GATED COMMUNITIES IN ISTANBUL

Thesis submitted to the

Institute of Graduate Studies in the Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Political Science and International Relations

by

Sibel Ekdemir Kaya

Boğaziçi University

2010

Gated Communities in Istanbul

The thesis of Sibel Ekdemir Kaya

has been approved by:

Assist. Prof. Dr. Selcan Kaynak       ————————————————

(Thesis Advisor)

Assist. Prof. Dr. Zeynep Gambetti       ————————————————

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özlem Öz       ————————————————

May 2010

Thesis Abstract

Sibel Ekdemir Kaya, "Gated Communities in Istanbul"

This thesis aims to discuss the gated communities (GCs) in Istanbul and their effects on social division. The research was primarily based on in depth-interviews with residents, members of house owner association (HOA) in selected GCs and marketing professionals working on GC projects in Istanbul. The residents' reasons to move to the GCs, plans for future place of residence, their civic engagement experiences, relations with local authorities as well as the HOAs and perceptions about the people living in areas outside the gates were analyzed. Three GCs targeting different social classes were selected in order to observe whether there were differences in terms of motivations for moving to GCs, perceptions about GC life-style and about the outside world for the upper and middle classes. Conclusions showed that each group aimed to disintegrate itself from the lower social class as a sign of status and an exclusive life-style. Most residents described their reason to live in a GC as they were fearful of threats posed by the city which was inhabited by people of different backgrounds. However, such a fear of crime and demand for isolation increased as more security facilities were introduced in each GC. In other words, the more security controls and regulations were set, the more the residents felt insecure and anxious about the outside and thus demanded extra security measurements.

Keywords: gated communities, social division

Tez Özeti

Sibel Ekdemir Kaya, "Istanbul'da Kapalı Siteler"

Bu tez, Istanbul'daki kapalı siteleri ve bu sitelerin toplumdaki sosyal bölünmeler üzerindeki olası etkilerini incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Araştırma temel olarak site sakinleri, site yönetimi üyeleri ve kapalı site projelerinin pazarlanması alanında profesyonel anlamda çalışmış kişilerle yapılan derinlemesine mülakatlara dayanmaktadır. Site sakinlerinin sözkonusu siteleri tercih sebepleri, gelecekte nasıl bir yerde yaşamak istedikleri, şehir hayatına katılımları, yerel yönetimler ve site yönetimleriyle ilişkileri ve kapalı sitenin dışında yaşayan insanlarla ilgili algıları analiz edilmiştir. Araştırma için, üst sınıfa ve orta sınıfa hitap eden farklı kapalı siteler seçilmiştir. Bu yolla, kapalı sitelere yerleşme motivasyonları ve kapalı site dışındaki yaşama ilişkin algılar açısından sosyal gruplar arasında farklılıklar olup olmadığı incelenmiştir. Araştırma sonuçları, kapalı sitelerde yaşamayı tercih eden her iki sosyal grubun da, bir statü ve münhasır yaşam biçimi göstergesi olarak kendini alt sınıftan ayırmayı amaçladığını göstermiştir. Site sakinlerinin çoğu kapalı sitelere taşınmalarını, çok farklı ortamlardan gelen insanların bir arada yaşadığı şehir merkezine karşı duydukları korku ve endişe ile açıklamıştır. Oysa güvenlik endişesi ve izole olabilme ihtiyacı, kapalı sitelerde alınan güvenlik önlemleri arttıkça daha da artmaktadır. Başka bir deyişle; kapalı sitelerde daha çok güvenlik önlemi ve buna ilişkin düzenleme hayata geçirildikçe, site sakinleri kendilerini site dışındaki dünyaya karşı daha güvensiz ve endişe içinde hissetmektedir ve bu durum da ekstra güvenlik önlemlerine ihtiyaç duymalarına sebep olmaktadır.

Anahtar kelimeler: kapalı siteler, sosyal bölünme

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION


> One realizes the incredible size and the capacity of the city the best
> while everybody in the city is asleep or just waking up. Seeing this
> unmanned mode of the city reminds us that like all the ones sleeping
> at the moment would do, one day we would be leaving here. Then
> with the fear of loneliness, we long for staying in the city forever.
> That's why attaching to a city always means attaching to the life
> itself.[1]


Urban life is the way of expressing oneself to the whole world as an entity.

Individual is the building structure of the society and she reshapes the place where

she lives according to her needs and perceptions. In other words, as an actor of the

society, individual has the capacity to change the societies as all other internal and

external dynamics, and interrelations of the actors constituting the society play the

dominant role in restructuring the society.[2]

Gated communities (GC) as new residential spaces of wealth came into the

scene by the 1980s.[3] In order to differentiate themselves from the lower class, the

middle class and the upper class moved to GCs where their contact with the outer

world was minimized and they were provided exclusive social services within the

GC which was usually surrounded by walls and barbed wires. GC formation is a

---

[1] Orhan Pamuk, "Bir İstanbul Romancısıyım", *İSTANBUL*, no.29 (April 1999), p.79.

[2] Oya Erişen, Suburbanization in Turkiye within the Process of Integration to Global Development and New Life-Style Settlement, (Ph.d diss., Middle East Technical University, 2003), p.4.

[3] Candan, Ayfer, B. and Biray Kolluoğlu. 11 February 2009. *Kentsel Değişim Sürecinde Yer Değiştiren Yoksulluk*, Available [online]: http://www.obarsiv.com/pdf/Kolluoglu_Bartu_NB.pdf [7 November 2009].

global phenomenon, growing in both developed and developing countries from the 1980s on.[4]

GCs can be described as residential areas that are fenced or walled off from their surroundings, prohibiting or controlling access by means of a secured entrance as gates intended to prevent penetration by nonresidents.[5] Promises of GCs can be classified as security, exclusivity, predictability and living together with like-minded people in general. Attractive and exclusive social services are provided for the residents while the surrounded walls, barbed wires, CCTV camera systems and the security guards are keeping the unwelcome outside.[6] The HOAs are the governing bodies setting rules and regulations binding all of the residents in order to keep the GC social-life in harmony. They are responsible for providing the social services for the GCs and they collect monthly fees from the residents in order to finance these social services.

This thesis aims to analyze the GCs in Istanbul and their effects on social division within the society by investigating the perceptions of the GC residents about the outsiders and their interactions with each other.

Through GCs, interactions of different social groups are minimized where the upper middle and the middle income groups detach themselves from the lower groups; the reasoning is usually quoted as fear of crime and security concerns. In

---

[4] Tüzin B. Levent and Aliye A. Gülümser, "Production and Marketing of Gated Communities in İstanbul", Paper Presented in 44th European Congress of the European Regional Science Administration, Regional and Fiscal Federation, Porto, Portugal (25-29 August 2004).

[5] Edward, J. Blakely and Mary G. Snyder, *Fortress America, Gated Communities in the United States* (Washington D.C.: Brookings, 1999), pp.144-177.

[6] Tüzin B. Levent and Aliye A. Gülümser, pp.3-9.

fact, more distinct motivations for GC formations are about prestige and exclusivity concerns of the élite group.

The main problem with such kind of differentiation –efforts to create homogeneous groups of people within boundaries- is that the city itself is heterogeneous by definition and that the very nature of the public life is disregarded. As a result, people are living in crowded populations as alienated groups just living in the same metropolitan area with no sense of solidarity or togetherness.[7]

The city should be evaluated as a collective project of surviving with strangers in Sennett's words.[8] Wirth described the city as the place of living of large numbers of socially heterogeneous groups of people with high population density.[9] Within cities, individual differences are rewarded rather than tolerated since they are different and thus useful to each other rather than being homogenous and like-minded.[10] The city dwellers are dependent upon more people for satisfactions of their life-needs than rural people thus they are associated with greater number of organized groups (each group functions only with reference to a single segment of his personality).[11] Considering all these points, efforts of some social groups to seclude themselves from the rest in fact violates the definition of being a city-

---

[7] Erhan Kurtarır, Seçilmişler Töre and O.M.Doruk, "Spatial and Cultural Impact Assesment of Symbol Replacement in Istanbul", Paper Presented at 42nd ISOCARP Congress, Istanbul (2006), p.7.

[8] Richard Sennet, interview by Yuri Kazepov, tape recording, New York, USA, 24 October 2002. In Kazepov, Yuri, ed. *Cities of Europe. Changing Contexts, Local Arrangements and the Challenge to Urban Cohesion.* Oxford: Blackwell, 2004.

[9] Wirth, Louis. "Urbanism as a Way of Life" In *Classic Essays on the Culture of Cities,* edited by R. Sennet (New York: Meredith Corporation,1969), pp.143-164.

[10] Wirth, Elizabeth M. and Albert J. R. Jr., ed. *Community Life and Social Policy: Selected Papers by Louis Wirth* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1956), p.118.

[11] Ibid., p.120.

dweller; since different groups are dependent on each other by working and producing for each other.

Social division through separation of different social groups in terms of their residential places and minimizing their interactions in public spaces are very important issues to discuss for Istanbul. It is the most crowded city of Turkey, still welcoming large groups of migrants reaching to a population of thirteen millions which is 18% of Turkey by 2009.[12] The migration waves began to increase after the 1950s following developments in industrial sectors and investments in Istanbul. Erman quoted from Kıray to describe the experience of Istanbul as fast depeasantization and slow workerization.[13]

In this thesis, a selected group of residents and the HOA members of three GCs targeting the upper middle and the middle classes will be examined in order to understand the likely effect of GCs on social division.

In the next chapter, first literature on urbanization and second GC experience of Europe and the United States will be reviewed. Third, rapid urbanization and GC formation experiences of Istanbul will be discussed in order to clearly understand the effects of GCs on urban transformation.

In chapter three, the design of the study regarding the selection of the GCs, their residents and the questions utilized during the interviews will be discussed.

Chapter four presents and discusses the findings under three main categories: Ethnographic observations, residents' narratives and marketing strategies. While the ethnographic observations detail the spatial layouts of GCs, the residents' narratives

---

[12] Tuik, *Haber Bülteni*, no. 15 (25 January 2010).

[13] Erman, Tahire (2004), *Gecekondu Çalışmalarında "Öteki" Olarak Gecekondulu Kurguları.* Available [online]: http://ejts.revues.org/index85.html[20 April 2009].

include reasons to move to GCs, plans for future place of residence, civic engagement experiences, and relations with local authorities as well as people living in areas outside the gates. Additionally, interviews with HOA members in order to understand their perceptions about built-in social life within GCs and their relations with local government bodies are discussed. Finally, marketing strategies for GC projects are examined through interviews with marketing professionals working on GC projects and limited text analysis of ads. The reason for this investigation is to understand the potential home-buyer profile as described by the sellers.

The last chapter is devoted to conclusion and suggestions. This thesis argues that there are various kinds of GC developments in large numbers in Istanbul targeting middle and upper-middle class income earners. In the field study, it has been observed that respondents were satisfied with the exclusivity and security level offered within their GCs. Each group aimed to disintegrate itself from the lower social class as a sign of status and an exclusive life-style. Most residents described their reason to live in a GC as they were fearful of threats posed by the city which was inhabited by people of different backgrounds. However, such a fear of crime and demand for isolation increased as more security facilities were introduced in each GC. In other words, the more security controls and regulations were set, the more the residents felt insecure and anxious about the outside and thus demanded extra security measurements. Life within gates embodies a vicious cycle of isolation and fear.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW


Studies on urbanization became important by the time of the Industrial Revolution although the cities are in fact very old artifacts of civilized life.[14] After the Industrial Revolution, scholars started to analyze cities as unique forms of social life rather than as images of society itself. The cities became larger and larger as a result of movement of rural people previously working in agricultural sectors towards urban areas in order to earn their lives in more profitable industrial sectors in Europe as well as in the United States.[15] Suburbanization followed these processes by the nineteenth century with its promise of differentiating the new emerging wealthy class from the labor class, triggered by developments in the transportation industry, as a way of escape from the city center.[16] GCs in today's understanding came into the scene by the 1980s, as new signs of prestige and security for the ones who can afford it, in order to differentiate themselves from the ones who cannot, living within gates together with like-minded people and utilizing the exclusive social facilities offered to them. What is mainly problematic about GCs is the risk of urban social segregation, witnessing highly fragmented social class structure where contacts and/or interactions between different social groups are minimized because of the fear of crime and of concerns about preserving the properties.

---

[14] Sennet, Richard, ed. *Classical Essays on the Culture of Cities* (New York: Meredith Corporation, 1969), pp.3-19.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Blakely, E.J., *Fortress America*, pp.11-12.

In this chapter, after a brief look at urbanization literature, evolution of GCs in general and GC developments in Istanbul followed by massive urbanization period of the 1950s will be analyzed to understand the GC phenomenon more clearly.

## Urbanization Literature

Classic urban writers fall into two important schools of research, namely German School and Chicago School. The German School centered in Heidelberg and Berlin, Weber and Simmel were among the most important scholars in the first quarter of the twentieth century. Chicago School researchers were from the University of Chicago and most of the members remained active from the 1920s until after the Second World War. Robert Park and Louis Wirth were the most significant scholars of the time.[17]

German school assumed that all characteristics of city culture, including large impersonal bureaucracies, the rule of rational exchange and rational law and the lack of warm personal contact between city men were related to the city as a whole.

Chicago School on the other hand tried to understand how different parts of the city functioned in relation to each other, they saw the city as a world in itself where different kind of experiences occurred within the same place at the same time.[18]

---

[17] Sennet, Richard, ed., pp.3-19.

[18] Ibid., p.8.

Weber was the first to study the modern city in 1905.[19] He described the modern city as a retrograde urban environment as a result of rational and bureaucratic forces underlying modern capitalism.[20] In his understanding, the city itself was a cosmopolite structure and should be composing of set of social structures that could produce many different styles of life where individuality and innovation should be encouraged.[21] In other words, he considered that the source of creativity was embedded in urban cosmopolitanism.[22] One set of social structures could produce a multitude of concretely different styles of life. However the city examples of the industrialization period in Europe and the United States were as if they had no character of their own, that all of the industrialized cities looked the same and impersonal where there were giant factories and office bureaucracies in the metropolis (city center) leaving no room for cosmopolitan development of the individual.

In order to understand the city phenomenon; Weber preferred to look at the cities of late Middle Ages, describing them as more civilized and in ideal-typical condition of the city, containing the essential characteristics of urban form quite specific to western civilization.[23] According to him, the best forms of urban settlements and organization were observed in northern Europe in the sixteenth century. He denoted that in an ideal-typical the city, the inhabitants lived primarily

[19] Ibid., p.5.

[20] Ibid., p.7.

[21] Ibid., p.6.

[22] Ayfer B. Candan and Biray Kolluoğlu, p.39.

[23] Simon Parker, *Urban Theory and the Urban Experience, Encountering the City* (New York: Routledge, 2004), p.9.

off trade and commerce rather than agriculture, and they formed exchange relations within the market place. Moreover, the cities should have a degree of political and administrative autonomy, having the right to regulate and tax the trade, manage security and fund arbitrational courts, and democratic participation of all actors living and working within the city was necessary.[24]

Georg Simmel was a younger colleague of Weber from the same school believing that there could be an alternative way of living within the new complex civilized modern cities, as opposed to Weber's belief in classical cities. Moreover, he claimed that the features of modern city life such as impersonality, faceless bureaucracies and rational market process were products of an urban condition, social-psychological in its nature, whereas for Weber, these were products of modern capitalism. [25] "The Metropolis and Mental Life" is among his famous studies.[26]

Simmel accepted the impersonal character of the modern city life based on money economy and exchange relations where rationality, exactness, and calculability were the basis of action of the individual. Profit maximizing was the main motive of actions leaving no place for qualitative analysis but quantities –all relations reduced to the question "how much?"[27]

He argued that since there were a lot of stimuli surrounding the individual, s/he was overwhelmed and reached a blasé attitude toward these enormous stimuli in

---

[24] Ibid., pp.10-12.

[25] Ibid., p.9.

[26] Simmel, George. "The Metropolis and Mental Life" In *Classic Essays on the Culture of Cities,* edited by R. Sennet (New York: Meredith Corporation,1969), pp.47-60.

[27] Ibid.

order to protect his intimate, inner feeling and values. S/he was unable to make clear classifications, everything being in a distant place and in gray color, seeing the other people distrustful, alien to each other. The decisions were held by brain rather than by heart as a defense mechanism of not reacting emotionally to the people around him in the city, in other words rationalization of daily life– freedom of individual at the expense of anonymity and loss of community ties and loneliness.[28] The imaginary of urbanity was a social existence that allowed freedom through anonymity.[29]

Simmel suggested that, a man could make his spirit free from his acts even within a modern city environment described above, that he could describe himself with the question of "who I am" rather than "what I do ordinarily". He could find ways of turning on himself in a way a monk would mediate, rather than feeling completely tied to his job, or his family or his friends.[30] Simmel believed by forming an "I" that was greater and apart from any of the emotionless daily acts that "I" performs, the city men could become free as transcending the routine of city life. He accepted the modernization process and sought to find ways of sustaining a healthy urban life having impersonal relations in the era of modernization, rather than Weberian glorification of the autonomous cities of the Middle Ages.[31]

He used the term "metropolis" in order to define a new type of city emerging under the influences of modernism and industrialism which was totally different than the previous city of preindustrial societies. In metropolis, both the central

---

[28] Ibid.

