlıoğlu NB (2007) Impacts Of Urban Renewal Policies: The Case Of Tarlabaşı-Istanbul. Unpublished MA Thesis: Sociology, Middle East Technical University.

Saraçoğlu C (2010) Kurds of Modern Turkey: Migration, Neoliberalism and Exclusion in Turkish Society. London & New York: I.B. Tauris Publishers.

Saraçoğlu C and Demirtaş-Milz N (2014) Disasters As An Ideological Strategy For Governing Neoliberal Urban Transformation In Turkey: Insights From Izmir/Kadifekale. Disasters 38(1): 178–201.

Sassen S (1991) The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo. Princeton: New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Sassen S (1994) Cities in a World Economy. Newbury Park: Pine Forge Press.

Sassen S (2006) Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval To Global Assemblages. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Sekmen S (2007) Kentsel Dönüşüm Üzerine Bir Model Önerisi: İzmir - Ferahlı Mahallesi Örneği. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi.

Sen A (1993) Capability And Well-Being. In: Nussbaum MC and Sen A (eds) The Quality Of Life. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 30–53.

Sen A (1999) Development as Freedom. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shaw K (2008) A Response to 'The Eviction of Critical Perspectives from Gentrification Research'. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 32(1). Wiley/Blackwell: 192–194.

Shaw K (2009) The Melbourne Indie Music Scene and the Inner City Blues. In: Shaw K and Porter L (eds) Whose Urban Renaissance?: An International Comparison of Urban Regeneration Strategies. London: Routledge, pp. 191–201.

Slater T (2006) The Eviction of Critical Perspectives from Gentrification Research. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 30(4). Blackwell Publishing Ltd: 737–757.

Slater T (2009) Missing Marcuse: On gentrification and displacement. City 13(2–3). Routledge: 292–311.

Slater T, Curran W and Lees L (2004) Guest Editorial. Environment and Planning A 36(7). Sage Publications: 1141–1150.

Smith N (1979) Toward a Theory of Gentrification a Back to the City Movement by Capital, Not People. Journal of the American Planning Association 45(4). Taylor & Francis Group: 538–548.

Smith N (1984) Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space. Blackwell.

Smith N (1987) Gentrification and the Rent Gap. Annals of the Association of American Geographers 77(3). Taylor & Francis, Ltd. Association of American Geographers: 462–465.

Smith N (1994) Geography, empire and social theory. Progress in Human Geography 18(4): 491–500.

Smith N (1996) The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification And The Revanchist City. New York: Routledge.

Smith N (1998) Giuliani Time: The Revanchist 1990s. Social Text (57). Duke University Press: 1.

Smith N (2002) New Globalism, New Urbanism: Gentrification as Global Urban Strategy. Antipode 34(3). Blackwell Publishers Ltd: 427–450.

Smith N and Willams P (1986) Gentrification Of The City. Smith N and Williams P (eds). Boston: Allen & Unwin Publishers Ltd.

Smyrnelis MC (ed.) (2016) İzmir, 1830-1930 Unutulmuş Bir Kent Mi?: Bir Osmanlı Limanından Hatıralar. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Şengül HT (2003) On The Trajectory Of Urbanisation In Turkey: An Attempt At Periodisation. International Development Planning Review 25(2). Liverpool University Press: 153–168.

Şenses F (1994) Labor Market Responses to Structural Adjustment and Institutional Pressure: The Turkish Case. METU Studies in Development 21(3).

Şenyapılı T (1982) Economic Change And The Gecekondu Family. In: Kağıtçıbaşı Ç (ed.) Sex Roles, Family & Community in Turkey. 3rd ed. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, pp. 237–248.

Şimşek A (2005) Yeni Orta Sınıf. İstanbul: L&M Yayıncılık.

Teernstra A (2014) Neighbourhood Change, Mobility and Incumbent Processes: Exploring Income Developments of In-migrants, Out-migrants and Non-migrants of Neighbourhoods. Urban Studies 51(5). Sage Publications: 978–999.

Tekeli İ (1992) Development of urban administration and planning in the formation of istanbul metropolitan area. In: Tekeli İ, Şenyapılı T, Türel A, et al. (eds) Development of the Istanbul Metropolitan Area and Low Cost Housing. İstanbul: Turkish Social Science Association, Municipality of Greater Istanbul, IULA-EMME, pp. 3–111.

Tok N (1999) A Critical Approach To Gecekondu Studies In Turkey With A Reference To The Modernization Theory. Unpublished MA Thesis, Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey.

TOKI Corporate Profile (2017) Ankara. Available at: http://www.toki.gov.tr/content/images/main-page-slider/16012017212815-pdf.pdf (accessed 19 August 2018).

Townsend P (1979) Poverty in the United Kingdom: A Survey of Household Resources and Standards of Living. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Townsend P (1993) The International Analysis of Poverty. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Töre EÖ and Kozaman Som S (2009) Sosyo-Mekansal Ayrışmada Korunaklı Konut Yerleşmeleri: İstanbul Örnegi. Megaron Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Mimarlık Fakültesi E-Dergisi 4: 121–130.

Türker-Devecigil P (2006) The Role of Local Actors in Transforming Informal Settlements in Turkey for Sustainable Urban Development: The Ankara–Dikmen Valley Case. International Planning Studies 11(3–4). Taylor & Francis: 167–186.