[29] Ayfer B. Candan and Biray Kolluoğlu, p.39.

[30] Sennet, ed. *Classical Essays*, p.10.

[31] Ibid., p.15.

region and the peripheries were affected by urban policies and they reciprocally affected each other as well. There's interdependence, interconnectivity and division of labor between all parts. The terms metropolis and metropolitan area were first used to describe Chicago of the 1910s, witnessing separation of work place and home due to industrialization followed by suburbanization trends on the peripheries of the city and complex social and economic relations among different parts of production and consumption of the goods.[32]

The Chicago School began to take form after the First World War till the end of the Second World War. Robert Park and his student Louis Wirth were among the most important scholars in the field of city culture.[33] Park had his doctorate degree at the University of Heidelberg before the First World War and was influenced mostly by Simmel's lectures.[34] First important writing of Park was published in 1918.[35]

According to Park, decline of community was due to urbanization and modernization process and separation of home from work; all of these attempts were undermining the importance of social solidarity and primary relations. He illustrated the "ecological approach" to understand the industrial cities; the geographical separation of house and factory, place to live and place to work were mainly shaping the city life and forming separate groups of people at different places with similar motives, forming homogeneously functional units in the same physical territory.[36]

---

[32] Ibid., pp.8-10.

[33] Ibid., p.15.

[34] Ibid.

[35] Park, Robert. "The City: Some Suggestions for the Study of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment" In *Classic Essays on the Culture of Cities,* edited by R. Sennet (New York: Meredith Corporation,1969), pp.91-130.

[36] Sennet, ed. *Classical Essays*, pp.13-16.

He stated that the city would be divided into subgroups of people living or working together where similarities would help constitute subgroups and sub regions within the city while accepting the reality of differences between different groups. This physical-functional separation was claimed to give "behavioral freedom" to the individual to express himself in Park's understanding of urban life. The individual represents several occupations at the same time which would be important and valuable for different groups (i.e. he contains cross-loyalties to different groups, conflicting interests in various social roles). So it would be impossible to impose standard sets of behaviors in the city and the individual could be innovative, free in terms of behavior, expressing herself/himself in the way s/he likes. The individual would be behaviorally free since he is not containing full solidarity to any subgroup within the society. In other words, there is no singular social group totally fulfilling his needs making him feel as a member that he should obey the rules and standards of that group as a whole. The city should be seen as a medium for the emergence of free man in deviant and innovative behaviors apart from the community.[37]

Wirth, who was a student of Park, suggested studying urbanization as a way of life implying that one should examine the city life in order to understand dynamics of the whole life since the city was a crucial result of modernization.[38] As noted before, he described the city as a place where heterogeneous groups of people in high density populations worked and lived together.[39] He claimed that for the city life, the secondary social contracts based on economic and contractual ties where

---

[37] Ibid.

[38] Wirth, Louis. "Urbanism as a Way of Life".

[39] Cevat Özyurt, "Yirminci Yüzyil Sosyolojisinde Kentsel Yaşam", *Balikesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 10, no.18 (December 2007), p.116.

home and work places were functionally separated, and had become more important than primary contracts based on kinship, culture and community which were the essence of pre-modern life. He was regarded as a great contributor to urban studies by analyzing how the division of labor influenced urban economics, urban land use, urban labor patterns and urban political structures and how these fragments communicated and influenced each other.[40]

Secondary social relations became important after the Industrial Revolution and separation of work place from home as noted above. Before, there was a single place and that was home where production was made.[41]

While describing the relations of city dwellers within the industrialized city, Wirth denoted that the physical contacts were close while the social contacts were distant, creating reserve of unattached individuals toward another which would cause loneliness.[42] Clock and the traffic signal were the symbolic of the basis of the social order as formal controls to counteract irresponsibility and potential disorder among these socially distant but psychically close city dwellers. Different groups of people selected different parts of the city to live according to their requirements and modes of life preferences.[43] People's desire to escape from the disadvantages, the costs and the civic responsibilities of urban living has also shared by industries in order to benefit from lower costs relating with the labor, the land and taxation by establishing themselves outside the limits of the central cities, beyond the reach of

---

[40] Sennet, ed. *Classical Essays*, pp.13-16.

[41] Yılmaz, Nail. n.d. *Farklılaştıran ve Ayrıştıran Bir Mekanizma Olarak Kentleşme*. Available [online]: http://iibf.kocaeli.edu.tr/ceko/ssk/kitap48/08.pdf  [20 October 2009].

[42] Wirth, Elizabeth M., p.122.

[43] Ibid., p.123.

their regulatory powers as well.[44] The suburbanite groups in fact drew their income from the central city and lived most of their cultural life there; civically they became divorced from the city. Wirth argued that escaping from the city would show a preference of more simple, primitive and stable form of life at the expense of many enriching factors making the life interesting and exciting which is also a thread for the advantages of large scale production. Instead, reconstructing the city by giving each function a proper place with strengthened city governments and reorganized city taxing system not attaching unusual significance to land since land was not the major form of modern wealth any more.[45]

Industrialization caused migration flows mostly triggered by economic motives. Those economically motivated migration groups need not to be from the same background, hometown, ethnic or regional group. The commonality among them is mainly the motivation to move, earning their lives. Once they arrive in the cities and start to work, they generate secondary relations based on rational and calculable decisions rather than moral, intimate sharing which would be based on solidarity ties with each other. The urban individual becomes member of different social groups on different occupations and he builds up various secondary relations with different secondary groups since any single group can not solely fulfill all of the individual's needs.[46]

---

[44] Ibid., p.210.

[45] Ibid., pp.214-215.

[46] Özyurt, pp.116-117.

Henri Lefebvre was a significant scholar emphasizing the importance of the production of space and reproduction of social relations. Sastrosasmito noted that Lefebvre stated that absolute space was lived rather than conceived, it was a representational space rather than a representation of the space.[47] Lefebvre claimed that the urban spaces were in fact socially produced entities and that they reproduced the society and the process of capitalism.[48] Every society and therefore every mode of production produced its own space so the city of the ancient world cannot be understood independently from the context of that period. Therefore attempts to formulate universal rules in order to understand and generalize urban transformations would not be appropriate.

Lefebvre analyzed the relationship between the psychical environment of the city and its many social and economic relations. He described the capitalist city as consumer society adding that the city dwellers need for creative activity (need for information, symbolism, imaginary and play) besides the right to consume. The things what made urban dwellers good, happy and playful should be studied in order to figure out the appropriate the cities of the future.[49] The human being has the need

---

[47] Sastrosasmito, Sudaryano. 11-13 November 2008. *Rethinking Theory, Space, and Production: Henry Lefebvre Today.* Available [online]: http://www.henrilefebvre.org/hlt/fls/Lefebvre_program2008.pdf [5 May 2009].

[48] Lefebvre, Henri, *The Production of Space. Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991), pp.1-454.

[49] Simon Parker, pp.20-21.

to accumulate energies and spend them, to see, to hear to touch in order to gather these perceptions in a world.[50]

Additionally he argued that in daily life different social groups would manage to become subjects or knowing each other as subjects only through their space production practices. Any idea or value that could not leave a trace on space would lose all strength and turn into simple signs or abstract descriptions.[51] Lefebvre influenced plenty of the current urban scholars including David Harvey.

Harvey's works on urban studies have contributed greatly to broad social and political debate. Most recently he has been credited with helping to bring back social class and Marxist methods as serious methodological tools in the critique of global capitalism, particularly in its neoliberal form.[52] He has been writing on urban issues since the 1960s.

He argues that urbanization has always been a class phenomenon that there is an intimate connection between capitalism and urbanization.[53] The capitalist has to produce a surplus product in order to produce a surplus value; this in turn must be reinvested in order to generate more surplus value for capitalist growth. Like the war industry in the times of recession, urbanization also leads to absorption of the surplus product (new market for potential buyers, potential workers, potential products to produce and to consume and new terrains for cheaper production facilities) also helping with unemployment and devaluation of the money.

---

[50] Bridge, Gary and Sophie Watson, ed. The Blackwell City Reader (Malden: Blackwell, 2002), p.367.

[51] Ibid.

[52] For further information please visit http://davidharvey.org/

[53] Harvey David, n.d., *Megacities Lecture 4,* Available [online]: http://www.kas.de/upload/dokumente/megacities/MegacitiesLectur4Worlds.pdf [10 April 2009].

Public works are mostly launched by the state in the times of depression with the same logic (to absorb the accumulated capital in order to keep the capital accumulation cycle going for neoliberal economy). The capitalist would need new profitable terrains to extract new raw materials, to import fresh labor forces for production (lowering the wages) as new markets of people with purchasing powers. New credit instruments are created, debt-financing state and private expenditures are raised for this capitalist growth. As the capitalist development increases, the urbanization rates of the capitalist countries are increasing accordingly.

He adds that the globalization has always been integral to capitalist development and the accumulation of capital has always been a geographical and spatial affair.[54] He argues that without the possibilities inherent in geographical expansion, spatial reorganization and uneven geographical development, capitalism would long ago have stopped functioning as a political-economic system.[55]

Harvey investigates the example of the construction of Paris in Napoleon's time by Haussmann as a detailed project of to absorb the surplus capital and surplus labor. By 1848, there were revolution attempts of unemployed workers and the republican bourgeoisie violently repressed them but they failed to resolve the economic crisis. Louis-Napoleon Bonaparte, engineering a coup, came into the power by 1851 and proclaimed himself the Emperor the following year. He arranged massive infrastructural investments both at home, with new city building attempts, and abroad with railway constructions through Europe and Orient as well. George-Eugene Haussmann was assigned to reconfigure the urban structure of Paris where

---

[54] David Harvey, "Globalisation in Question", *Rethinking Marxism* 8, no.4 (Winter 1995), pp.1-17.

[55] Ibid., p.2.

new canals, railroads, buildings were built and all infrastructures were renewed which lead to social stabilization in terms of the absorption of the capital.[56]

The city center was the main place for both work and home for all inhabitants at that time in rebuilt Paris. With the introduction of new financial institutions and debt instruments, Paris became the great center of consumption – which brought total *embourgéoisement* of Paris through consumerism. The whole city was reconstructured systematically so that all parts of the city could easily be observed / sighted in order to control any possible deviations, strikes, demonstrations, attacks of homogeneous small groups. By this design of the city, it was not possible in fact to form any homogenous segregated places to live and to work of different groups of people. There was only one center for everything (shopping, consuming and leaving); there was no place for subgroup formation of people (in order to be able to control the whole city against possible inner/outer attacks and dangers).

This "creative destruction" attempts mostly harmed the working class since at first the slums were all fallen down with efforts of renovation of the city. Instead of trying to find ways of integrating working class inhabitants to the new proposed city life, ignorance and efforts to eradicate them from the city was preferred, in order to celebrate the bourgeoisie class. This ignorance in fact created new slums and further new social tensions within different classes living in the city.

He also gives the example of the United States by the time of the Second World War before which there was a serious capital-surplus disposal problem by the

---

[56] David Harvey, "The Right to the City", *New Left Review*, no.53 (September-October 2008), pp.23-40.

1930s. The mobilization for the war (i.e. war expenses and production) temporarily solved the economic crisis. He implies that after the war Robert Moses examined in detail what Haussmann did for Paris by implementing urbanization processes in order to accumulate capital and applied the same procedure for the United States.[57] New railroads and highways were constructed, giving way to suburbanization, a total reengineering of the whole metropolitan area besides the city center. New financial institutions and tax arrangements were made in order to increase the purchasing power of the middle class for second cars (raising also oil consumption) and houses as well. The subsidized home-ownership for the middle class changed the focus of community action towards defense of property values and individualized identities, turning suburban votes towards conservative republicanism. The logic behind was that the homeowners with the burden of debt were less likely to strike and object, and easy to govern and manipulate from the governing body's point of view. The result was social stabilization, fast suburbanization and less people (mostly African-American who cannot afford suburban housings, cars etc) living in the city center. This segregation in terms of settlement gave way to social unrest among different in the following years and it is still ongoing debate.

He concludes that urbanization can be a proper way of capital accumulation in neoclassical economies; however there should be democratic control over production and utilization of the surplus for all inhabitants, including the masses left without any rights for the city as in the case of Paris or the United States. Otherwise further segregation attempts would increase the polarization and tension between the

---

[57] Ibid., pp.27-28.

19

benefited and the marginalized groups which would destroy the social stability

reconstructed through urbanism.

It would be valuable to note that some scholars like Bıyık considered the new

design of Paris to be panoptical with wide boulevards and systematic design that

could be easily controlled by governing authorities.[58] The term panoptical refers to

British philosopher Jeremy Bentham's prison project as an effective and low cost

solution for supervision of prisoners by 1785.[59] The prisoner could not see where the

watchman was, the watchman could see each prisoner at all times without being

seen and the prisoners never knew for sure whether they were watched or not so they

always felt themselves under surveillance.

Richard Sennet is a valuable sociologist and writer in the field of

urbanization and his first book was published in 1970.[60] He proposed that every

person has a multiplicity of identities which are incomplete and the cities should be

the places of exchange which would enrich the capacity of the individual and

fulfilling his needs and strengthening the sense of belonging to the city. He still

works on this field. In "The Fall of Public Man" he analyzes the important term

"public man" and its role in urban life of modernist era.[61] He claims that the city is

in fact a place where people generate impersonal relations with each other accepting

---

[58] Bıyık, Zeynep. 16 February 2009. *Kapalı Bir Kent Mekanında Direniş: "Tarlabaşı".* Available [online]: http://www.planlama.org/new/konuk-yazilar/kapali-bir-kent-mekaninda-direnis-tarlabasi.html [25 September 2009].

[59] Silke B. Lank. 2004. *The Impacts of Video Systems on Architecture* (Ph.d diss., Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich, 2004), Available [online]: http://graphics.ethz.ch/Downloads/Publications/Dissertations/Lan04.pdf [10 December 2009].

[60] Richard Sennet, *The Uses of Disorder, Personal Identity and City Life* (New York: Knopf, 1970), 1:198.

[61] Richard Sennet, *The Fall of Public Man: On the Social Psychology of Capitalism*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), 1:373.

the individual differentials that each one contains. The individual seeks for his own profit as a public man rather than trying to build intimate (and primary) relations with full solidarity within homogeneous groups. His argument on modernist cities is that the importance of the public life is weakened and the individuals tend to form "narcissist" relations, trying to form homogeneous communities within the city as *gemeinschaft* and hence attempting to create intimate societies.[62] He claims that the different groups of people are by definition a component of the city. The individual wears masks in the public realm of the city to protect his intimate individuality from the others. Seeing the others as "dangerous", "distrustful" and "useless" glorifies the intimate relations like the ones within families or close friends as opposed to public relations. This glorification leads to search for such kind of primary relations with the public, resulting in feeling a continuous lack and dissatisfaction, asking "What does that mean for me?" and using the phrase "Everybody is trying to harm and deceive me…" The attempt is not trying to join the public or community life but rather trying to show and impose one's own way of life.

Here it would be valuable to analyze the terms *gesellschaft* and *gemeinshaft* in order to understand the danger lying behind various social groups' attempts of differentiating themselves from other groups within a society. In the late nineteenth century, Ferdinand Tönnies created the duality of the terms of *gesellschaft a*nd *gemeinshaft* in order to understand the term community.[63] *Gemeinshaft* describes the "true" community, homogeneous identity where interdependent relations occur, natural, emotional society whereas *gesellschaft* refers to a community of mobile

---

[62] Özyurt, p.120.

[63] Ferdinand Tonnies, *Community and Society (Gemeinshaft und Gesellshaft).Ttrans. and ed. Charles P. Loomis* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1957), 1:298.

people gathering impersonal relations based on rational choices in modern life. As argued by Richard Sennet, people's attempts to create *gemeinshaft* living models in modern society is very dangerous in terms of social, economic and political relations/division of labor among those people.[64]

*Gemeinshaft* building attempts with the sense of unity among people sharing this intimate environment are claimed to be too dangerous since there are heterogeneous groups of people living together within the cities in fact and that the idea of building a community should refer to something more like an "agora" where differences meet and enrich each other. In *gemeinshaft* case, people would try to form homogeneous groups in terms of social, economic and political norms, living in ghetto areas where any entrance of the outsiders are strictly forbidden and GC residents are voluntarily staying within the borders of ghettos as in primitive clans in illusion of community power. In fact, for all city dwellers; instead of ghetto-type residential formations, ways of living together of with different social groups while enriching each other and shaping the city life should be found out.[65]

Zigmund Bauman is a Polish sociologist extensively analyzing the modernization and further post-modernization processes.[66] He examines "the disadvantaged stranger", who came into the scene as a result within the city life.[67] According to him, all modern life is lived in cities where different groups live and work together in rational, complex and interdependent relations with each other.[68]

---

[64] Richard Sennet, interview by Yuri Kazepov, p.4.

[65] Ibid.

[66] Beilharz, Peter, ed. *The Bauman Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), 1:376.

[67] Zigmund Bauman, "Making and Unmaking Stranger", *Thesis Eleven,* no.43 (January 1995), pp.1-16.

[68] Özyurt, pp. 121-123.

The modern society creates the stranger by its formulation and the attempt should be towards preserving this stranger within the system rather than trying to erase it since it is an important component for the society.[69] The stranger can be described as the one that is physically close to us but at the same time emotionally apart from us, also being stranger depends on the situation and the conditions the individual stands. In other words, strangeness is a relative term; in one condition the individual could feel himself as a stranger whereas in another condition, he might find himself in much closer intimate relations with another group. Classical cities contain cultural and moral subgroups within itself where the modern city tries to form one homogeneous identity for all and therefore ignore any particular component, positioning it as "stranger". He criticizes modern city planners since they try to construct homogeneous looking cities, ignoring "the stranger" element that evolves with the city. The result is always segregation efforts of different groups and social stratification. These efforts constitute community building in the shape of ghettos, namely voluntarily and involuntarily ghettos in the city. An involuntary ghetto is a place where the residents cannot exit whereas the voluntary ghettos (mostly constructed for the élite) are places the outsiders are not allowed to enter and the residents are free to exit whenever they like. The outsiders of voluntary ghettos have no other choice except forming involuntary ghettos in the outside.[70]

Mike Davis is another important writer studying social fragmentation within the city, examining the "other side" of the city in LA example. He has written the book "City of Quartz" in 1990 examining social and ethnic tensions of different

---

[69] Ibid.

[70] Ibid.

groups in LA and possible results of this tension.[71] In 1992, there were massive

violent and brutal riots for six days resulted in fifty people's death and thousands'

injure in LA. The reason behind was that an African-American immigrant was

attacked and murdered by the police and those policemen were cleared of all

charges, afterwards there were massive movement of slums attacking to everywhere,

burning entire blocks.[72]

Davis points out that the ones protesting were not African-Americans but

Latin-Americans and the underlying reason was not just the brutal action of the

police on one black guy.[73] Economic and social conditions were severe after 80's

economic crisis for all immigrants and they were living in segregated ghettos, totally

detached from the rest of the city.

Earlier phases of this social explosion was failing economy, widening gap of

income distribution among inhabitants of the city, an urban growth detached from

economic growth where the advantaged group were moving towards new urban

spaces that were in neither a city or countryside but immense areas of villa suburbs

with shopping malls, social complexes, isolated islands for the global élite which

could be called as "paradises of evil".[74] The élite were living in GCs and totally

shielding themselves from the rest, ignoring the fact that this uneven distribution

was a direct result of the existing neoliberal economic conditions.

---

[71] Mike Davis, *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles* (New York, Verso, 1992), 1:462.

[72] Davis, Mike. 7 January 2009. *The New Ecology of War*, interview by Mattias Hagberg, Available [online]: http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2009-01-07-davis-en.html [20 March 2009].

[73] Ibid.

[74] Davis, Mike and Daniel B. Monk, ed. *Evil Paradises: Dreamworlds of NeoLiberalism* (New York: New Press, 2007), 1:352.

Uneven expansion of GCs of élites brought about a counter action as rapid growth of slums sited near isolated city areas for the disadvantaged, mostly immigrants, working in informal sectors. In LA, there are some black places entirely disconnected from the entire world (like Watts district) containing any shops or working/social places at all within the district.[75] The people living here had no chance but to work in informal sectors giving way to criminality and extremity.

An additional interesting feature of Los Angeles is that with growing suburbanization activities and hence increasing social and economic inequality among inhabitants, it is not only the center but also many of the suburban regions facing all aspects of poverty. Lifestyle Index for Los Angeles shows regions assessed as "unpleasant" are distributed to all parts of LA, including northern, southern and eastern suburban areas as well, meaning that all levels of income earners are trying to escape from inequalities, crimes; that every small group tries to integrate within themselves, raising gates, barriers to "the others" by all means, facing growing demand for social services. Flight from the city center now turns into the flight from near-in suburbs and this is an ongoing process.[76] This shows us that suburbanization is not a solution for a better life unless the income inequalities within the region / country are solved permanently.

The people of slums described above were forming a different social class now and the main difference between them and the previous working class is that the slums lack the social power of the latter where it has the strength to halt the production for its wills. Davis concludes that industrialization has a tendency to

---

[75] Ibid.

[76] Blakely, E.J., *Fortress America*, p.143.

unite people, where the logic of informal economy is the opposite, and the people in slum areas would try to attack to the others or exploit each other giving way to civil war, street gangs etc as in the case of LA.[77]

## GCs Literature

### Early Developments

GCs can be described as residential areas that are fenced or walled of from their surroundings, prohibiting or controlling access by means of a secured entrance as gates or booms.[78] They are self-contained, separate communities with carefully constructed identities where outsiders and insiders exist as a result of physical privatization of the area.[79]

GCs are in fact old phenomenon, England witnessing the very early examples by occupying Romans around three-hundred BC where Roman soldiers were given land and estates in tribal areas after their term of service in the army to stabilize Roman order in the vast and sparsely defended country side.[80] The first walls around these housings were in fact in order to control the local villagers who might return on the baron at any moment rather than protecting from potential external invaders.

---

[77] Davis, Mike. 7 January 2009., p.3.

[78] Blakely, E.J., *Fortress America*, p.8.

[79] Tüzin B. Levent and Aliye A. Gülümser, pp.13-15.

[80] Blakely, E.J., *Fortress America*, pp.3-6.

Following years of the kingdom, GCs continued to exist where the royal family and other wealthy persons were hiding in the Tower of London to protect themselves from the rebellions and dangerous lower class villagers. In London there were no police forces until eighteenth century, hence living behind walls was the proper way of protecting each group from potential dangers. The system of walls and class division was deeply ingrained in England where the walled abbeys, manors and castles are the examples of this understanding.[81]

Modern GCs emerged as part of the international trend towards suburbanization of cities in the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries.[82] By the nineteenth century, English merchants and industrialists start to build small county houses outside the villages as early examples of suburbanization and by the time of George III; new paved highways were constructed and also first railways were constructed for these towns.[83]

Transportation improvements played an important role in the suburbanization process of the United States as well by the late nineteenth century. In the United States, suburbs were promising living with the same social class group members together as a sign of status for the ones who can afford to buy a house from there. The upper income gated developments like Tuxedo Park in New York's were built in the late 1800s by wealthy citizens in order to isolate themselves from the

[81] Ibid.

[82] Quintal, Dana and Susan Thompson. 2007. *Gated Communities: The Search for Security*. Available [online]:http://www.fbe.unsw.edu.au/cf/publications/presentations/attachments/SOAC07Quintal%26 Thompson.pdf [15 December 2009].

[83] Robert, A. M. Stern, ed., *The Anglo-American Suburb* (New York: Academy Editions, 1981), 1:96.

troublesome aspects of rapidly industrializing cities which was a very similar

reasoning for GC formation in twenty-first century.[84]

      For the cases of both England and the United States, suburban housing was

an escape from the city center. In the case of England, London was still the

attraction center despite its dirt and crowded industrial looking where

suburbanization was perceived as a second housing for weekends and holidays.

However for the case of the United States, industrialization process triggered both

urbanization and suburbanization at the same time. American merchant class could

not afford two housing at the same time and the land was cheap and plenty which

would result in suburbanization effort as an alternative way of living. Additionally,

industrialization process contributed new middle class' level of income to

differentiate itself and to live with the other middle class people as a sign of status.[85]

      Sandercock states that by the mid twentieth century, urban crisis emerged in

the United States due to lack of adequate attention to ongoing racial conflict,

violence and inequalities in residential accommodation and schooling and that white

middle class flew to suburbs buying the protection required instead of addressing

social problems.[86] Leisure World in Orange County was the first example of

retirement developments in the United States and Low denotes that it was the

beginning of the trend where middle class Americans walled themselves off.[87]

---

[84] Oscar Newman, *Community of Interes*, (New York: Anchor Press / Doubleday, 1980), 1:356.

[85] Blakely, E.J., *Fortress America*, pp. 13-14.

[86] Leonie, Sandercock, *Cosmopolis 2:Mongreal Cities in the 21st Century* (London: Continuum, 2003), 1:271.

[87] Setha, Low, *Behind the Gates: Life, Security and the Pursuit of Happiness in Fortress America* (New York: Routledge, 2004), 1:288.

Rise of transportation facilities in the United States in following years weakened the security promise of the suburbs rising middle class minorities of Asians, Hispanics and African American to whom equal housing access laws were applied. As a new way of security, GCs within the suburban areas came into the scene and affordable people were seeking to own a house in there, denying the existing reality of newly emerging middle class containing various ethnic groups and various backgrounds.[88]

<u>Recent Developments</u>

The rise of GCs can be traced back to master planned developments of the late 1960s and 1970s in the United States; in fact GCs are considered to be a global phenomenon occurring in both developed and developing countries at the same time, transforming the urban environment.[89] In fact, GCs can be considered as fastest growing residential formations in the twenty first century.

Definite numbers on GCs are unavailable due to lack of national or state level data on the issue, complicated also by rapidly increasing numbers of communities in the United States. There are several scholars worked on GCs in the United States including Klaus Franz; Edward J. Blakely and Mary Gail Snyder; Rowland Atkinson; Sarah Blandy and Evan McKenzie.

Reasons for the appearance of GCs include the raise of insecurity, fear of crime, the failure of the state to provide services to citizens, increasing social

---

[88] Blakely, E.J., *Fortress America*, p.15.

[89] Tüzin B. Levent and Aliye A. Gülümser, p.2.

inequalities and social polarization and an international trend encouraged by

developers and sense of community.[90]

GCs represent hope of security addressing consumers searching for a sense

of community or identity while keeping out the unwelcome and offering attractive

social facilities within the gates for the residents only.[91]

Newman argues that security measures within the GC function as a unifying

factor for the residents. He states that the community space is clearly defined by

walls and gates of GC and that this clear definition increases the resident's desire to

protect the space, regarding the concepts of territorial reinforcement and defensible

space.[92]

What is meant by security includes both protection of material goods and the

people who live in them.[93] Common features of security are entry controls including

gates, traffic barriers, hardened perimeters including walls, fences and internal

surveillance including armed guards and alarm systems etc.

It would be important to note that, while security and/or fear of crime are

among the most important motivating factor to move to GCs both in the United

States and Europe; it is observed that the crime ratios are decreasing over the past

---

[90] Sonia, Roitman, "Who Segrates Whom", Paper Presented at the Conference: "Gated Communities: Building Social Division or Safer Communities?", Glasgow (18-19 September 2003).

[91] Jill, Grant, "Planning Responses to Gated Communities in Canada", Paper Presented at the Conference: "Gated Communities: Building Social Division or Safer Communities?", Glasgow (18-19 September 2003).

[92] Oscar, Newman, *Defensible Space* (NewYork: The Macmillan Co, 1972), 1:264.

[93] Quintal, Dana and Susan Thompson, p.1038.

twenty years in those countries while the number of GCs are increasing with this promise.[94]

Blakely and Snyder denote that the main promises of the developers of GCs are security and social familiarity. They usually use the term community to promote their materials, in ads they promise "a totally new way of life", "an old community setting", "new communities within the city" and even "your new hometown". Other aspects of GCs can be classified as the desire for exclusivity (providing prestige status to residents), predictability (homogeneous group of people that could easily be controlled through rules, conditions and covenants).[95]

They classify GCs in three categories as lifestyle communities, prestige communities and security zone communities.[96] Main promise of lifestyle communities is offering leisure time activities and amenities exclusively for the GC residents while preventing the outsiders with gates and security controls. The gates of prestige communities symbolize distinction and prestige protecting current investments and controlling housing values. Motivation for security zone communities is fear of the crime and outsiders and mostly it is not the developer who builds the gates but the residents and they occur in all income levels.[97]

---

[94] Frantz, Klaus, "Private Gated Neighbourhoods, A Progressive Trend in US Urban Development." In *Private Cities,* edited by George Glasze, C.Webster and K. Frantz (New York: Routledge, 2006), pp. 64-75.

[95] Blakely, E.J., *Fortress America*, p.18.

[96] Ibid., pp.38-45.

[97] Özlem Güzey.n.d. *Development of Gated Communities: Social and Spatial Segregation in Ankara, Turkey,* Available [online]:http://sadapt.agroparistech.fr/ersa2007/papers/983.pdf [23 September 2009].

GCs are considered to be effective in the formation of new social class which can be described as "leisure class".[98] Residential choices of this social class are considered to be largely characterized by self-interest and personal affluence as well as desire for disengagement.[99] Living in a GC with like-minded neighbors would contribute to gain exclusivity and disengage from the rest.[100]

Blakely and Snyder claim that rapid demographic, economic and social changes have resulted in fear about the future where the stability of neighborhoods is uncertain and vulnerable although the fear in fact is unrelated to actual crime trends and locations. Besides running from crime, the homebuyers are also running from a larger sense of disorder and the loss of control-over traffic, noise and incivility. They avoid day-to-day incivilities and random social contact by moving to GCs and the developer presents a complete package of a lifestyle for them in the GC.[101]

Another related reasoning for homebuyers' preferring GCs is the loss of confidence on public regulations and political processes to protect the neighborhoods from unwanted uses and dissatisfaction about provision of the social services required by local governments.[102]

It would be valuable to note that flight of the middle class to suburban areas has long been considered as preservation of a way of life and private property

[98] Derek, Hook and Michele Vrdoljak, "Gated Communities, Heterotopia and a "Rights" of Privilege: a "Heterotopology" of the South African Security Park", *Geoforum* 33, no.2 (May 2003), pp.195-219.

[99] Rowland Atkinson and Sarah Blandy, "Introduction: International Perspectives on the New Enclavism and the Rise of Gated Communities", *Housing Studies* 20, no.2 (March 2005), pp.177-186.

[100] Özlem Güzey, p.3.

[101] Blakely, E.J., *Fortress America*, pp.144-160.

[102] Özlem Güzey, p.3.

rights.[103] However the current motivation for GCs is different in terms of reflecting an individualistic concept of democracy where the idea of individual freedom takes the priority over the idea of the solidarity.[104]

Beside the homebuyer's point of view, the developers as well as local governments have their own reasoning for GC developments. As McKenzie implies, developers pursue higher density in order to maintain profits despite rising land costs by putting more people in less land and also providing amenities to them and creating common ownership of social areas like parks, pool etc.[105]

Local governments seek benefit from GCs since there is a private association (HOA) providing the social services for GC residents which otherwise the local government would be responsible for. The residents monthly pay assessments for the HOA while it hires private firms for trash collection, plowing snow in winter, repairing and lighting streets etc.

Meanwhile the residents of GC continue to pay their taxes to the local government as well. Thus cities can acquire new property tax payers without having to increase their public service expenditures.[106] In other words, suburbanization costs are paid by the private developers and the final homebuyer.[107]

---

[103] Ibid., p.4.

[104] Ibid.

[105] Evan McKenzie, "Private Gated Communities in the American Urban Fabric: Emerging Trends in Their Production, Practises and Regulation", Paper Presented at the Conference: "Gated Communities: Building Social Division or Safer Communities?", Glasgow (18-19 September, 2003).

[106] Ibid., p.4.

[107] Özlem Güzey, p.4.

The HOAs are considered to be as local-pseudo-governments since they relocalize the governance and avoid public access to local resources by making their own rules although they are not democratic.[108] The homebuyers have to accept all of the rules and regulations set by the HOA at the time of purchase so they are in enforced relationship with the HOA.[109] The homebuyers also benefit from this strict control of the social and physical environment assured by the HOA since the property value of the house as well as the prestige of the neighborhood is kept stable.[110]

McKenzie claims that the HOA is not a passing fashion rather it is an important institution reflecting the ideological shift to privatization which is characteristic of the neoliberal consensus.[111] He analyzed the regulation of the City of Las Vegas pointing that it mandated that further developments be done with the HOAs. He reported that the city's Zoning Code and Development Code required that all the new development should have certain features like a landscaping plan, open spaces and often security walls and if these features are included then there must be a HOA to maintain them.[112]

Having said that the developers provide private governance for the residents as a substitute for local governments, it is important to note that there are still boundaries for the developer set by municipal authorities. First of all, it is the

---

[108] Ibid.