Van Criekingen M and Decroly J-M (2003) Revisiting the Diversity of Gentrification: Neighbourhood Renewal Processes in Brussels and Montreal. Urban Studies 40(12): 2451–2468.

Wacquant LJD (1993) Urban Outcasts: Stigma and Division in the Black American Ghetto and the French Urban Periphery. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 17(3): 366–383.

Weinstein L and Ren X (2009) The Changing Right to the City: Urban Renewal and Housing Rights in Globalizing Shanghai and Mumbai. City & Community 8(4). Blackwell Publishing Inc: 407–432.

Whitehead J and More N (2007) Revanchism in Mumbai? Political Economy of Rent Gaps and Urban Restructuring in a Global City. Economic and Political Weekly 42(25): 2428–2434.

Williams JJ (2000) South Africa: Urban transformation. Cities 17(3). Pergamon: 167–183.

Wilson WJ (1987) The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wu F, Zhang F and Webster C (2013) Informality and the Development and Demolition of Urban Villages in the Chinese Peri-urban Area. Urban Studies 50(10). SAGE Publications: 1919–1934.

www.ensonhaber.com (2015) Esenler'in kentsel dönüşümünde bedava daire. Available at: http://www.ensonhaber.com/esenlerin-kentsel-donusumunde-bedava-daire-2015-02-17.html (accessed 20 August 2018).

Wyly EK and Hammel DJ (1999) Islands of Decay in Seas of Renewal: Housing Policy and the Resurgence of Gentrification. Housing Policy Debate 10(4): 711–771.

Yaman M (2011) Kentsel Dönüşüm Uygulamaları Ankara Büyükşehir Belediyesi: Dikmen Vadisi 3. Etap Örneği. Unpublished PhD Thesis: Ankara University.

Yönder A (1987) Informal Land and Housing Markets: The Case of Istanbul, Turkey. Journal of the American Planning Association 53(2). Taylor & Francis Group: 213–219.

Yücel-Young Ş and Datta A (2007) Suburban Development and Networks of Mobility: Sites In Izmir, Turkey. Global Built Environment Review 6(1): 42–53.

Zayim A (2014) Differentiated Urban Citizenship and Housing Rights: Analysing the Social Impacts of Urban Redevelopment in Globalizing Istanbul. International Planning Studies 19(3–4). Routledge: 268–291.

Zukin S (1998) Urban Lifestyles: Diversity and Standardisation in Spaces of Consumption. Urban Studies 35(5–6): 825–839.

APPENDICES

A. TÜRKÇE ÖZET / TURKISH SUMMARY

Neoliberal şehirleşme dünyaya yayıldıkça, şehirlerin manzaraları da girişimci kentsel gelişim modeline göre değişmektedir. Kent yöneticileri, küresel sermayeyi çekmek ve şehirlerde ekonomik rekabeti desteklemek için özel sektör ve yerel girişimcilerle işbirliği içinde emlak piyasasına yatırımı yönlendirmekte ve arazinin metalaşmasını hızlandırmaktadır. Bu çerçevede, kentsel dönüşüm projeleri soylulaştırmayı hızlandırmakta ve kentsel rantı arttırmaktadır.

Soylulaştırma kendi içinde yerinden edilme bileşenini de taşır. İlk olarak, finansal yatırım ve bölgenin fiziksel olarak iyileştirilmesi nedeniyle, daha yüksek gelirli sakinler bölgede daireler satın alır. Bölgedeki sosyo-kültürel sermayenin değişmesiyle birlikte düşük gelirlilerin bölgede yaşamaya gücü yetmez. Ayrıca bölgedeki arazi ve ev fiyatlarının yükselmesiyle dar gelirliler soylulaşmış bölgelerden konut veya arazi satın alamazlar. İkincisi, bölgenin yeniden değerlenmesinin bir sonucu olarak, düşük gelirli insanlar bu mahallelerde yaşamayı göze alamazlar, önceden var olan düşük gelirli sakinlerin yerini daha yüksek gelirli sakinler almaya başlar. Dolayısıyla, düşük gelirli mahallelerin sosyo-kültürel özellikleri de daha yüksek bir sınıfa yayılmakta ve düşük gelirliler yerinden edilmektedir. Küresel Kuzey'deki kentsel dönüşümün ve soylulaşmanın ana aktörü piyasa güçleri olurken; Küresel Güney’de bu rolü devlet üstlenmektedir. Bu rol; kent içindeki tamamıyla metalaşmamış, düzensiz, sahipsiz veya düşük rant üreten alanların, tamamıyla metalaşmış alanlarda uygulanan agresif kentsel dönüşüm programlarının benzerleri yoluyla dönüştürülmesini ifade etmektedir.

Küresel Güney'de şehir içi kaçak veya kayıtsız alanlarda yaşayan gecekondu sakinleri bu projelerden özellikle etkilenmektedir. Bu alanlara özellikle şehir içinde rant üretebilecek

ve dolayısıyla kapitalist birikimi yaratabilecek ideal yerler olarak bakılmaktadır. Bu projeler şehir imajını geliştirmeyi amaçlarken merkezdeki mahallelerden kentsel yoksulu yerinden eden ve belli bir sınıfı şehir içinden temizlediği gerekçesiyle eleştiriler almaktadır. Gecekondu alanlarını iyileştirme veya temizleme politikası olarak pazarlanan pek çok kentsel dönüşüm projesi çok sayıda kentsel yoksulun yerinden edilmesine neden olmuş ve şehir hakkından yararlanma kapasitelerini azaltmıştır.

Türkiye ekonomisinin neoliberal ekonomiye katılımıyla birlikte Türkiye'deki büyük şehirler küresel kente uyumlu olarak değişmeye başladı. Özel sektörün gayrimenkul piyasasına ilgisi artarken, şehirler yükselen yeni sınıfların beklenti ve ihtiyaçlarına göre yeniden şekillendi. Küresel sermayenin gayrimekul piyasasına yatırımı ve şehirlerin turistik merkezler olarak pazarlanması arazi spekülasyonunu yoğunlaştırdı. Bu durum da kentsel rantın metalaşması ve ticarileştirilmesi üzerinde baskı yarattı. Endüstri ve imalat sektörlerinin çevre alanlara taşınması ile birlikte, bu sektörlerin özellikle kent içindeki iş olanaklarına yakın olan gecekondu bölgeleri, şehir için daha önce ifade ettikleri üretkenliklerini kaybetti.

Türkiye'de yoksulluk konusundaki son çalışmalar, yeni yoksulların aşırı yoksulluk durumuna düşmeye eğilimli olduğuna dikkat çekmektedir. Ekonomideki, şehir planlamasındaki ve refah dağıtımındaki değişiklikler yoksulluğun da değişmesinde neden olmakta ve statüsünü yükseltme fırsatlarından mahrum olan sınıflarda yeni yoksulluk biçimlerinin ortaya çıkmasına zemin oluşturmaktadır. Yeni yoksulluk sosyal dışlanma, alt sınıfın büyümesi, yoksul mahallelerin şuç ile damgalanması ile içiçe gelişmektedir. Sosyal ve mekansal dışlanma, yeni yoksulluğun bir parçasıdır. Ayrıca, sosyal ve mekanda dışlanma ile birleşen bu tür yoksulluk biçimleri aile, komşuluk, hemşehrilik gibi önceki göçmenler için birleşme mekanizması sağlayan dayanışma ağlarının da dağılmasına neden olmaktadır. Bu süreçten, süregelen savaş nedeniyle 90’larda Güneydoğu’da yerinden edilmiş ve batı şehirlerine yerleşmiş Kürtler, düşük beceri ve fırsatlara sahip yeni bir alt sınıf oluşturdukları için özellike etkilenmektedir. Bugüne kadar yapılan çalışmalar yoksul insanların temel sosyal hizmetlere katlanmakta

zorluk çektiğini ve yerinden edilme nedeniyle büyük şehirlere göç eden Kürtlerin daha fazla sosyal dışlanma hissine sahip olduklarını göstermektedir.

Son dönemlerde Türkiye'nin gecekondu yerleşimlerinde yaşanan kentsel dönüşüm deneyimi, kentsel yoksulluğun değişimine ilişkin açıklayıcı dersler sunmaktadır. Ülkemizdeki gecekondu alanlarında hayata geçirilen kentsel dönüşüm projeleri, söylem düzeyinde, devlet destekli kentsel gelişim neticesinde kentsel yoksulluğun iyileştirilmesi ve şehir içi ticari ve rekreasyonel alanların üretilmesini amaçlamaktadır. Bu bağlamda; bu tez, özellikle son 20-30 yılda turizm potansiyeli vurgulanarak pazarlanan ve küresel sermayeden bu kapsamda pay alması arzu edilen Türkiye'nin üçüncü büyük şehri İzmir'de, bu söylem merkeze alınarak, heyelan riski taşıyan ve turizm potansiyeli yüksek olan Kadifekale eteklerinde bulunan 9 mahalleyi kapsar şekilde uygulanan Kadifekale Kentsel Dönüşüm Projesi'nin pazarlanan amaca hizmet edip etmediği, yani kentsel yoksulluğun iyileştirilmesine katkıda bulunup bulunmadığını araştırmaktadır.

Birçok akademisyenin belirttiği gibi, Türkiye'deki kentsel dönüşüm projeleri, şehir içi mahallelerde bulunan yoksul alt sınıfların sosyo-ekonomik iyileşmelerini sağlamak yerine, çevrede inşa edilen toplu konutlara yerleştirerek ters etkiler yaratmaktadır. Kentsel dönüşüm projeleri, gecekondu yerleşimlerinin dönüşümünü hedeflediği için, yalnızca fiziksel yapının değil, aynı zamanda sosyal, kültürel, ekonomik ve politik yapıyı da değiştirmektedir. Neoliberal ekonomi ve küresel sermaye için şehirler arası rekabete paralel olarak, özel sektör ve gayrimenkul piyasası alt sınıflar veya dışlanmış toplulukların yaşadığı şehir merkezindeki çöküntü alanlarının rantının arttırılmasına yönelmiştir. Gecekondu mahallelerinde uygulanan kentsel dönüşüm projeleri ile yoksulluk mekansal olarak yer değiştirmekte ve kentin çeperlerine doğru taşınmaktadır. Ancak; yoksul insanları şehir merkezlerinden ve dolayısıyla kentin görünen yüzünden uzaklaştıran söz konusu kentsel dönüşüm projeleri, yapabilirlikleri ve kendi imkanlarıyla yoksulluktan çıkma ihtimalleri kısıtlı olan ve çoğunlukla merkezde bulunmanın sağladığı avantajla enformel sektörde çalışan bu insanların sosyo-ekonomik durumlarının

iyileştirilmesine yönelik gerekli gelir dağılımı, istihdam projeleri ve sosyal politika araçlarıyla desteklenmediğinden ötürü eleştirilmektedir.