[109] Ibid., p.5.

[110] Ibid.

[111] Evan McKenzie, p.5.

[112] Ibid., pp.5-7.

municipality to decide where to construct the development (i.e. zoning), secondly it sets out specific construction standards as building codes. Thirdly the municipality gives the grants for building permits for building plans, the developer is inspected regularly during the development process in order to see whether it fulfills the conditions set by the municipality which are important for the whole city's environment and welfare.[113]

Although the municipal authorities has important right of recognition on the development plans to be constructed , there are legal limits on these municipal concerns as well and unreasonable denial of building permits might be regarded as virtual "taking" of private property. McKenzie gives the example of *City of Monterey vs. Del Monte Dunes, 526 US 687* (1999) where a residential developer sought to build several hundred homes on a 37.6 acre plot of beachfront land. The developer submitted nineteen different plans and was rejected five times by municipal authorities due to adverse environmental impact. The developer sued and won a jury verdict of 1.46 million USD, standing as an option for all developers to use the jury trial process.[114]

It is important to note that there are no legal boundaries in fact for the HOA while setting the terms and conditions, covenants leaving in fact no room for expectations of liberal democracy from purchasers' the point of view. The United States laws in fact require that a copy of the project's (enclave's) terms and conditions and other governing documents be available in the sales office for

---

[113] McKenzie, Evan, "The Dynamics of Privatopia" In *Private Cities*, edited by G. Glasze, C.Webster and K.Franz (New York:Routledge,2006), pp.9-30.

[114] Ibid., p.20.

potential purchasers to examine.[115] However there is no possibility for negotiation in purchaser's side, no one has the right to choose some conditions to obey while denying the others (one covenant might be not allowing any pets for instance), it is much more like "take it, or leave it" condition. There are some examples of organized homeowner rights movement such as a weekly internet radio program "On the Commons" in the United States where homeowners raise their voices about unpleasant regulations and restrictions of the HOAs in order to keep the homogeneity within the borders of GC, like a house owner house owner fined by $50/day for placing more than three sea shells in her flower bed within the GC.[116]

In most of the GC developments, first the developer company governs the HOA for while in order to maintain the stability and the standard appearance it promised for potential buyers, in accordance with its own profits; later it transfers most of its authority to house owners in the HOA (keeping his voting share safe for late decision makings by the HOA members). The developer controls the HOA for a period of time determined by the covenants and by the state of law. While creating covenants, there might be two kinds of vote membership, namely class A and class B. Class A members are the homeowners where each house represents one vote (all the people living in or owning -joint ownership, the house counts for only one vote). Class B membership however is for the developer-owned units that have not yet been sold and they count for three votes each, keeping the developer in at least 17% ownership of all votes. This guarantees that it would be the developer ruling the

---

[115] Ibid., p.21.

[116] For further information visit http://onthecommons.us/

association through its hired private employees until it transfers these duties to the HOA. Until that time, the financial interests of the developer is protected.[117]

The HOAs are mostly not entities with high levels of participation of residents or self-governance by them. Blakely and Snyder recall that residents consider the HOA as a means of protecting their private property rather than being responsible for public goals relate to the whole shared community.[118] Residents are individualistic goal seekers, not connected to each other except personal benefits related situations rather than being socially integrated through social structures.[119] This situation also minimizes possibility of social contact and social cooperation between residents, by transferring all rights to solve social situations required interaction and decision making processes within the community to the rule setters those are claimed to represent them.

Blakely and Snyder also denote that the HOA's ability to set rules and conditions mostly serves for controlling purposes rather than community building purposes.[120] The more specific rules are established, the less the residents need to deal with each other, and rather they can turn into to the third party to arbitrate or enforce sanctions if required. This in fact avoids social interaction and ways of cooperation, weakening solidarity and social ties between residents, transferring older forms of social responsibility to legal contracts within the GC.

Formation of social capital through communitarian ties within the enclaves of GC is another point of concern. Social capital is important for the society mainly

---

[117] McKenzie, Evan, "The Dynamics of Privatopia", p.21.

[118] Blakely, E.J., *Fortress America*, p.35.

[119] Ibid.

[120] Ibid.

because of its potential for beneficial economic and social growth and for efficient functioning of the market with clear definition of property rights, contracts and any other negotiated arrangements.[121]

Robert Putnam has described social capital as features of social life - networks, norms, and trust - that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives.[122] There are three main components of social capital namely social networks (who knows who, neighbors in GC case), social norms (the informal and formal "rules" that guide how network members behave to each other, reciprocity principle for GC case) and sanctions (the processes that help to ensure that network members keep to the rules, covenants in GC case).

For the case of GCs, their ability to form social capital for its residents by replacing the traditional community can be examined through those three components. GCs build legal networks within neighbors tying them together, giving them collective responsibility in management -as members and voters of the HOA (network); through the rules and conditions set by the HOA, GCs raise norms as standards of living together within the gates (norms), and since the rules and covenants are binding for all residents, any deviations' punishment is accepted by each member from the beginning (sanction).[123]

Briefly, GCs are mostly the signs of prestige and exclusivity with security promises in homogenously designed social areas surrounded by walls and gates

---

[121] Cabinet Office of UK. April 2002. *Social Capital, a Discussion Paper*, Available [online]: http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/media/cabinetoffice/strategy/assets/socialcapital.pdf [10 November 2009].

[122] Ibid., p.10.

[123] Blandy, Sarah and Diane Lister. "Gated Communities: (Ne)Gating Community Development?" In *Gated Communities*, edited by R. Atkinson and S.Blandy (New York: Routledge, 2008), p.98.

targeting special social groups who can afford them, namely the middle and the upper social class. Liberal economy policies affected by global trends widen the gap between income levels of different social groups in the society and this way of residential differentiation through GCs raises the social segregation in the city.

The social services within the GC are mostly privatized minimizing the inhabitants' relations and dependence to local authorities and outsiders. The HOAs are the governing bodies of GCs and mostly they do not reflect all inhabitants' willingness or participation or awareness on the rules and regulations set in order to keep homogeneity within the GC. Most of the inhabitants do not clearly know the rules they are bounded by the covenants they signed when started to live within the GC. The lack of any social ties among inhabitants has shifted the role of social capital to shape the social structure of the community, building solidarity and participation efforts within to written rules of the HOAs. Main focus of these written rules are in fact to prevent any possible social conflicts between each inhabitant rather than building social ties between them based on solidarity, closeness, participation and toleration towards differences.


Further Studies on GCs in the United States, UK, Brazil and Australia


There are many studies on GCs for several countries in the world. Some complementary examples for this study will be examined here including cases from the United States, Great Britain, Brazil and Australia. Analyzing these examples would help understanding the motivations to move to GCs and to what extent they achieve their promises for the homebuyer and the society as a whole.

Klaus Franz examined the GC experience of Phoenix, the capital of Arizona where all the GCs were mapped and the total population recorded. According to his survey carried out in 1999, there were altogether 641 GCs in seventeen of the twenty-three municipalities within Metro Phoenix 19.3% of which have guarded gates as well. Approximately 320,000 people lived in GCs which is 11.7% of the total population. Another feature of Phoenix indicated that no more than 13% of all the closed residential areas were enclaves for the upper class, leaving 49% to the communities of the middle class and 2% to those of the lower class, showing that it was no longer only the upper class choosing to live in gated, enclosed areas as homogeneous groups.[124]

While investigating the fear and crime protections features, he points out the lack of sidewalks or car parking areas close to the GCs in order to minimize encountering with the other adding that there are usually no signposts showing the way to the communities as well.

Franz also denotes that gates within gates structures are also observed due to differentiations in terms of socio-economic status of people, represented by home styles and social facilities. Gated master-planned communities arise with the search of "exclusivity", counting to sixty communities in Phoenix of that time. He gives the example of Desert Mountain which is a well protected gated master-planned community composed of twenty-nine GCs with nine hundred custom homes and 2,400 residents in the north of Scottsdale, a city of 195,000 inhabitants.[125]

---

[124] Frantz, "Private Gated Neighbourhoods, A Progressive Trend in US Urban Development", pp.71-74.

[125] Ibid., p.72.

Le Goix's study on GCs in Los Angeles showed that GCs are targeting various social class groups rather than targeting only a specific group depending on their priorities.[126] In his study, half of the GCs were located within the rich, upper scale and mostly white neighborhoods, one third were located within the middle class, average income and white suburban neighborhoods. 20% of the GCs surveyed were located within average and lower income Asian or Hispanic neighborhoods, especially in the northern part of Orange County and in the north of San Fernando Valley.

Sarah Blandy and Diane Lister investigated the legal framework of GCs in Great Britain and their ability to form social capital within the community by looking at residents' relations with each other and with wider neighborhood.[127]

Firstly, they carried out a telephone survey on behalf of the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors; on a random sample of 1,001 respondents living in UK GCs by 2002. The respondents were asked whether they found living in GCs appealing or not. 34% said that they like living in GCs. 72% of supporters state the most attractive aspect of the community as greater security whereas 17% denoted its being "peaceful and quiet" place and 6% cited "living with people of similar background". The answers of "greater status/prestige" and "privacy" had the share of 1% each. 50% of the defenders of GCs stated that "they would rather be a part of community", where they made a distinction between living in a GC and a real (unplanned) community.

---

[126] Renaud Le Goix, "Gated Communities: Sprawl and Social Segregation in Southern California" In *Gated Communities*, edited by R. Atkinson, and S. Blandy (New York: Routledge, 2008), pp.131-151.

[127] Blandy, Sarah and Diane Lister., pp.97-111.

Secondly, they conducted a small scale study of the GC, Upper Green in Nether Edge. Nether Edge is considered to be a mixed neighborhood with a definite and alternative identity of itself, containing different groups of people from various ethnic and social groups.

Each resident automatically became a member shareholder of the residents' management company. The developer would transfer the ownership and management responsibility of the development to the company when the last plot was sold containing the golden share for the first year to ensure control.

Elderly people were more satisfied to live in Upper Green with respect to younger ones. When twenty-three residents were asked for their main (most important) reasons to move to Upper Green, twenty people (87% of total) ranked maintenance of property values as "most important" or "important" whereas sixteen people (70% of total) ranked security features and twelve people (52% of total) ranked moving into a community as important reasons behind their decision. It was observed that the respondents' expectations from the community and neighborliness were not proactive social activities that would lead to living together with solidarity and shared values, building close social ties with each other forming like-minded, similar neighbors. "Saying hello to each other when came across since they parked their cars next to each other" were enough for them in terms of building social relations within the GC. They do not want to have close ties with each other or build a community within the enclave. Another respondent said "If we found we were getting on top of other people, we would move" whereas another said "I do not see

us being a part of the community of this development… for me, one of the attractions is actually living on it…"[128]

These findings show that property values and security issues are much more important for people to move the GC. Additionally, they expect low level of informal contact with their neighbors.

The residents were asked whether they knew the details of covenants binding them as members of the GC. One or more of covenant were mostly recalled whereas some of them were remembered incorrectly. It was not a new phenomenon since previous US studies showed that less than 10% of GC residents had read the covenants prior to purchase.[129]

The respondents were also asked to assess the importance of covenants on their social life within the community. Most of them did not feel as if the covenants restricted their behaviors but they claimed that the rules and conditions would ensure that all other residents kept to the terms of the lease. In other words it was believed that the appropriate behaviors of other residents could only be guaranteed by these rules.

The exclusive offer of the GC adversely affected the neighboring community; they were mostly irritated by the notion of "strangers mean trouble" on Upper Green ads since they were living together for a long time as members of various social and ethnic groups. On graphite, they were calling Upper Green as ghettos of the middle class because of their exclusivity and segregation insistence.

---

[128] Ibid.

[129] Blandy, Sarah and Diane Lister, p.107.

This study shows that the legal frameworks of GCs are not sufficient enough to create social capital in the sense of social networks, norms and sanctions. Most of the residents do not clearly know all of the rules they are obliged to. Being unaware of the implications for collective management, they tend to have weak social ties and they see the covenants as guarantees of other's appropriate behaviors (meaning that in the absence of covenant, the other will not behave accordingly and peacefully) and relations with wider neighborhood are adversely affected with exclusivity promises.

Calderia examines Sao Paolo's experiences of residential differentiation in terms of walled GCs in order to understand the formation of the promise of exclusivity and its further effect on social segregation. She describes Sao Paolo as a society with most inequitable distributions of wealth (social inequalities are obvious) in the world.[130] She adds that fortified enclaves are considered to be are status symbols and instruments of social separation.[131]

She claims that while emphasizing the value of what is private and restricted for the owners within, the walls of GC devalue what is public and open in the city. The GCs behave as if they do not belong to their immediate surrounding but to largely invisible networks instead, promising socially homogeneous environment and hence status for the residents. She implies that the residential differentiation and tension between different social groups reaches a critical high level by the 1990s

---

[130] Caldeira, Teresa, P.R. "Fortified Enclaves: The New Urban Segregation" In *Theorizing the City: the New Urban Anthropology Reader* edited by S. M. Low (New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 2005), pp. 83-107.

[131] Ibid., p.84.

where the upper class could not achieve to isolate themselves from the lower class.[132]

She observes that for the first time after the 1940s, residential places of the upper class and the lower class stand that much near to each other with no contact, separated by walls of the GCs, raising the tension between each group. High crime rates are the most important motivation for GC formation for the upper class groups in Sao Paolo.[133]

She denotes that from the 1940s till the 1980s, middle and upper middle class were living in central, well-equipped neighborhoods and the poor lived in the periphery.[134] By the 1990s, the physical distance separating rich and poor have decreased whereas at the same time the mechanisms to keep them apart have become more obvious and more complex.[135]

She analyzes the period after the 1980s in Sao Paulo in four different processes. Firstly, the 1980s and the early 1990s were years of economic recession, with high rates of inflation and increasing poverty (impoverishment), the 1980s were called as "lost decade" after the miracle years of 1970s. Periphery became unaffordable for the poorest while the working classes had been building their own houses in the periphery since the 1940s, buying cheap lots and building houses with any infrastructure or services and they were expanding the city.[136]

---

[132] Günal, Asena, trans "Duvarlar İnşa Etmek", *Birikim*, no.123 (July 1999), pp.87-96.

[133] Teresa P.R. Calderia, *City of The Walls: Crime, Segregation and Citizenship in Sao Paolo* (California: Berkeley University of California, 2000), 1:473.

[134] Caldeira, Teresa, P.R. "Fortified Enclaves", p.84.

[135] Ibid.

[136] Ibid., p.85.

Second, these economic environment helped consolidation of democratic government in Brazil after twenty-one years of military rule, bringing the working classes and dominated rules to the center of the politics and transforming relations between politicians and the citizens. Local authorities tried to invest more on the infrastructural services for the peripheries.[137] The poorest people were totally unable to afford any housing in the peripheries with rising land costs as a result of improved infrastructural environment and they started to return to the city center for settlement.[138] Thirdly, the economic activities were transformed into finance and commerce activities rather than industrial productions, displacement of services and commerce from the inner city to periphery coinciding with new avenues and subway line.[139] Fourthly, the increase in violent crime and fear, mostly police violence where fear of crime transformed all types of public interactions was observed.[140]

She quotes from Sassen that high-income gentrification requires an increase in low-wage jobs, referring to the expansion of domestic services for the residents of GCs.[141] She denotes the class separation attempts as forms of distinction within the GCs by giving examples of separate elevators and entrances for labeled "social" and "service", asking for ID cards from servants at the entrances etc. As the number of servants rises, strict forms of control are applied by empowering other workmen to control others and these methods in fact would make daily face-to-face relationships

---

[137] Ibid.

[138] Ibid., pp.85-86.

[139] Ibid.

[140] Ibid., pp.86-87.

[141] Ibid., p.89.

impossible between the servants and the families hiring them. Different classes are

not supposed to mix or interact in the public areas of the buildings.[142]

Public streets become spaces in which the elite circulate by car and poor

people circulate on foot or by public transportation; to walk on the public street is

becoming a sign of class in many cities. Around the enclaves, there are large empty

spaces creating distance and discoursing pedestrian circulation.[143] She adds that in

cities where fortified enclaves create spatial segregation, social inequalities become

more explicit where social boundaries are rigidly constructed. Residents from all

social groups have a sense of exclusion and restriction, labeling different social

groups as dangerous, creating stereotypes.[144] Conditions for democracy would imply

that people recognize those from different social groups as co citizens, having

similar rights. Cities of walls do not strengthen citizenship; rather they contribute to

its corrosion. Engagement of variety of social groups in a political life in which

common goals and solutions would have to be negotiated would be impossible in

cities of walls.

Quintal and Thompson conducted a study on three GCs in the greater Sydney

Metropolitan areas to understand the motivations to move GC in Sydney.[145] They

concluded that main motivation was not about physical security as in most cases of

the United States and South African GCs but it was provision of package of features

by the development including location, house design and community facilities. They

referred to the research of Glasze, Webster and Franz where they concluded that

---

[142] Ibid., pp.89-90.