Kadifekale, 20. yüzyılın başlarından bu yana göçmenlerin yaşadığı yaşadığı İzmir'in merkezinde eski bir gecekondu mahallesidir. Kadifekale, etnik önyargılar ve bir çöküntü alanı olduğu için İzmir'de kaçınılan damgalanmış alanlardan biriydi. Özellikle 1980'lerde hız kazanan kırdan kente göç ve savaşın sürüklediği Kürtlerin yerleştiği ana bölgelerden biri oldu. Kadifekale, kalesi ve Helenik, Roma ve Bizans İmparatorluğu'nun arkeolojik kalıntılarının da olduğu bir bölge olduğu için önemli bir turizm rantı imkanına sahipti. Bu çerçevede; uzun yıllardır alandaki heyelan tehlikesi bilinmesine ve bu tehlikeye yönelik çeşitli kereler Bakanlar Kurulu kararlarıyla "afete maruz bölge" ilan edilmesine karşın patronaj ilişkileri nedeniyle bu duruma kayıtsız kalınmış ve Kadifekale büyümeye devam etmiştir. Ancak; 2000'li yılların başı itibarıyla Türkiye'de yaygınlaşmaya başlayan neoliberal kentleşme ve neoliberal politikaların kent yönetimlerini etkilemesiyle birlikte söz konusu bölgenin kentsel dönüşüme tabi tutulmasına karar verildi. Kadifekale Kentsel Dönüşüm Projesi, Kadifekale'deki hak sahiplerinin Uzundere TOKİ konutlarına yerleştirilmesini ve Kadifekale'nin turistik ve rekreasyonel bir mekan olarak yeniden tasarlanmasını amaçlıyordu.

Bu çerçevede; bu tezin alan araştırması, Kadifekale'den Uzundere TOKİ'ye taşınan 39 kişiyle yarı yapılandırılmış sorular üzerinden gerçekleştirilmiş ve projenin Kadifekale ve Uzundere'deki planlama ve uygulama süreçleri yerinde gözlemlenmiştir. Dönüşüm projesinin insanların mekansal, sosyal ve ekonomik durumlarını nasıl değiştirdiğini analiz etmek için araştırmada Kadifekale ve Uzundere'deki yaşam koşullarının karşılaştırmasına yönelik sorular sorulmuştur. Ayrıca; bu çalışmada, İzmir Büyükşehir Belediyesi ve TOKİ gibi kentsel otoritelerin kentsel dönüşümdeki rolü ve perspektifi de anlaşılmaya çalışılmıştır. Sorular genel olarak yedi ana başlık altında toplanmıştır: (1) konut/mekanın fiziksel dönüşümü, (2) hanehalkı üyelerinin çalışma koşullarındaki değişiklik, (3) aile refahındaki değişim, (4) sosyal mekan ve sosyalleşmedeki değişim, (5) sosyal ağlardaki değişim, (6) aidiyet ve sosyal dışlanma ve (7) güncel sorunlar.

Kentsel dönüşüm projeleri, hanehalkının fiziksel durumunu önemli ölçüde değiştiren mekansal bir dönüşüm yaratmaktadır. Özellikle dar gelirliler için, konut hanehalkının sürdürülebilir olmasını sağlayan bir değeridir. Hanehalkı demografisi, ailelerin ev alanını azaltan ya da arttıran mekansal dönüşümden etkilenir. Bu nedenle, ilk sorular fiziksel dönüşümle ilgilidir ve mekansal dönüşümün taşınanların demografik özelliklerine uyup uymadığına bakmaktadır.

İkincisi, konut aynı zamanda hanehalkının ekonomik fırsatlarını da etkilemektedir. Yaşam alanının merkezi olması, ulaşım masraflarını asgariye indirirken kamu alanlarına veya şehir merkezinde ekonomik fırsatlara daha kolay erişimi sağlar. Bu nedenle görüşmelerde mekansal değişimin çalışma koşullarına ve aile refahındaki değişime etkilerini değerlendiren sorular da yöneltilmiştir.

Üçüncüsü, fiziksel dönüşüm, başka bir fiziksel alana taşınma ve değişen çevreye sosyal adaptasyon ile birlikte sosyal bir değişimi beraberinde getirir. Taşınma süreci boyunca, pek çok sakin, onlara yalnızca maddi destek sağlamakla kalmayıp aynı zamanda sosyal desteği de sağlayan komşular, arkadaşlar, şehir dışındaki dostlar gibi sosyal ağlarını geride bırakmaktadır. Pek çok çalışmanın vurguladığı gibi, gecekondu, kentsel yoksullar için bir yerleşim alanından daha fazlasını ifade eder. Düşük yaşam koşullarına rağmen gecekondular kentsel yoksulları güçlendiren sosyal ağlar içermektedir. Bu yüzden, görüşmelerde üç başlık altında sosyal dönüşüme odaklanılmıştır: sosyal alandaki değişim, sosyalleşme sürecindeki değişim ve sosyal ağlardaki değişim. Dahası, fiziksel dönüşüm sakinler arasında mekana bağlılık duygularını da dönüştürür. İnsanlar ve mekanlar arasındaki bağlar, insanların belli yerlerle pozitif veya negatif ilişki kurmasına yol açabilir. Görüşmelerde ayrıca Kadifekale'den Uzundere TOKİ'ye değişen mekan aidiyeti de sorulmuştur. Bu bağlamda, kentsel dönüşümün mahalleye aidiyeti nasıl değiştirdiği araştırılmıştır. Görüşmeler, kentsel dönüşüm projesinin Uzundere TOKİ'ye taşınan Kadifekale sakinlerinin genel memnuniyetini ve Kadifekale’deki yaşamlarına dair memnuniyetini kıyaslayan sorularla sonlandırılmıştır.

Kadifekale gecekondu yerleşimi yan yana müstakil evler, dar sokaklar ve sokaklar boyunca bir araya gelen yerleşim birimlerinden oluşan bir mahalleydi. İzmir'in tam merkezinde bulunduğundan, Kadifekale sakinleri 10-15 dakikalık otobüs yolculuğu ile veya yürüyerek kent merkezine ulaşabiliyorlardı. Uzundere TOKİ ise İzmir'in merkez ilçelerinden Karabağlar'ın en dış çeperinde şehir merkezine yaklaşık on kilometre uzaklıkta bulunmaktadır. Kadifekale sakinlerinin önceki yaşam alanlarıyla tamamen uyumsuz bir şekilde dikey konut birimleri ve yüksek katlı apartman blokları olarak tasarlanmıştır. Apartman blokları ayrıca çocuk parkları, ortak bahçeleri ve oturma bankları ile çevrili alanları paylaşır. Engebeli bir alanda inşa edilmiştir, bu nedenle sakinler, özellikle tepelerin alt kısımlarında yaşayanlar; herhangi bir yere ulaşmak için özel araç veya toplu ulaşım araçlarını kullanmak zorundadır. Uzundere TOKİ, kapitalist sosyo-mekânsallığın işaretlerini taşımaktadır. Merkezde; bir market, bir kahvehane, bir oyun salonu, bir restoran, bir eczane, bir kadın ve bir erkek kuaförü ve bazı dükkanların bulunduğu bir alışveriş merkezi bulunmaktadır. Uzundere TOKİ'nin girişindeki apartman blokları bu evleri gönüllü olarak satın alan sakinlere tahsis edilmiş olup, sosyal hizmetlere ve cami, alışveriş merkezi, eczane, sağlık merkezi gibi temel olanaklara nispeten daha yakındır. Tepelerin alt kısımlarında yaşayan sakinler bu tesislere ulaşmak için bile ulaşım araçları kullanmak zorundadır. Bölgede, sadece bir aktarma istasyonuna yarım saatte bir giden bir otobüs hattı ve Uzundere TOKİ'yi diğer bölgelere bağlayan özel girişimciler tarafından işletilen minibüsler vardır. Uzundere'ye taşınan Kadifekale sakinleri artık merkeze ulaşmak için en az iki toplu taşıma aracına binmek ve yaklaşık bir-bir buçuk saat yolda geçirmek zorundadır.

Uzundere, geçmişte İzmir'in çevresinde bulunan bir köydür. Ancak, 1998 yılında İzmir-Aydın karayolunun inşası ile İzmir'e daha yakın bir alana dönüşmüştür. Günümüzde Uzundere, Karabağlar ilçesinde bulunmaktadır. Kentsel makamlarla yaptığım görüşmelerde yetkililer Uzunderenin İzmir'in başka yerlerinde bu kadar fazla gecekondu sakininin yerleştirecek başka bir yer olmadığı için seçildiğini belirttiler. Bu nedenle, Kadifekale kentsel dönüşüm projesinin uygulama aşamasında, Kadifekale'deki hak

sahiplerine taşınmayı kabul ettikleri ve yeni konut sözleşmelerinin şartlarını onayladıkları takdirde Uzundere’e taşınacakları söylendi.

TOKİ, Uzundere'de 3080 ev inşa etti ve İzmir Büyükşehir Belediyesi, bunlardan 2688'ini Kadifekale gecekondu alanı da dahil olmak üzere gecekondu yerleşimlerinin sakinler için satın aldı. Bu evlerin 1744'ü Kadifekale sakinlerine tahsis edildi. Kadifekale sakinleri 2010 yılında Uzundere'deki bu evlere yerleştirmeye başladı. Ancak, halkın oraya taşınacağı ve evlerin 2008 yılında TOKİ tarafından Belediye'ye devredildiği bilinmesine rağmen, görüşmecilerin bir çoğu bölgenin, okullar, sağlık merkezleri, cami, kahvehahane, alışveriş pazarları vb. gibi sakinlerin günlük yaşamını önemli ölçüde etkileyen temel sosyal donatı alanlarından ve önemli tesislerden önemli bir süre yoksun olduğunu belirttiler. Bu donatıların bir çoğu ilk taşınnanlardan bir iki yıl sonra sonra inşa edilmiştir. Bu süreçte, bölgede Ramazan ayında kullanmak üzere sakinler kendileri prefabrik bir cami inşa etmiştir. Ayrıca, 2010 yılında bölgedeki yerleşimlerle birlikte artan bölgedeki öğrenci nüfusu, belediyenin sağladığı araçlarla yakındaki mahallelerde bulunan okullara bir buçuk yıl süreyle taşınmıştır.