[143] Ibid., p.93.

[144] Ibid., p.102.

[145] Quintal, Dana and Susan Thompson, p.1037.

there is an over-emphasis on security as an explanatory factor for the popularity of GCs as "locational choice is made on the basis of subjective evaluation of bundles of civic goods".[146]

## Critiques about GCs

GC environments have been criticized by academics, the media and the wider community for a multitude of reasons.[147] Much of the critique is about the potential of breakdown of civic life and divisions within the society. Moreover, concerns about security and fear of crime and unwillingness of GC residents to contribute for public services relying on the HOAs might cause additional serious problems within the society.

The arrival of GCs is considered to be related to urban social segregation.[148] By creating physical barriers to access and privatizing civic responsibilities like police protection, GCs create excluded outsiders while excluding themselves from the others. This creates an inside-outside tension, reducing the number of public spaces that all can share which means reducing the possibility of contacts that people from different socioeconomic groups might otherwise have with each other.[149]

GCs also threaten citizen involvement reducing people's potential to understand another and commit to any common or collective purpose.[150] The

---

[146] Ibid., p.1038.

[147] Ibid., p.1036.

[148] Özlem Güzey, p.6.

[149] Ibid.

[150] Ibid., p.7.

physical separation of GCs also has social impact because the design of the typical GC eliminates the need for interaction with outsiders. Güzey recalls that Blakely and Snyder have stated when the community of responsibility stops at the gates, the function and the very idea of the democracy is threatened.[151] The future might be a territorial organization where everybody lives in autonomous enclaves according to his financial capacity and that the provision of public services would directly depend on the individual wealth with the spread of GCs.[152]

Designing confined social environments within GCs is also dangerous for healthy growth of the children in that they live in a detached position from real world there. Simons denotes that these confinement and isolation attempts may have detrimental effects on the children's growth.[153]

According to his field study held in Buenos Aires, one of the respondents told that his five-year-old son cried when he was on the subway for the first time since it was completely alien to him. In fact, the children tended to lose much of connection with the reality of the country. He reported that another respondent claimed that children who grew up in GCs did not recognize the idea of limits, as they could go wherever they wanted whenever they wanted within the GCs and did not understand that this was not the case in the outside city. One respondent described her anxiety about her son's isolation from the city life stating that he was

---

[151] Ibid.

[152] Ibid.

[153] Simons, Ben. 2006. *The Grass is Always Greener in Gated Communities: The Social Segregation and Construction of Difference in the Urbanizaciones Cerradas of the Buenos Aires Metropolitan Area*, Available [online]:http://digitalcollections.sit.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1373&context=isp_collection [20 November 2009].

not accustomed to "do not talk to strangers in the streets" or "look before you cross the street" warnings as long as they lived in the GC.[154]

In terms of security promise of GCs, Atkinson and Blandy inform that GCs are not safer than non-gated suburban neighborhoods but it makes harder for them to get in. As the walls of some GCs are raised higher, crime displacement from hardened targets towards areas presenting softer target occurs.[155] In crime prevention, one should also take the reluctance of local governments in providing general social services with the existence of private governance of GCs into consideration. It is also important to note that when people have less contact and hence less share with others unlike themselves, they have fear more from each other.[156]

Another risky situation about GCs is that the private government structure of the HOA is weakening the ability of the local government to collect taxes to provide public services. The more the residents are satisfied with the private services and detached from the local government, the more reluctant they are to pay taxes for the services they do not use of. This situation increased the burden on the non-gated residents of the city and turning them to alternative (informal) ways of provision.

One example of this exemption is the case of Leisure World Laguna Hills in Orange Country, in the south metropolitan area of Los Angeles which is the largest GC in North America with 22,000 residents. It was found in 1964 and gained city status by 1999, succeeded to be independent from the local authorities. Residents of

---

[154] Ibid.

[155] Rowland Atkinson and Sarah Blandy, *Housing Studies* 20, no.2, pp.177-186.

[156] Özlem Güzey, p.7.

Leisure World Laguna Hills do not make fiscal contributions to neighboring communities, for example to support the local school district.[157]

In conclusion, GCs are signs of prestige and social differentiation promising secure social life within the borders as exemplified by American as well as English examples by twenty-first century.

The social services within the GC are mostly privatized minimizing the inhabitants' relations and dependence to local authorities and outsiders. This privatization pleases the HOAs, who are the governing bodies of GCs where in fact not all the inhabitants' willingness or participation or awareness are represented as a social entity of a relatively homogeneous group of people. Most of the inhabitants do not clearly know the rules they are bounded by the covenants they signed when started to live within the GC. The lack of any social ties among residents has shifted the role of social capital to shape the social structure of the community, building solidarity and participation efforts within to written rules of the HOAs. Main focus of these written rules are in fact to prevent any possible social conflicts between each inhabitant and keep the property values rather than building social ties between them based on solidarity, closeness, participation and toleration towards differences.

---

[157] Frantz, Klaus, *Private Cities,* pp.64-75.

Urbanization Experience and GC Developments in Istanbul

<u>1950-1980 Period</u>

The population of Istanbul was one million in 1950; it rose to five million in 1980, ten million by 2000.[158] It was approximately thirteen million by 2009 and 18% of the population of Turkey lives in Istanbul.[159]

When looked at the income shares of the population of Turkey, it is observed that the annual income of the richest 20% of all households is 46.9% of the whole and that of the poorest 20% of all households is 5.8% by 2007.[160] Uneven distribution of income is an issue for Istanbul as well where residential differentiation attempts of different social groups have been reshaping the urban appearance of the city.

Rapid growth of urbanization in Istanbul is directly related with increasing migration flows started by the 1950s from inner parts of the country caused by mostly economic reasons. This rapid rate of urbanization has caused many social, political and economic problems for all inhabitants since the employment opportunities as well as the spaces to live for the urban mass was not adequate. As quoted before, Istanbul's experience can be described as fast depeasantization and

---

[158] Çağlar Keyder, "Globalisation and Social Exclusion in Istanbul", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 29, no.1 (March 2005), pp.124-134.

[159] Tuik, *Haber Bülteni*, no.15 (25 Januray 2010).

[160] Tuik, *Haber Bülteni*, no.221 (17 December 2009).

slow workerization.[161] In order to understand the urbanization experience of Istanbul, it would be valuable to analyze political and economic dynamics of the period (from the 1950s to the 1990s).

After the 1950s, statist/protectionist policies were transformed into liberal policies in a multi-party democracy; promoting the private sector, agricultural mechanization in rural areas (which means diminishing agricultural job opportunities in these areas) and rapid industrialization in urban areas. This shift resulted in movement of masses towards cities basically for economic reasons.[162]

These rapid flows of migrants were not able to find proper jobs and settlement places in the city, mostly worked in informal sectors, living as detached groups from the urbanized, formal income earners within the city.[163]

For settlement, the migrants were forming shanty towns on public lands– where there is ownership ambiguity- near the working areas at the center at first; while masses were continuing to arrive, the peripheries lacking of infrastructural etc services became new home seeking areas.[164] The governing party (Democrat Party- DP) was elected mostly by rural areas and to please those masses it conducted populist policies, weakening controls and sanctions on illegal settlements.

The success of these populist policies can be explained by Holston's words that urban politics is in fact a natural arena in which immigrants engage such that

---

[161] Erman, Tahire (2004), p.4.

[162] Yılmaz, Nail. n.d. *Farklılaştıran ve Ayrıştıran Bir Mekanizma Olarak Kentleşme*. Available [online]:http://iibf.kocaeli.edu.tr/ceko/ssk/kitap48/08.pdf [10 November 2009].

[163] Ibid., pp.255-260

[164] Tahire Erman, p.1

they elect and support the politicians who could credibly promise returns meaning that they become citizens through their allegiance to the space of residence.[165]

Keyder claims that illegal settlement problem was a result of state's unwillingness to engage capitalist land property relations with the capital owners. There would have been several options to cope with shanty towns. Firstly the state could have effectively restricted any housing settlement on public lands or it could have sold the land at the best price in a capitalist market. These are two extreme alternatives whereas other ways could have been selling the land to individuals or building cooperatives at subsidized prices or it could have built public houses for rent. For all alternatives, the state would have generated income and helped solve the integration problem of the newcomers to cities. Instead, populist protectionist policies were applied over no one's land for vote gains and masses continued to come and form illegal settlements afterwards.[166]

Besides populist relations, another distinctive urban policy of the DP in the early 1960s was dismantling old buildings, *konaks* and frame houses in order to build wide roads, boulevards such as *Barbaros* Boulevard and the *Beşiktaş-Maslak* road and modern apartments. Living in apartments became a sign of status for relatively high income earners to differentiate themselves from the rural migrants with no proper jobs or housings in Istanbul.[167]

Erder states that while the emerging middle class group was trying to differentiate itself from the lower class migrants, the newcomers did not constitute

---

[165] Holston, James. "Spaces of Insurgent Citizenship". In *Cities and Citizenship,* edited by J.Holston, (Durham: Duke University Press, 1999), pp.155-173.

[166] Keyder, Çağlar, "Enformel Konut Piyasasından Küresel Konut Piyasasına" In *İstanbul, Küresel ile Yerel Arasında, translated by S. Savran,* (Istanbul: Metis, 2000), pp.171-191.

[167] Rıfat, N. Bali, "Çılgın Kalabalık'tan Uzak...", *Birikim*, no.123 (July 1999), pp.35-46.

one single group of "other" in fact. Slum groups detached from the city were also detached from each other since what they had mostly in common was their economic reasoning to move to Istanbul instead of their social backgrounds, places for birth, their ethnic groups, their religious or political beliefs etc. She gives the example of *Ümraniye* to show the differentiation among them in terms of place of birth, ethnic/social groups, income levels, working sectors etc.[168]

After the 1960s (after the coup d'état), liberal economic policies shifted towards developmental import substitution economic policies and masses in shanty towns became resources of cheap labor force for industries and a potential market for the end products which led to continuing weak controls on illegal settlement onwards.[169]

While there was an increase in migrant flows and shanty town settlements, new middle class groups' desire for differentiation from these groups was rising, too. House ownership (in apartment buildings) was an important distinction point in terms of status between inhabitants of the city. Required legal regulations were made, new apartment buildings and building communities were constructed, new small scale contractors and small construction firms emerged.[170]

---

[168] Sema, Erder, *İstanbul'a Bir Kent Kondu: Ümraniye*, (İstanbul: İletişim, 1996), 1:310.

[169] Tansı Şenyapılı, "Economic Change and the Gecekondu Family", In *Sex, Roles, Family and Community in Turkey*, edited by C. Kağıtçıbaşı (Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies 3, 1982), pp.237-248.

[170] Keyder, Çağlar, "Enformel Konut Piyasasından Küresel Konut Piyasasına" , pp.183-184.

<u>Period after the 1980s</u>

By 1983, the Anap Government came into power with its liberalizing policies influenced by global trends, all kinds of developmentalist subsidies were left behind and service sectors targeting global markets and emerging global consumers within the country were preferred to previous industrial sector applications.[171] In other words, there was transition from national developmentalist policies to neoliberal capitalist policies all over the country.[172]

Turgut analyzes the economic shift in the 1980s in terms of transition from previous fordist developments to post-fordist policies denoting that fordist policies advocate strong capital society, economic stability as well as continuous economic growth, rising living standards and promising democracy for everybody.[173]

In fordist economies high rates of industrialization occurs, labor force is very specialized and well-organized (i.e. labor unions are effective on production process), and economies of scale principles are applied where maximum amount of production in minimum time period is essential and there is a developmentalist state.[174]

On the other hand, post-fordism advocates flexible specialization, weak and disorganized labor force (where wage rates and prices of goods are also flexible) and decentralization (both in terms of production and in terms of administrative affairs)

---

[171]Çağlar Keyder, and Ayşe Öncü, "Globalization of a Third-World Metropolis: İstanbul in the 1980's", *Review: A Journal of the Fernand Braudel Center,* no.17.3 (1994), pp.383-421.

[172] Keyder, C. "Globalisation and Social Exclusion in İstanbul" p.127.

[173] Sırma, R. Turgut, *İstanbul'un Yönetimi, Bir Kent Planlama Yönetimi Denemesi* (İstanbul: Anahtar Kitaplar, 2004), 1:203.

[174] Ibid., pp.44-48.

where local authorities are more powerful to take decisions and quickly apply them.[175]

Petroleum crisis of the 1973s affected all over the world, followed by economic depression and stagnation. Previous fordist policies were shifted to post-fordist policies in order to find alternative ways of production in terms of flexibility and profitability.[176]

Following global trends of liberalization, previous rural populism was turned in to "urban populism" within cities. The new middle and the upper class living in Istanbul were influenced by global patterns, consuming global products, and producing for global markets. Global investors were interested in Turkish market and work force. Foreign direct investment (FDI) in Turkey is an increasing trend from the 1980s onwards. In the 1980s, there were 0.2 billion USD FDI inflow to Turkey whereas it reached to a level of twenty billion USD in 2006 and 2007. In 2008, Turkey had ranked twentieth among the top countries attracting FDI.[177] In 1980 there were seventy-eight FDI firms where the number reached to 6,511 in 2003.[178]

Among main characteristics of FDI developments in developing countries are concentration of FDI in biggest cities and mostly in service sector, investing in

[175] Ibid.

[176] Ibid., pp.43-49.

[177] Yased. 2009. *Investment Environment in Turkey.* Available [online]: http://www.yased.org.tr/webportal/Turkish/Yayinlar/Documents/YASED%20Investment%20Environment%202009.pdf [10 September 2009].

[178] Lale Berköz and Şevkiye Şence Türk, "Yabancı Yatırımların Yerseçimini Etkileyen Faktörler:Türkiye Örneği", *itüdergisi/a* 6, no.2 (September 2007), pp.59-72.

tourism, banking, finance, consulting etc, mainly targeting foreign markets.[179]

Berköz and Türk denote that the situation is the same for Istanbul as the heart of FDI in Turkey and these FDI sectors correspondently created a new kind of labor force composed of high paid and high-educated professionals.[180] They recall that this concentration of FDI in one single big city of the developing country is in fact problematic since it increases the existing regional instability, introducing FDI concentrated city as the main focus for all economic activities which in turn leads to massive flows of migration to the city.[181]

Another problematic part of the concentration of FDI investments in Istanbul mostly in service sector was that although the value produced by manufacturing sector decreased, the employment rate had been quiet stable (it decreased from 33.6% in 1980 to 32.8% in 1990).[182] This indicated that a serious decrease in the share of wage-earners in manufacturing which would in turn strengthen the income inequality among the population, widening the disintegration in terms of consumption patterns, residential places as well as working areas etc.[183]

The existing rich class of the period was divided into two groups, one of which was the group of industrialists of the previous developmentalist period (usually worked in the textile industry) moved to big cities from Anatolia whereas the other was new emerging young and talented rich class working in service

---

[179] Ibid. p.60.

[180] Ibid.

[181] Ibid.

[182] Aksoy, Asu. June 1996. *Küreselleşme ve İstanbul'da İstihdam. Translated by Emrehan Zeybekoglu*, Available [online]: http://www.festr.org/panel/resim/f06536b7e64e3ca713f3d809286ff857.pdf  [05 August 2009].

183 Ibid.

sectors. GCs and suburban settlements as a way of residential differentiation from the other classes within the city and a promise for a return into good old times of *mahalle*s living near to like-minded people and beginnings of gentrification of the old neighborhoods came into the scene after the mid 1980s.[184] Under the influence of these trends, big construction firms entered competition for land to build GCs and middle class mass housing complexes. Mass Housing Administration was founded in order to supply low rate long term credit for the middle class buyers in order to make them house owners with formation of housing cooperatives.

Transition to two layer municipality structures in 1984 strengthened the local governments in terms of financial resources where they gained the ability of collecting taxes and they also could establish new taxes.

In terms of involvement in local government's decision making process in case of Istanbul, Erder claims that the more active groups were the less integrated low income groups.[185] The reason behind might be their ability to reach the basic requirements of urban life such as job opportunities, sheltering etc which are already available for the urban elite was too limited that they were affected by all decisions taken by the local government. She adds that the urban élite was mostly seeking for Ankara government's approval and support rather than local authorities for their capital accumulation plans in both local and global context.

The efficiency of the local government is in fact directly related with the size of the region and its ability to generate its own income, financing from the

---

[184]Ayşe Öncü, "The Myth of the Ideal Home Travels Across Cultural Borders to İstanbul", In *Space, Culture and Power: New Identities in Globalizing Cities. Edited by Ayşe Öncü and P. Weyland,* (London: Zed Books, 1997), pp.56-72.