Kadifekale sakinlerinin Uzundere TOKİ'ye taşınması, sadece mahallenin mekânsal yapısında değil, sosyal, kültürel ve ekonomik özelliklerinde de bir değişikliğe neden oldu. Kadifekale kentsel dönüşüm projesi üzerine önceki yapılan çalışmalar, Kadifekale kentsel dönüşüm projesinin planlanması ve uygulanması, projenin yürütülmesinde kayıt dışılığın kullanılması, afetlerin ideolojik bir anlatı olarak neoliberal kentsel dönüşüm projelerini meşrulaştırmak amacıyla kullanılması konularına değindi. Ayrıca Uzundere ile Kadifekale arasındaki mahalle ölçeğinde sosyo-mekansal uyumsuzluklar ele alındı. Bu çalışmalar Kadifekale kentsel dönüşüm projesinin uygulama sürecini incelerken, bu çalışma Uzundere TOKİ'deki yerinden edilmiş sakinler ve projenin insanların geçim kaynağı ve yoksulluğun değişen koşulları üzerine etkisini analiz etmektedir.

Taşınma sürecinde sadece gecekondu sahiplerine Uzundere TOKİ’de bir ev hakkı verilmiş olup Kadifekale’nin önemli bir kısmını oluşturan kiracılar projeye dahil

edilmemiştir. Hak sahibi olanlara taşınacakları mahallenin yeri, mekansal dizaynı ve apartmanların mekansal düzeni konusunda danışılmamiş olup felaket söylemi ve enformel stratejiler Kadifekale sakinlerini Uzundere'ye taşımak için bolca kullanılmıştır. Dikeysel mekan düzenine sahip Uzundere TOKİ yatay mekansal düzene sahip Kadifekale gecekonud yerleşimine göre yüzyüze iletişim fırsatını azaltmıştır. Büyük bir kısmını Kürtlerin oluşturduğu kiracılara ev hakkı verilememesiyle birlikte bölgedeki Kürt topluluğu dağılmış ve yerinden edilme topluluğun yerinden edilmesiyle sonuçlanmıştır. Yine mekansal değişim ve projeden kiracıların dışlanması komşuluk, etnisite ve hemşehrilik üzerine konumlanmış olan bağların dağılmasına neden olmuştur. Mekansal olarak kendi yaşam şartlarına çok farklı bir yere taşınan Kadife sakinlerin kaybettileri komşuluk ilişkilerini tekrar kurmaya çalışmaktadır. Ayrıca taşınan Kadifekale sakinlerinin Uzundere TOKİ'ye taşınma ile birlikte temal ihtiyaçları için ödedikleri asraflar yükselmiştir. Evlerinin taksitlerine ek olarak, apartman masrafları, mutfak masrafları, ulaşım masrafları artmıştır. Büyük bölümü enformel sektörden yaşamını kazanan eski Kadifekale sakinleri için bu masraflar ciddi sıkıntılar oluşturmakta ve taşınanların büyük çoğunluğu evlerini uzun dönemde koruma konusunda güvensiz ve endişeli hissetmektedir. Özellikle çevreye taşınmayla birlikte büyük çoğunluğu merkezi ilçelerde çalışan işçiler işini kaybetmiştir. Yine sosyal bağların dağılması ve çevreye taşınma ile birlikte birçok çalışan bilgi ve gelir kaynakları azalmıştır.

Yoksulluk dinamikleri perspektifinden bakıldığında, Kadifekale kentsel dönüşüm projesi, Kadifekale sakinlerinin bir bölümünü daha güvenli bir ortama taşımakta etkiliyken, onlara destekleyici bir mahalle, sosyo-ekonomik iyileşme ve uygun büyüklükte, uygun fiyatlı konut sağlamada başarısız oldu. şeyden önce proje, Kadifekale sakinlerinin ayrılmaz bir parçası olan kiracılara karşı dışlayıcı bir proje olarak tasarlandı, bu nedenle katılımcı bir planlama süreci üzerine inşa edilmedi. Kiracıların projeden dışlanması gerçeği, kendi içinde, en fakirlere konut hakkının reddedilmesidir.

İkincisi, Kadifekale sakinlerinin yaşadıkları alan hakkında şeffaflık ve bilgi edinme hakkı gayri resmi müzakereler ve kentsel otoriteler tarafından yerine getirilmeyen nedeniyle ihmal edilmiştir. Taşınan gecekondu sakinlerinin aylık ev taksitlerini ödeme konusundaki uzun vadeli kabiliyetleri konusunda endişeları ev hakkı konusunda yaşadıkları adaletsizlik duygularını da ifade eder.