[185] Sema Erder, "Küresel Düzlemde Yerel Eğilimler", *İSTANBUL*, no.7 (October 1993), pp.50-55.

inhabitants or the great municipality. The number of inhabitants within the region is directly related their ability to express their choices and ideas about the region-related issues. However, for the case of local governments in Istanbul, they are weak in terms of generating their own incomes and introducing a democratic environment where all inhabitants can easily express their ideas since there are a lot of inhabitants within each district.[186]

District municipalities of Istanbul were in fact effective only in providing services but not in representation of citizen groups at local government level or modifying the characteristics of the services according to local needs. By 1990, new municipal districts formed however most of the districts' population is still too high to support citizen participation.[187] The local governments failed to transform their role from providing urban services to the urban management, to the urban governance phase and they certainly could not address the question of which groups bear the sacrifices in order to achieve the growth associated with structural programs.[188]

Moreover their administrative autonomy in terms of land use where they expropriate the land and sell it out to big construction companies created a new market for large construction projects.[189]

---

[186]İlhan Tekeli, "Geleceğin İstanbul'u", *İSTANBUL,* no. 8 (January 1994), pp.114-116.

[187] Feyzan Erkip,"Global Transformations versus Local Dynamics in İstanbul – Planning in a Fragmented Metropolis", *Cities* 17, no.5 (October 2000), pp.371-377.

[188] Trudy Harpham and Kwasi A. Boateng, "Urban Governence In Relation to The Operation of Urban Services in Developing Countries", *Habitat International* 21, no.1 (March 1997), pp.65-77.

[189] Çaglar Keyder and Ayşe Öncü, "İstanbul Yol Ayrımında", *İSTANBUL,* no.7 (October 1993), pp.28-35.

The mayor was Bedreddin Dalan and the great municipality in fact remained in the more powerful position whereas the local municipalities engaged in land use and speculative relations with developers and construction companies.

In order to attract more global capital to Istanbul, Dalan organized huge development operations such as luxury hotels (located mostly in *Dolmabahce-Ortaköy-Yıldız* triangular area), residence complexes, skyscrapers, business centers (*Sabancı* Center, *Yapı Kredi* Plaza, *Vestel* Twin Towers etc), opening up *Tarlabaşı* boulevard, developments along Bosphorus coasts, second bridge project (which would made development activities along the northern parts of the Marmara sea feasible, new luxury housings, business towers were built). These developments were highly criticized due to the destruction in natural and historical structure of Istanbul and increasing national budget expenditures to finance these activities.[190]

Among big construction companies targeting the middle and the upper class groups for luxurious settlement projects, there were holdings like *Alarko* Holding which had previous experiences in Arabic country projects. *Maya* Group built *Etiler Maya* GC in 1976 and *Alarko* Holding built *Alkent* GC in *Ulus* in 1986. Additionally, housing settlements along the Marmara Sea were built as summer holidays or weekend settlements. As a result of transformation improvements, these settlements became permanent settlements. Villa settlements started to arise by the end of 1980s, firstly near *Zekeriyaköy* located in contiguous region of *Eyüp* Municipality, in a few years many big construction companies such as *Alarko*, *Acarlar* and *Sinpaş* developed new luxury projects on the area.[191]

---

[190]İlhan Tekeli, *Kent Planlaması Konuşmaları* (Ankara: TMMOB Mimarlar Odası, 1991), 1:153.

[191] Aslı D. Danış and Jean-Francois Pérouse, "Zenginliğin Mekanda Yeniden Yansımaları: İstanbul'da Güvenlikli Siteler", *Toplum ve Bilim,* 104 (2005), pp.92-123.

Evaluation of Social Segregation in Istanbul after the 1980s

Kurtarır analyzes the new consumption patterns and inhabitant's demand for differentiated housing settlement as a symbol of status in the era of globalization in terms of Marx's alienation argument.[192]

He denotes that according to Marx, the individual in industrial society consumes goods unconsciously and causelessly, he replaces his subject of existence with objects.[193] He alienates to the product because it is a result of baseless effort, he alienates to the production process because he is producing for the others without the cognition of others' role in process and he is alienating to himself because he is replacing himself with the object and loosing his real reason of life. Kurtarır claims that in the case of metropolis life, the individual alienates the space and he defines himself over his consumptions and cities are arenas of this process.

Öncü implies that by the 1980s the upper and the middle class groups have tended to leave the city center in order to live in socially well equipped complexes located far away from the center which was noisy and dirty. She adds that new differentiating feature for the upper and the middle income groups was to own "an ideal house" where one could live with like-minded people in a sterile social area and homogenous housings settlements. In those social complexes, every people of all ages engage in sport activities, barbecue together and watch their kids playing in safe playgrounds in an area surrounded by walls.[194]

---

[192] Erhan Kurtarır, Seçilmişler Töre and O.M.Doruk, pp.3-5.

[193] Ibid., p.5.

[194]Ayşe Öncü, "İdealinizdeki Ev Mitolojisi Kültürel Sınırları Aşarak İstanbul'a Ulaştı", trans. Hayrullah Dogan, *Birikim*, no.123 (July 1999), pp.26-34.

She claims that previous distinctive features of the middle and the upper class social groups with respect to lower class groups were their purchasing power to buy an ordinary apartment house and the level of education they can attain. The increase in penetration of TVs as new sources of information into the market and transformation of shanty town settlements into apartment buildings weakened the symbolic capital of the middle and the upper class in Istanbul.[195]

She describes another distinctive property of new GC complexes that the developers do not only express a couple of concrete features; rather they tell a story about what it is like to live in such a place. Narratives about the social life within the gates are essential, what is offered is in fact a much abstract thing as a way of life.

Bali recalls this life-style myth created within the walls as a world of privileges exclusive for the élite which claims that they can self sufficiently live in city-like environment where there was a center where all social complexes were built like schools, shops, sport center etc.[196] He exemplifies this elitist and exclusivist approach with the selection criteria of about schools in GCs. In order to raise the children (the successors) of the élite in appropriate way, branches of highly reputational schools are built within the GCs.

Kurtuluş opposes the self-sufficiency and exclusivity promise of the GCs for the élite.[197] She denotes that one can not provide his own water when it is cut off by the city water supply; one can not talk about self-sufficiency that they are connected and interdependent with the rest of the city.

---

[195] Ibid., p.28.

[196] Rıfat N. Bali.

[197] This quotation is from the speech made by Hatice Kurtuluş at the symposium "Yeni Yaşamlar, Mekanlar, Sınırlar: Kapalı Konut Yerleşmeleri" held in 4-5 March 2010, İstanbul.

As noted before, homogeneity in terms of the appearance of buildings as well as social complexes and general social rules set by the HOAs binding all residents are essential for GGs to keep a standardized life-style promise.

Öncü recalls that many urban planners denote that the homogeneity promise of the GCs in the formation of space and buildings in fact isolates people and alienates them. She adds that the planted garden areas of GCs are places to watch but not to plant on your own or to sit and spend time there and the children playgrounds are usually composed of a few playground surrounded by wires and wall. However most of the residents are usually pleased with living in that GC and describe the place as a lively and airy place adding that there is a nice and appropriate social environment for the kids as well. What is implied by appropriate is that the kids play with their friends who are the children of similar parents from the same social class.[198]

GCs and luxury housing settlements were supported by municipal authorities since they were providing their own security and other public services for their residents on their own. Arıkoğlu states that it is too risky giving the authority of decision making on crime and deciding who is guilty to private companies instead of public authorities, causing social disintegration, setting new rules of security based on demands of house owners and harming objectivity principle.[199] In fact security measurements were not as severe as mentioned for the case of Istanbul compared to for instance Sao Paolo with high risks of crime or Beirut in civil war period.[200]

---

[198] Ayşe Öncü, "İdealinizdeki Ev Mitolojisi Kültürel Sınırları Aşarak İstanbul'a Ulaştı".

[199] Kaya Arıkoğlu, "Kapalı Banliyöler ve Suça Bakış", *Arredamento Mimarlık,* no. 7-8 (2003), pp.48-55.

[200] Aslı D. Danış and Jean-Francois Pérouse, p.120.

When describing Istanbul as a metropolis, Keyder and Öncü make a comparison between other third world metropolis and Istanbul.[201] Their findings show that Cairo and Sao Paolo are ranking first in terms of population growth rate whereas the widest shanty town regions are at Bombay and Jakarta among third world metropolis. In terms of child crime it is Mexico with highest rates and in Calcutta and Rio the rate of unequal distribution of income is severe. Istanbul should not be considered as one of the worst examples of third metropolis in the worlds in terms of shortages, inequalities or crime compared to other examples.

Tanyeli claims that the inhabitants of Istanbul are too reluctant to accept the idea of living in a metropolis and that they are seeking for previous communitarian relations within the city.[202] When compared to "blaze attitude" of Simmel's explanation of metropolitan individual who is mostly indifferent towards various stimuli around him, Tanyeli considers *Istanbullities* to be too anxious and too concerned about prevailing differences among people within the society -in terms of their social, economic and political backgrounds, social class, level of incomes, working areas, or ethnic/religious preferences and that this attitude makes public interactions and building any kinds of public relations among different groups very difficult. He states that fear of crime is not valid for the case of Istanbul when compared to other metropolis around the world and that people are not likely to know or to learn the different patterns evolving in the same city. He adds that this lack of curiosity about "the other" which can be exemplified by *Suadiye* residents'

---

[201] Çağlar Keyder and Ayşe Öncü, "İstanbul Yol Ayrımında", p.28.

[202] Gürkaş,Tayfun. 22 March 2007. *Interview with Murat Belge and Uğur Tanyeli*, Available [online]:http://www.metropolistanbul.com/public/temamakale.aspx?mid=24 [12 September 2009].

not knowing or having willingness to know Fatih district is a constructed curiosity by prevailing political and economical dynamics.

Danış makes a comparison between classical Ottoman *mahalle*s and today's GCs concluding that the former was based on "religious" or "ethnic" similarities/similar identities (similarity in terms of social and cultural background) while the base for the latter is usually the socio-economic status in terms of their income level –main distinctive point is the ability to buy houses at that rate.[203] The first was successful to create cultural ties, solidarity and willingness for participation all of which the latter is lacking of. The latter does not usually contain similarities in terms of the level of education and the birth place, either.

The main problem with such kind of differentiation and seeking for homogeneity within enclaves is that the city (the metropolis) is heterogeneous by definition and this is disregarding the very nature of the public life, ignoring the lower class, people living in crowded populations as alienated groups are just living in the same metropolitan area with no sense of solidarity, interaction, cooperation or negotiation.[204] The city should be evaluated as a collective project of surviving with strangers in Sennett's words.[205]

---

[203] Aslı D. Danış, "Bahçeşehir Bir Mahalle mi?", *İSTANBUL,* no.40 (January 2002), pp.102-105.

[204] Erhan Kurtarır, p.7.

[205] Richard Sennet, interview by Yuri Kazepov. p.12.

Previous Studies on GC Experiences of Istanbul

There are some very detailed and important studies on GCs in Istanbul some of which were held by Hatice Kurtuluş, Ayfer Bartu Candan, Biray Kolluoğlu and Aslı Didem Danış.

Kurtuluş states that the urban transformation of Istanbul is mostly driven by supply side (developers, state, local authorities, land owners etc) rather than demand side (consumer, the new middle/upper class).[206] She adds that the capitalist relations between different actors including state, developers, land owners and previous "producer" now "consumer" individual influenced by global consumption trends are crucial for new residential formations in the city.

She denotes the uniqueness of Istanbul in Turkey in terms of land ownership structure. There were large areas of undivided farmlands in outside regions of Istanbul and many GC complexes were built on those lands where the developer bought the land from the original land owner.[207]

Two of her field researches are about *Bahçeşehir* and *Beykoz* districts.[208] In both cases she reports that the advertisements describe the city centre is as a dangerous place, full of heterogonous groups of people, crowded, unsecure and not well organized. The GCs offers an alternative way of living with people "like you". She states that this method is one way of creating demand for GCs by labeling the city center as an inferior place. She denotes that main motivation for GC formations

---

[206] Kurtuluş, Hatice, ed. *İstanbul'da Kentsel Ayrışma* (İstanbul: Bağlam, 2005), 1:186.

[207] This quotation is from the speech made by Hatice Kurtuluş at the symposium "Yeni Yaşamlar, Mekanlar, Sınırlar: Kapalı Konut Yerleşmeleri" held in 4-5 March 2010, Istanbul.

[208] Kurtuluş, pp.77-126.

is not merely "the independent rational choice" of the new middle class potential buyer but it is mostly the supply side's plans for capital accumulation.

For suburban growth at that large (in order to accumulate desired capital), large (entire) lands were required and these places were formerly private property farms to build GCs on them. Surrounding of these farm places were usually public domains with illegal settlements of slums on them.

*Süzer* Holding, closely tied with state authorities, bought the farm places in *Bahçeşehir* from the landowner in 1984 and *Bahçeşehir* Mass House Project financed by *Emlak* Bank was built in the area. *Bahçeşehir* land of ten million meter-square area was sold at one million USD where one was sold at 400,000 USD in 2003, which was as a sign of close relationships between government authorities and developers in urban transformation process of Istanbul.

In 1994, first residents arrived and sooner many social facilities such as schools, shopping malls, trade centers, bars cafés, hospitals, pharmacy and banks were built within *Bahçeşehir.* At first the place was to be more autonomous, providing all kind of social, infrastructural services by private companies, as the population increased rapidly followed by advertisements, *Bahçeşehir* Municipality was formed by 1999.

Compared to the middle class suburbanization process in post-war United States, Kurtuluş states that the residents of *Bahçeşehir*, as one of the main suburbanization examples of Turkey, are not in fact from the same social class in terms of their cultural, social background, resource of income or place of birth adding that what they have in common is mostly their level of income, the period of income accumulation (that is after the 1980s) and their consumerist preferences-following global consumption trends.

60% of the population of residents is first generation *Istanbullities* –they are not born here- and Bahçeşehir is not their first location in Istanbul. Additionally, they do not feel any belonging to Istanbul but to *Bahçeşehir* - they even like *Bahçeşehir* more than their own place of birth, which is in line with developers' presenting the city "as dangerous" and *Bahçeşehir* "as a way of living in a harmonized environment", the promise states living in Istanbul without having to be *Istanbullu*.

Main reason to live in *Bahçeşehir* is mostly good conditions of environment rather than security matters as most of the other examples. She additionally denotes that there are many residents in *Bahçeşehir* working in illegal sectors or there are investigations about some residents, including some against the sate. She claims that formation of social capital as a sign of living within a community as a member was not in fact managed in *Bahçeşehir*.

Residents are mostly from different places of Istanbul, rather than from rural areas. Women don't work but don't feel themselves as housewives; they are outside in social areas. When asked for an alternative place to live, the answer is more homogenous GCs. They do not have the sense of collective action for city issues, no sense of belonging to the city, no need for public spaces, they are in fact seeking for autonomy from the outside of the region. In order to differentiate from outsiders, the prices in public and social prices are set as high.

For GC settlements in *Bahçeşehir* neighborhood, Danış makes a comparison between to groups of residents, "the fresh middle class" people who are well educated, working at well paid good jobs as doctors, pilots, engineers etc. and "the Anatolian entrepreneurs" doing usually trade or manufacturing business. The first

group mainly differentiate themselves from the latter in terms of the level of education and their main motivation to move to *Bahçeşehir* is the peaceful, green areas with good landscaping as alternative to the city center which is now too crowded, dangerous and chaotic. The motive for the latter is mostly upgrading their social status in line with their level of income, preferring the larger villas and decorating their houses in most brilliant ways.[209]

This comparison in fact shows us the idea of GCs is not in fact the right way of trying to form "the homogeneity" in its promise and hence creating the need for more differentiated and more luxurious GCs in order to live with only the most similar/homogeneous people. Back to "alienation" discussion about the rapid urbanization process, one can conclude that continuing alienation within the society would disintegrate the components of society into the smallest unit, named individual as a result of this process.[210]

*Beykoz Konakları* is another field study subject of Kurtuluş, which is a more closed version with more luxurious housings targeting specifically the upper class with the promise of global luxury consumption trends as well as traditional bourgeoisie trends of Ottoman times (*konak* buildings, naming them as classical Turkish-Ottoman Music modals etc.), trying to build strong residential belonging for the élite.

Owners of the houses at *Beykoz* should sign a contract about administration rules, they should obey the rules in order to develop a consistent culture within the

---

[209] Aslı D. Danış and Jean-Francois Pérouse, p.114.