Üçüncüsü, proje, Kadifekale mahallesinin sadece pazarlanmasını ve metalaştırılmasını sağlamakla kalmadı, aynı zamanda Kadifekale sakinlerinin temel ihtiyaçlarını meta haline getirdi, çünkü konut, eğitim, sağlık ve beslenme yetenekleri şu anda Uzundere TOKİ'de bir çok sakin için ödeme yapma kapasitelerine bağlı. Kadifekale sakinleri, tamamen metalaşmamış konut haklarına, düzensiz gayri resmi piyasaya ve Kadifekale yerleşim yerindeki sosyal ağlara dayanarak yiyecek ve barınma sağlayabiliyorlardı. Bu ihtiyaçlar artık ekonomik tahakküm mantığı altında piyasa yönelimli ve tüketime odaklı uygulamalara yönlendiriliyor. Yeni apartmanlarda yaşamlarını sürdürebilmeleri, uzun vadeli ev aidatlarını ödeyebilmelerine dayanmaktadır. Eğitime, sağlık hizmetlerine ve beslenmeye erişebilme yetenekleri, en azından ulaşım için ödeme yapma yeteneklerine bağlıdır. Bu nedenle, Kadifekale sakinleri artık tüketici vatandaşlık ve pazar uygulamaları mantığına dahil edilmiştir.

Ayrıca, sosyal sermayenin önemli bir projesi olan akrabalık ve dostluk bağları, gecekondularda Türkiye'de yoksulluğun olumsuz etkilerini azaltmakta önemli bir rol oynamıştır. Ancak Kadifekale kentsel dönüşüm projesi taşınan Kadifekale sakinlerinin sosyal sermayesini destekleyici bir mekansal alan üretememiştir. Uzundere'ye taşınma ile birlikte büyük aileler ve komşuluk ilişkileri dağıldı. Ayrıca sakinler sosyalleşme için gerekli sosyal alanlardan yoksun bırakıldı. Sosyal bağların bu şekilde dağılması ve taşınan Kadifekale sakinlerinin yaşamlarına uygun sosyal alanların inşa edilmemesi çoğunluğunu Kürtlerin oluşturduğu Kadifekale sakinlerinin kültürel ve politik pratiklerine zarar verebilecek gibi görünmektedir. Araştırma sırasında Uzundere'deki Kürt sakinleri arasında devam eden dayanışma bağları olduğunu gözlemlendi, ancak bu bağların ne ölçüde sosyal sermaye oluşturabileceği uzun vadede incelenmesi

gerekmektedir. Sosyal ağların dağılması ve Uzundere'nin sosyal ağlar oluşturmak için uygunsuz mekansal özelliklerini kentsel alanda kullanım değeri önceliğinin kapitalist rant yaratma ve tüketim kültürü oluşturmaya feda edildiğini göstermektedir.

Dahası Kadifekale kentsel dönüşüm projesi Kadifekale sakinlerini İzmir şehir merkezinden uzaklaştırmış ve taşınan Kadifekale sakinlerinin artık şehir merkezine ulaşmasını önemli ölçüde zorlaştırmış ve netice olarak şehirde hareket edebilme kabiliyetlerini önemli ölçüde azaltmıştır. Buna ek olarak, taşınma ile birlikte boş zamanları ve merkezi alanlardaki faaliyetleri azalmıştır. Taşınan gecekondu sakinlerinin merkezi yerlerdeki sosyal hizmetlere ve iş yerlerine erişme kabiliyeti şimdi insanların yeterli zamana sahip olmasına, sağlık ve finansal yeteneklerine bağlıdır.

Sonuç olarak, ve en önemlisi, gecekondu bölgeleri kentsel yoksulların sosyal ağlar tarafından beslenen gayrı resmi refah sistemine dayanarak dar gelirlerin yoksulluktan çıkması için kalıcı ve yaratıcı olma imkânlar sunarken, Kadifekale kentsel dönüşüm projesi gibi bu kentsel dönüşüm projeleri kentsel yoksulluğu çevreye taşıyarak ve kentsel mekanın sosyal sermaye üretmesini kısıtlayarak dar gelirlilerin marjinalleşmelerine katkıda bulunmuştur. Bu etki, topluluk desteğinden yararlanan ve gecekondu yerleşimlerindeki samimi sosyal ilişkilerden yararlanan kadınlar için daha da önemlidir. Taşınan birçok Kadifekale sakini yeni yaşam alanlarını tanımlamak için artan mahrumiyet ve sosyo-mekânsal dışlanma duygularını yansıtan 'açık cezaevi', 'dağın tepesi' 'kafes' gibi metaforlar kullanıyor.

Bu yönleri dikkate alarak; Kadifekale kentsel dönüşüm projesi eleştirel kent teorisi perspektifinden bakıldığında, Kadifekale'yi turistik bir merkeze dönüştüren ve yoksulluğu çevreye taşıyan bir proje olarak da sayılabilir. Kadifekale kentsel dönüşüm projesi gibi toplum planlaması ve katılımcı bir proje dinamiklerinden yoksun olan bu tür kentsel dönüşüm projeleri, şehirdeki yoksulları piyasanın insafına bırakmakta, sosyo-ekonomik statülerinin yükselmesini engellemekte ve beklenmedik krizler karşısında kentli yoksulu daha kırılgan hale getirmektedir. Beklenmedik krizler karşısında

kendilerini koruyabilecek kredi, tasarruf veya sigortadan yoksun olan kentli yoksullar özellikle sosyal sermayelerinin azalmasıyla birlikte dış şoklara karşı daha savunmasız hale gelmiştir. Bu nedenle, bu yeni mahalleler beklenmedik felaketler durumunda bölgesel izolasyon ve sosyo-mekansal ayrımcılıkla birlikte çürüyen mahallelere dönüşme riski taşımaktadır. Gecekondu yerleşimlerinin sağladığı güvenlik ağından sıyrılıp şehirlerin dış alanlarına kaydırılan yoksullarla birlikte Türkiye yeni yoksulluğun genişlemesiyle karşı karşıya kalabilir.