[210] Kurtarır, p.8.

group, social capital was formed by legal regulations –but it is interesting to note that young kids steal coke from the stores within the complex, accumulation of social capital is weak, kids are bored, taken everything as given). There are no supermarkets in *Beykoz Konakları* since they don't want to interact with foreigners from *Acarkent.*[211]

*Kemer* Country is another example of closed communities studied by Candan.[212] She states that one distinctive promise of *Kemer* Country is "building a place of pluralism, diversity and difference as a real community of modern times" and that for this social divergence, different types of houses built in various styles and colors were introduced where the buyer can choose which fits him the most, which is not a valid sign of heterogeneity. The house prices starting from 700,000 USD with its famous "golf course" and all English written labels in fact welcome certain type of people with that high level of income and consumption preferences. "Being far away from the city center" is mostly liked by the residents since "the outsiders will not be able to reach here easily" which in fact make this GC "exclusive" for the rest of the people outside.

Candan and Kolluoğlu make a comparative analysis of GC developments in *Göktürk* neighborhood and *Bezirganbahçe* public housing project in terms of voluntary and involuntary movement of people to new areas of settlement and social area formation within these newly built regions.[213] They claim that while local municipality and services provided by it are irrelevant for the residents of GCs in

---

[211] Kurtuluş, pp.161-186.

[212] Ayfer Bartu, "Dışlayıcı Bir Kavram Olarak Mahalle", *İSTANBUL*, no.40 (January 2000), pp.84-86.

[213] Ayfer B. Candan and Biray Kolluoğlu.

*Göktürk*, in *Bezirganbahçe* the over-presence of urban governance through its monitoring of everyday activities and the regulation of the relationship between the local municipality and the residents are observed.[214] They add that regulations regarding the use of public space in *Bezirganbahçe* are very limiting with an overemphasis on the implementation of a new life-style, describing ways of living in an apartment building, how to use the balconies and toilets, forbidding them to sit and gather in front of the buildings, etc.[215] Respondents of *Göktürk* has formed a homogenous group with at least twenty times higher wages than the official minimum wage, whose family structures closely resemble to each other, who shop in the same places and eat in the same restaurants and send their children to the same schools.[216] Candan and Kolluoğlu describe *Göktürk* as "a gated town" rather than a GC since there are five schools (three of which are private), four hospitals (three of which are private) and four shopping malls in the area.[217] They claim that *Göktürk*'s indicated residential compounds can be described as non-places since they lack history and they do not have any distinguishable markers of identity and that they can be replicated endlessly in different spaces.[218] They conclude that the only commonality between residents of two indicated neighborhoods is that the rest of the city is either totally alien or made up of no-go and cannot-go areas for each resident group.[219]

---

[214] Ibid., p.11.

[215] Ibid., p.24.

[216] Ibid., p.29.

[217] Ibid., p.30.

[218] Ibid., p.32.

[219] Ibid., p.41.

It would be important to note that Özer counts some possible solutions for the tension among heterogeneous groups living in the city together. In order to build a strong urban identity, the local governments should be self-governing, democratic, pluralist and participant in structure and should generate its own resources to fulfill the services for its region. Resources can be generated through land supply, building public housing complexes on suitable lands which are not the property of treasure or important agricultural lands, collecting "urban tax" as in the case of New York. He adds that the other alternative options are formation of a "City Assembly" in which all different associations (civil servants, teachers, engineers, specialist in municipal affairs etc) are represented, creating commissions and comities for the urban people in order to represent themselves within the local governments.[220]

---

[220] Ahmet Özer, *Kentleşme ve Yerel Yönetimler* (Ankara:Ürün, 2000), 1:172.

CHAPTER THREE

METHOD


This thesis aims to investigate the development of GCs in Istanbul. More specifically, main objectives have been to analyze GC residents' perceptions about civic life and their interactions with outside of the GCs and effects of these patterns on the social segregation of the urban society. Within this framework, the core themes of the research, soon to be discussed are GC residents' civic engagement experiences, their reasons to move to GCs, their expectations from GC life, and their perceptions about the people living outside the gates of their GCs.

The methodology rested on qualitative methods including in-depth interviews with GC residents, members of the HOAs of GCs and marketing professionals working on GC projects. Furthermore, personal observations about the physical layouts of GCs and limited textual analysis of ads on GCs enriched the study.

Regarding in-depth interviews, a total of twenty-one residents were interviewed; their motivations to move to the GCs, their relations with neighbors as well as people living outside the gates, and finally their relations with the HOAs and local governance bodies were particularly inquired.

Residents' narratives on these issues were analyzed in terms of their safety concerns, their perceptions of exclusivity promise of the GCs, their consumption patterns and their points of interactions with civic life.

Additionally three members of the HOAs were interviewed to understand the place of HOA mechanism in building a harmonized social life within the GCs with

rules and regulations binding all of the residents to achieve collective responsibility among them.

In order to examine the marketing strategies and main promises of GC marketing campaigns for potential home buyers, five marketing professionals including two marketing executives and three ad agency professionals working in GC projects were interviewed. Additionally, some statistical data about GCs printed media communication in 2009 was analyzed in order to understand the place of GC sector in the overall printed-media communication in Turkey. Limited textual analysis of ads was conducted for several GCs to examine the discourse of GCs.

Ethnographical observations were analyzed to reveal the patterns in spatial organization of GCs and to compare the inside with areas outside GCs in terms physical appearance and landscaping, social facilities, etc.

The next two sections will detail the sampling strategies for the GCs and the respondents selected to be interviewed.

GCs Selected for the Study

The first step in the sampling strategy was to select the GCs. Three GCs were selected; one had a target customer of the upper and the upper middle class people; the other two had middle class as the target resident group. The appeal of a particular GC is apparent through the prices of the houses as well as the features of social facilities.

The reason behind this three-tier system of selection was to observe whether there were any differences for the two different social class groups in terms of motivations to move to the GCs and promises of the GCs for them. Considering the

widespread demand and supply of the middle class targeting GCs in Istanbul, two different middle class GCs, one recently completed in 1999 and the other being ten-year-old were examined in order to enrich the findings of the research.

The upper-class targeting GC examined in this study is Antrium Residence (AR) in *Ümraniye* and the two GCs mainly addressing the middle class are TEM Avrupa Konutları (TAK) in *Gaziosmanpaşa* and Ağaoğlu My City (AMY) in *Ümraniye*.

*Ümraniye* and *Gaziosmanpaşa* are densely populated districts of Istanbul where mostly migrants settle down and live in squatter housings. *Ümraniye* is the fourth most populous district of Istanbul according to the 2007 census and it is one of the most important immigrant districts with shanty town settlements.[221] Erder implies that heterogeneous groups of immigrant people in terms of income level and level of integration to the city-life have been living together in *Ümraniye*. She states that the region is not a settlement area of a single homogenous group and that some of the inhabitants identify themselves as middle class although they live in slums within the region.[222]

*Gaziosmanpaşa* was the most populous district of Istanbul of about 1.5 million people till 2007 census.[223] By 2007, district areas were redesigned and some *mahalles* were separated from *Gaziosmanpaşa* Municipality, the district became the sixth most populous district with the population of 460,000.[224]

---

[221] İBB. 03 April 2008. *İstanbul'un Yeni İlçe Haritası Çizildi.* Available [online]: http://www.ibb.gov.tr/tr-TR/Pages/Haber.aspx?NewsID=15773 [3 September 2009].

[222] Sema Erder, *İstanbul'a Bir Kent Kondu: Ümraniye*, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1996), 1:310.

[223] NTVMSNBC. 14 April 2008. *Gaziosmanpaşa'da "Kentlileştirme" Projesi.* Available [online]: http://arsiv.ntvmsnbc.com/news/442611.asp [20 August 2009].

[224] İBB.

*Gaziosmanpaşa* can be described as an immigrant welcoming district where people with low income levels work mostly in retail trade sector, living in shanty towns and considering the district as a transition region for better life conditions. The region is also known as the center of crime and drug dealers as a result of low levels of income and continuously arriving immigrants.[225]

There are several urban transformation projects held in *Gaziosmanpaşa* one of which is TAK project of TOKİ (Mass Housing Development Administration) aiming to improve the general appearance and socio-economic status of the region.

Critiques of the urban transformation attempts in *Gaziosmanpaşa* denote that the purpose of the project is in fact attracting new élite into the region rather than improving the socio-economic conditions of the existing inhabitants by solving existing problems of unemployment, crime etc. It is claimed that instead of trying to find solutions for indicated problems, the problematic parts of the region are planned to transform to somewhere else by forcing the inhabitants to move.[226]

Commonalities of the GCs examined are that each GC is surrounded with barbed wires and has various security controls including CCTV cameras, security guards, and controlled entrances; each GC has a social complex including a gym, swimming pools, green areas, kindergarten, children's playground, café-restaurant and parking lots. There are differing sized houses for differing preferences in each GC. Moreover, all of the residents interviewed described the indicated GC locating in "suburban areas" since they should drive to every place they would like to go from the GC.

---

[225] MIMDAP. 5 December 2005. *Rant Odaklı Bir Kentsel Dönüşüm Projesi: Gaziosmanpaşa* Available [online]: http://www.mimdap.org/w/?p=469 [15 October 2009].

[226] Ibid.

AR is located in *Ümraniye* and it contains 443 apartment flats in twelve blocks, completed in 2007. There are various types of houses such as one-bedroom flats and five-bedroom duplex villas where some famous singers, actresses live in. All blocks are placed in a circular order surrounding the social complex area including swimming pool, cafeteria, barbecue area, tennis area, children's playground, *Bilfen* kindergarten and closed-social complex including a market, fitness center, sauna, table-tennis area, hairdresser, dry cleaning etc. There is a surrounded river basin area in the middle of the GC besides the swimming pool which contributes to the amplitude appearance of the GC as a whole. Cars entering the GC directly go to underground parking garages and residents can take the lift up to their houses from there. There are no cars on the ground within the GC and visitor cars are not allowed to enter the GC. The price of a three-bedroom apartment flat was approximately at 550,000 TL by 2009.

AMY is located in *Ümraniye* and it contains ten blocks and three villas, completed by 2000 as the first housing project of Agaoglu Group with "My" concept (some examples of following projects are My Home-*Çengelköy* (2004) with thirty-six villas, My Town- *Ümraniye* (2005) with 560 apartment flats, My Country-*Çekmeköy* (2006) with 159 villas and 112 *konaks* and My World-Ataşehir (2007) with 3,636 apartment flats).

There are open and closed swimming pools, a café-restaurant, fitness center, dry cleaning, *hamam&sauna* and *Bilfen* kindergarten within AMY. In order to use the sport complex and swimming pools, extra payment per usage or "My Club" subscription is required. There is no supermarket within the GC and three-bedroom apartment flats were sold at about 320,000 TL by 2009.

TAK is located in *Gaziosmanpaşa* and there are 3,000 apartment flats in thirty-six blocks, completed by 2009. There is a social complex including swimming pools, a café-restaurant, fitness center, tennis area, a supermarket, *BJK* primary school, services like car-wash, dry cleaning, hairdresser etc. There are small open-air swimming pools in front of the blocks and a main one in the center and an indoor swimming pool. Sport complexes and swimming pools except the small ones in front of the blocks are extra charge. Three-bedroom apartment flats were sold approximately at 350,000 TL by 2009.

Respondents

The interviewees were selected by quasi- snow ball sample technique where first an acquaintance of the researcher in each GC was contacted and afterwards s/he introduced further residents who could be interviewed. The researcher did not have any contact with most of the respondents before the interviews. The interviews were made in various places including inside the houses of some residents, social complexes of the GCs and café-restaurants during lunch breaks of working respondents.

Any selection methods -random or non-random- other than snow-ball technique were not effective for this research for two reasons: The questions were quite in detail and required at least forty minutes discussion and that the residents were frosty against foreigners in general. Additionally, when they were out of their houses, they were generally with a friend or relative in social complexes as observed during other scheduled interviews. One other barrier for incidental interviews was

that entering the GC without stating who you have come to see was forbidden, which was a strict rule stated by each HOA.

Twenty-one residents from three GCs were interviewed where six were from TAK; seven from AR and eight from AMY.

There were two residents who did not accept to take part in the research since they were busy with work and because of their kids' health problems.

Three ad agency professionals were interviewed who were working on GC projects of *Ağaoğlu Group* and *Sinpaş Group* -which were among the biggest development companies in Istanbul, in order to examine the keywords used in the campaigns, and the basic messages of the advertiser (i.e. the developer) to attract potential customers. The researcher tried to reach professionals from the ad agency of AR; but they did not respond to the requests.

Additionally, two marketing professionals from *Ağaoğlu Group* were interviewed in order to acquire a general view of housing sector in Istanbul and how they defined a potential customer for GCs in Istanbul.

Three members of the HOAs were interviewed including one from AMY, one from TAK and one from *Baytur Sitesi* in *Kozyatağı* which was governed by the same private the HOA firm with AR.

All of the interviews were conducted in the line of prepared questions; sometimes additional questions were asked in order to further probe the respondents' experiences about the indicated GC. Each interview lasted about one hour.

All of the interviews were recorded by a cassette-player with permission of the respondents excluding two preferring to reply the answers via-email due to their time constraints for scheduling a face-to-face interview. The researcher subsequently

contacted the two respondents indicated above to clarify some of their expressions after receiving their e-mails.

The full list of questions for the residents, the HOA members and marketing professionals are in Appendixes A, B and C.

# CHAPTER FOUR

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter will present and discuss the results of this study in three sub-sections: First ethnographic observations about the regions inside and outside the gates of GCs will be discussed, and then the respondents' perceptions about GC life-style and their interactions with the civic life outside the gates will be analyzed. Finally GC marketing strategies relying on the statements of marketing professionals, limited textual analysis of ads on GCs and statistical data about marketing expenditure shares of GC development firms in Istanbul will be evaluated.

## Ethnographical Observations about the GCs

The ethnography of GCs was analyzed by looking at their geographic location and the disparities between the outer region and the areas inside of each GC. Points of connection to outside space, means of public transport available for the residents, formation of the social space inside the gates and markers of status in terms of the social services provided for the residents and features of security within the GCs were scrutinized. Additionally the exclusivity patterns aimed to create within the GCs in terms of physical appearance and social environment of the GC were examined. These observations were comparatively analyzed for the selected GCs targeting the upper class and the middle class groups in order to understand whether there were differences in the formation of GCs targeting different social-class groups.

Geographic Locations of GCs

As detailed in the Chapter Two, AR and AMY are located in *Ümraniye*, nearby the highway connections for the second bridge and TAK is in *Gaziosmanpaşa*, near TEM.

In terms of the outside regions around, AR is much far away from the center (*Ümraniye* Centrum), built on a newly constructed area nearby TEM and it would not be easy to reach AR without a car. With limited connection to the outside region, AR promises a relatively more exclusive place of living for residents among the three GCs.

AMY is surrounded by poor housings of *Ümraniye* where there are several one-floor single slum houses with gardens around the GC. There are narrow sidewalks and some low-quality single small businesses nearby such as a flower shop possibly targeting the people living in areas outside AMY rather than the middle class residents of AMY.

TAK is very near to TEM that it is not easy to reach to a central place outside the GC on foot rather than by car and there are no shops or stores near around TAK.

As indicated before, *Ümraniye* is the fourth most populous district of Istanbul where contains various social groups of immigrant people with varying levels of income live. The shopping district of *Ümraniye* is extensively large place where one can see a lot of various shops such as wedding dressers, driving courses, groceries, markets, hardware stores, clothing stores, electrician stores and service depots standing right next to each other. This study showed that the eclectic appearance of the shopping district containing a lot of various shops opened at different times standing right next to each other indicates that different needs of the

various migrant groups arriving and settling in *Ümraniye* region at different times shaped the physical appearance of the central region.  The region can be described as self-sufficient market for the demands of the inhabitants.

The sidewalks in *Ümraniye* region are very narrow to walk on and there are barriers on them to prevent driving on and there is always a traffic jam because of parking in very narrow streets, entering one-way roads from the wrong direction, driving too much slowly rather than driving in a harmonized way. One of the respondents in AR denoted that the traffic problem of *Ümraniye* was very typical and that one who had not been to there before would not be able to clearly understand what it was like.

*Gaziosmanpaşa* is another immigrant district where finding locations is very difficult if one does not know the exact driving directions, especially at night. The study indicated that being in the region outside TAK at night was like being on an intercity highway outside Istanbul where there were a few street lamps and poorly descriptive signs to find a place.

In short, sharp contrasts between the areas outside the gates and inside were observed where the indicated GCs have created a totally different atmosphere within the gates as compared to the general appearance of each region. Additionally, no sign of improvement in the surrounding regions of the GCs was observed in terms of landscaping or small business formation targeting the residents. This indicated that there were no signs of integration between GCs and regions outside strengthening the social segregation among different social groups living in the same region.

## Points of Entrance

Beside previously indicated general security measures of the GCs such as barbed wires and walls surrounding the GCs and CCTV cameras; all gates of entrance were under surveillance of security guards where each GC preferred various security control mechanisms.

As a security control mechanism, there are two different entrance gates in AMY where visitors with the service personnel and the residents enter separately. TAK and AR have different security mechanisms for the point of entrances and both visitors and residents use the same entrance gates in the two GCs.