Sürdürülebilir kentsel dönüşüm için bir dizi özellik gereklidir: yönetişim ve planlama, yenilikçilik ve rekabet gücü, yaşam tarzı ve tüketim, kaynak yönetimi ve iklim azaltma ve uyarlama, ulaşım ve erişilebilirlik, binalar ve sosyal etkileşim ve kamusal alan. Burada, bu çalışmanın sonucunda ortaya çıkan sosyal politika önerileri vurgulanmaktadır:

i. Katılımcı yönetişim ve planlama: Katılımcı bir kentsel dönüşüm süreci, kentsel gelişim projelerinin başarısı ve sürdürülebilirliği için anahtardır. Sürdürülebilir bir geçim sağlamak kümülatif zorluklar yaşayan marjinalleşmiş kesimler için daha da önemlidir. Konut sakinlerinin aktif katılımı sadece planlama aşamasında değil, karar alma sürecinde ve uygulama aşamasında da sağlanmalıdır.

ii. Yer değiştirme zorluklarını azaltma ve adaptasyon: Kentsel dönüşüm projelerinde düşük gelirli sakinlerin yer değiştirme ve uyum sürecini kolaylaştıracak önlemler alınmalıdır. Bu önlemler insani, ekonomik, sosyal bakış açılarını bütünleştirmeli ve gelirin azalması, sağlık koşullarının kötüleşmesi ve sosyal ağların dağılması gibi yer değiştirme sürecinde ortaya çıkabilecek bazı sorunları önlemelidir.

iii. Kapsayıcı kentsel dönüşüm: Fiziksel iyileştirme ile sınırlı kalan kentsel dönüşüm projeleri, semt sakinlerinin mahalledeki yaşamlarını iyileştirmeyi amaçlayan bir sosyal projeye sahip olmadıkça başarılı olamaz. Sürdürülebilir kentsel dönüşüm

taşınan gecekondu sakinlerinin insani, ekolojik, sosyal ve ekonomik kapasitelerini geliştirmek için kapsamlı bir plan üzerinde çalışmalıdır. Bu araştırma, ailelerin, konut giderlerini yönetememesi durumunda çocuklarını çalıştırmak için seferber ettiğini gösteriyor. Bunun, uzun vadede sosyo-ekonomik yükselme ve sürdürülebilir bir geçim inşa etme kabiliyetleri üzerinde daha kötü sonuçlar oluşturması muhtemeldir.

iv. Yaşam tarzı ve tüketim: Kentsel gelişim projelerinin planlanması ve uygulamasını geliştirmek için konut sakinleriyle istişare yapılmalıdır. Planlama, taşınanların ihtiyaçları ve isteklerine göre tasarlanmalıdır. Bu çalışma, düşük gelirli sakinlerde piyasaya dayalı süreçleri ve tüketimi destekleyen kentsel dönüşüm projelerinin uzun vade de başarısız olacağını göstermektedir.

v. Ulaşım ve erişilebilirlik: Kentsel dönüşüm projeleri, sürdürülebilir bir kentsel ulaşım ile erişilebilir mahalleler oluşturmalıdır. Bu çalışma, çevresel düzenlemenin insanların gelir kaynakları ve gelir yönetimi kapasitesi üzerinde ters etkiler yarattığını göstermektedir.

vi. Binalar: Kentsel dönüşüm projeleri sakinlerinin ihtiyaçlarına, yaşam tarzlarına ve isteklerine karşılık gelen uygun fiyatlı, konforlu ve sürdürülebilir binalar oluşturmalı ve konut sakinlerinin değişen çevre koşullarına uyum sağlamalarına yardımcı olmalıdır. Bu, sadece şehir otoritelerini değil aynı zamanda uzmanları, sakinleri ve özel paydaşları da içeren etkili bir paydaş katılımı gerektirir.

vii. Sosyal etkileşim ve kamusal alan: Kentsel dönüşüm projeleri, sosyal ağlar kurmak için sakinler arasında ilişkileri kolaylaştıran sosyal alanlar yaratmalıdır. Bu çalışma, yeni toplu konut alanlarındaki sosyal alan eksikliğinin taşınan sakinler tarafından dile getirilen ana şikayetlerden biri olduğunu ve sosyo-mekansal dışlanma hissinin artmasının nedenlerinden biri olduğunu

göstermektedir. Kentsel dönüşüm projeleri, yeşil alanları ve ekolojik gelişmeyi sakinlerin geçim kaynağına entegre eden sosyal alanlar geliştirmelidir.

B. TEZ İZİN FORMU / THESIS PERMISSION FORM

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences ☐

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences ☐

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : Eroğlu.....
Adı / Name : Ensarı.....
Bölümü / Department : Sosyal Politika /Social Policy.....

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (**İngilizce** / English) : Relocation from an Inner-City Neighborhood to Peripheral Mass Housing: From Kadifekale to Uzundere, Izmir

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE**:** **Yüksek Lisans** / Master ☐ **Doktora** / PhD ☐

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. /** Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide. ☐
2. **Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **two year**. ***** ☐
3. **Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for period of **six months**. ***** ☐

***** *Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu Kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir.*
A copy of the Decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature ..... **Tarih** / Date .....