In TAK, there are two separate driving ways for entrance standing near to each other; pedestrian or driving visitors used the one on the left next to security guards' corner and told who they came to visit and residents used the right way by using their contactless cards for entrance.

In the case of AR, all gates were in the form of tollgates where one should slow down while entering the GC and there was a waiting room inside for visitors in the entrance of each gate.

In all GCs' points of entrance, the security guards ask the visitor who he/she was and who he/she came to visit. Afterwards the security guards called the resident and took his/her consent about the visitor's entrance to the GC, and then allowed the visitor to come in. In middle class targeting AMY, the service personnel coming to the GC for babysitting, cleaning, cargo delivery etc were obliged to give an ID card in order to enter/exit while other visitors (friends or acquaintances of the residents) were not. The study indicates that this two-tier application indicated a class-based differentiation in terms of security controls and anxiety about the lower class.

In short, besides the general security systems including walls, barbed wires and CCTV cameras, all GCs applied various security control mechanisms at the entrance points. In order to enter the GC, the approval of the resident for the visitor was compulsory; in AMY this approval was not enough for the lower class service personnel that they additionally had to give an ID card to enter the GC. That much insistence on security controls at entrances for nonresidents indicated high levels of fear of crime about the outsider world and the reciprocally glorified security promise for the region of the GC.

## Means of Public Transport

Generally, accesses to public transportation lines were not very easy for the upper class targeting AR compared to the middle class addressing AMY and TAK.

There was a nearby central public bus station to AMY with connections to certain regions like *Kadıköy, Üsküdar, Levent* and *Mecidiyekoy* and a mini-bus stop near TAK for the lines of *Mecidiyekoy, Taksim, Levent* etc.

There are several service lines to/from *Levent* and *Zincirlikuyu* for TAK and everybody can use them buying the required ticket. The security guards did not check the service buses at the entrance or exit, and three of the six respondents from TAK were displeased with this uncontrolled entrance and exit of people. One respondent gave example of the boys dropping brochures into the mailboxes of the houses who she thought, entered the GC so easily by service lines. She implied that she did not feel herself safe thinking that it was that easy to enter to the blocks.

There were no means of public transport to reach AR and if required; residents told that they took on a taxi to reach the nearest bus station in *Ümraniye*,

and from there they took on a bus with route to *Mecidiyeköy* first and then change the bus to reach *Taksim, Levent, Beşiktaş* etc. Moreover, reaching AR with private car was not easy if the driver did not know the exact directions since there was no main street to get there. According to the respondents' statements, most of the residents used the shortcut passing through the parking lot of *Carrefoursa* store which was approximately five-hundred meters away from AR. Additionally most of the nearby roads were one-way roads which was hard to recognize if one did not know the area well.

In summary, accessing to public transportation was not very easy for the GCs studied except AMY which was close to a central bus station. Uncontrolled entrances of people by using the public service lines created crime fear and anxiety among residents of TAK. As will be detailed in following section on narratives of respondents, most of the residents interviewed (including all of the seven respondents in AR) preferred to drive their private cars rather than using any means of public transport to reach and leave their houses in GCs. Experiences of civic engagement using public transportation channels were not observed for the selected GCs, especially for the case of the upper class oriented AR both because of its geographical location and the transportation preferences of the residents.

Markers of Status: Social Facilities in GCs

In terms of social facilities, all three GCs had almost self-sufficient social areas within the gates. All GCs contained open air/indoor swimming pools, a café-restaurant, a kindergarten, children's playground, a sport center for fitness, Pilates, squash etc., open-air/indoor tennis courts, service points such as dry-cleaning,

hairdressers and tailor etc, technical service personnel, parking lots and carefully arranged green areas for walking and bicycling.

Additionally, AR offered some more exclusive courses like ballet-courses for children at the age of twelve. In fact, AR had the largest and most luxurious looking social complexes of all three GCs including the largest swimming pool. A private firm, also serving for another reputable GC (*Stargate-Baytur* in *Kozyatağı*) was hired for the administration of social facilities and the sport complex.

In terms of general placement of social facilities within the GC, AR had a more centralized social area in the middle of the GC with much more attractive landscaping styles, larger green areas, more luxurious sport complexes, longer walking routes, characteristic barbecue areas within the GC including larger houses in modern styles.

At the moment one entered AR, she would recognize that she was in a specially designed place for pleasure that even the color of the ground was a special tone of red and this tone of color for ground was the same for all parts of the GC. There were no cars or motor vehicles on the ground where the kids could safely play and run in a large area within the social complex.

All twelve blocks in AR were built around the center where all social complexes including the open swimming pool, barbecue areas, sport complex, market, kindergarten and café-restaurant were located. All flats were with sight-view of the center and the other sides of the blocks viewing skirts of *Ümraniye* were designed as fire escape stairs.

In the case of TAK, the physical land was not appropriate for such a centralized design like AR's; blocks were located apart from each other, some being far away from the swimming pool, some other being far away from the café-

restaurant etc. Some blocks had sight-view of *Gazi Mahallesi* and *Gaziosmanpaşa* consisting of mostly one bedroom or two bedroom houses which were much cheaper than the houses near the pools, according to respondents' statements.

Another distinctive point of social life in AR was that many residents spent a long time in the open air café-restaurant, having their lunch and staying another two or more hours sitting there, reading newspapers, drinking something, chatting with a friend visiting them or a neighbor or sitting alone. When scheduling the interviews, one respondent implied that her weekend plan was to meet a friend -which is also a resident of AR- at the café of AR and the time of the interview was arranged according to the timing of this weekend plan.

In all GCs, the HOAs set rules and regulations to keep the social life and general appearance of the GC in harmony. Inside the blocks, there were boards for announcements of the HOAs about rules, warnings and upcoming events in the GCs.

Both in the upper class targeting AR and recently built middle class TAK, there were built-in furniture as oven, dishing machine and aspirators in each house and the residents were not allowed to bring different furniture instead, according to the rules of the HOAs.

Another regulation for standardization the social life within the GC, residents were not allowed to bring their own food or drinks to the café-restaurants in either of the GCs. Three of the six respondents in AR were very displeased with this restriction that even in birthday parties of their kids they were not allowed to bring or serve their own food or drinks. They were also criticizing these rules binding them to buy something each time they went down the café. Since there was nowhere else to go near the AR, they were using the café nearly every day as a resident so they did not want to be obliged to buy something each time.

Besides these restrictions, AMY and AR contained some free-use social areas for their residents other than the café. There were camellia areas in AMY where the residents could bring food and beverages to spend time together with their neighbors or visitors. In AR, there were barbecue areas in AR where the residents could cook on their own with friends or neighbors.

The barbecue area were among the most favorable and distinctive features of AR for most of the respondents. Four of the seven respondents in AR noted that they invited their friends for barbecue rather than hosting them at home and they thought there were no other GCs offering barbecue services rather than AR in Istanbul and they were pleased with that exclusivity.

Social facilities like swimming pools and sport complexes were of extra charge in AMY and TAK whereas in AR they were all inclusive for the residents. The condo fees of AR were extremely high in order to compensate for the usage of social complexes, compared to AMY or TAK. For instance, the fee for a three-bedroom house was about four-hundred TL in AR with respect to approximately one-hundred TL monthly fees for TAK by 2009.

In AR and TAK, non-residents could not use the social facilities even if paid for it unless they were residents' guests. In AMY anyone could subscribe and utilize the social complex.

Residents of AR could invite their friends to use the swimming pool free of charge in general but some of the respondents implied that at the end of last summer there was a new regulation of the HOA about visitors' entering the pool. One visitor for each resident-house would be free of charge and that the other visitors should be paying for it; the reason was that there were a lot of visitors of many residents that the residents could not use the pool comfortably when it was that much crowded.

Considering the parking lots, all three GCs contained closed parking garages for residents and the residents could take on the elevators from there to reach their houses without encountering anybody.

In AR, there were no open parking areas and no visitor cars were allowed to enter the GC, so all of the residents' cars were parked underground, in closed parking garages. This was one of the most distinctive features of AR for the residents interviewed since it created a specially-designed, controlled environment with no threat of traffic especially for children. They could play and hang around safely in open-air areas or go to the kindergarten. One respondent, thirty-three-year old, mother of five-year old son said "He can ride on his three-wheel bicycle to the kindergarten on his own every morning. Isn't it so nice? In fact that is the reason why we live in AR; he can do whatever he wants freely with no risk of traffic here."[227]

Inside AMY, there were open air parking lots reserved for visitors and residents separately and there was no alternative place to park the cars outside the gates. In TAK, visitors were allowed to park their cars temporarily in front of the blocks. Besides visitors, there were some residents parking near their blocks instead of closed parking garages. Two of the six respondents in TAK were unpleased with residents' disobedience of parking rules taking aesthetical appearance of the GC and safety of their children into consideration. However, none of them has declared their dissatisfaction to the HOA at the time of interviews.

---

[227] Interview by author, tape recording, İstanbul, November 2010. "Oğlum, her sabah 3 tekerli bisikletiyle anaokuluna gidebiliyor, çok güzel değil mi? Antrium'da oturmamızın en önemli sebebi bu aslında, oğlumuzun trafiksiz bir ortamda özgürce hareket edebiliyor, canı ne istiyorsa yapabiliyor olması."

In terms of supermarket and shopping centers, there were several big supermarket stores like *Tansaş, Real* and *Carrefoursa* about one kilometer-distance by car from each GC. There were *Meydan* Mall in *Ümraniye* and *Bayrampaşa Forum* Mall near to TAK by car. There was a small market in AR and relatively larger market in TAK (which was a local store *Onur* Market) whereas there was no market within AMY. Instead, there were some small stores *Şok* and *Mopaş* nearby AMY and all of the respondents told that they preferred to call the stores since they had delivery services, instead of exiting the GC for shopping.

It would be valuable to note here one of the six respondents in TAK told she never bought from local markets like *Onur* Market instead she preferred trustworthy reputable supermarket stores. Other two of the six noted that they could not find specialized products (i.e. food for pets, diet-food etc.) in *Onur* Market so they preferred to use the reputable stores in general.

In all three GCs, there were some rules set by the HOAs to keep the general appearance of the buildings in harmony. With these rules, outside appearance of all blocks were kept homogeneous in terms of color, shape and construction material. All of the balconies, windows and even stuffs kept in the balconies in terms of the size, shape and tone of color should be the same. There were no laundries hung on the balconies since it was not allowed by the HOAs. In the formation of social harmony in AR for instance; bicycling, skateboarding or walking a dog was strictly forbidden at some regions of the social complex which are reserved just for walking.

When looked at the front doors of the houses, all of them had the same kind of front doors with the same color and style in AR and TAK. However, for the case of AMY these rules were not strictly applied as in the case of AR or recently built TAK. At some floors in AMY, doors of four houses were to be in different styles

from each other with various decorations on them which were very interesting to observe considering the strict regulations about the homogeneous looking of the outsides of the blocks.

Shortly, all GCs had similar social facilities within the gates promising a self-sufficient daily life minimizing the needs to go outside of the GC. The level of exclusivity promise differed between the upper class targeting AR and other middle class oriented GCs, AMY and TAK. AR offered more differentiated and luxuriously designed social facilities like ballet-courses, barbecues and much more esthetically designed green areas and roads inside the GC in return for higher condo fees. The residents of AR could use all social facilities without extra charge per use; their visitors could freely use the facilities as well. Moreover, AR was the one applying the HOA rules most strictly of all three GCs including rules about parking, usage of social areas and general appearance of the region inside the GC. As a result, it preserved the most homogeneous and controlled social environment of all three GCs.

There are several well-known supermarket stores around the GCs where most of the residents prefer to use rather than local alternatives within or near around the GC. At the time of the interviews with residents of TAK, there were plans of opening of a new store of *Tansaş* near to TAK mainly targeting its residents as potential customers.

Security Controls within the GCs

As noted before, all three GCs contained security guards at the gates, barbed wires surrounding the GCs and CCTV cameras for surveillance.

Moreover there were extra security measurements within the blocks and even in the houses. There was a PIN code security system at the entrance of each block. At the time of visits, this security system was online only in AMY but not in the other two although there were some posted signs in the entrances about the regulation. Two of the six respondents in TAK claimed that they would feel much safer if the PIN code system was working.

In the case of TAK, there was an in-house screening mechanism where the residents could identify the visitors at the gates of GC from their houses and allowed him/her to enter the GC. One respondent denoted that she felt herself very safe that she could see everybody entering the GC from the gates with in-house screening system and that she could easily warn the security to check whenever she saw someone looking suspicious at the entrances.

The height of the barbed wires in AR was increased lately for security reasons. One respondent in AR denoted that the height of the wires was increased upon their request since they heard that some glue-sniffing kids were coming to sleep in the outside region of the GC. She added that there would be tree planting activities for the outside region of the enclaves where all residents could join this social activity. The purpose of this action was implied as strengthening the security of the outside region by preventing people from standing there and minimizing the noise problem for the blocks built very near to TEM.

In AMY, CCTV cameras were hidden so the outsiders or unacquainted residents could not see them. Interestingly, none of the residents interviewed in AMY were aware of CCTV system within the GC. The relevant information about hidden CCTV system was gathered from the HOA member interviewed. She added

that AMY was among three GCs in Istanbul with zero crime report by 2009 according to records of the police.

In AR and TAK, the CCTV cameras were set on top of the barbed wires, at the gates of entrance to the GC and at the entrance of blocks as well as closed parking garages.

There were additional CCTV cameras in closed parking garages in all three GCs. Two of the seven respondents from AR implied that they found the security controls at parking lots very poor; any foreigner could easily enter the parking lot and use the elevator directly to the houses especially in day times while most of the residents were at work. One respondent told that one day she saw a car quickly entering the parking lot right after her opening the gate of the parking lot with her remote control. She did not feel safe; she first called her husband and then the security guards and asked them to check whose car that was. She added that since it was known that there were a few CCTV cameras there, any foreign person could easily harm the residents if he liked to.

Three of the six respondents in AR were complaining about the lack of camera system they could use for the surveillance of children's playground while sitting in the house. They were also suspicious that the camera views were not regularly watched over by the security guards that there could be uncontrolled entering and exiting people there. Two of the eight respondents in AMY told that they felt anxious about the foreign people entering the GC by stating that they had My Club subscription since the security guards did not check them afterwards.

Security was a very important promise of the indicated GCs; different methods of surveillance were applied at the same time and there were security

controls for almost every part of the GCs, from the main gates to the entrances of the blocks.

What is more interesting that; that the existence of security controls at the entrances like walls and barbed wires made the residents think that they were necessary and they believed in a potential threat coming from the ones living outside the GC (i.e. the ones who could not afford to live in the GC as members of lower-class). This belief made the residents to demand additional and more specific security measurements like camera systems to watch over the small playgrounds within the GC, security controls for service lines entering the GC, the ones coming to use the sport club, the need for PIN code security systems in the entrance of blocks and the need for approving the visitor's identity by watching the camera in the house.

One respondent in AR told that she saw that the security guards were letting the kids with babysitters out of the gates. She added that there was a HOA rule stating that the security guard should not let the kids out unless the parents gave a signed approval for it. She did not feel safe when the security rules were not strictly applied. She said:

> A few days ago, I wanted to see what the security guard would do if a babysitter wanted to go out with the kid. Our babysitter took a neighbor's daughter and went out the gates easily. When I asked to the security guard, he said he let them out since he knew me. How can he be sure that I will not kidnap my neighbor's daughter? These kinds of exceptions in the application of the rules, especially on security issues are not right.[228]

---

[228] Interview by author, tape recording, İstanbul, November 2009. "Geçenlerde, çocuklar bakıcılarla dışarı çıkamaz kuralının nasıl uygulandığını test etmek, güvenlik görevlisinin ne yapacağını görmek istedim. Komşumun çocuğuyla bizim bakıcımız rahatlıkla site dışına çıkabildi. Görevliye neden izin verdiğini sorduğumda beni tanıdığını belirtti. Benim komşumun çocuğunu kaçırmayacağımı nereden biliyor? İnsanlar birbirlerini tanıdıkça kuralların uygulanışı esnetilebiliyor. Özellikle güvenlik kuralları söz konusu olduğunda bu esnemeleri doğru bulmuyorum."

In other words, most of the respondents noted that considering that there was a serious threat about the outside which they were made to believe by the prevailing security controls, there should be extra security controls to minimize the risk of crime which was in fact already minimized by the general security controls. This attitude increased their anxieties about everything happening outside the GC.

Briefly, when analyzed the ethnographical appearance of the GC, all three GCs aimed to create very special, sterile and differentiated inner areas compared to the areas outside the gates. Since they were located in squatter-regions of Istanbul, some of the windows of the houses were viewing the squatters and highroads while most of them were designed to view the social complex built in GC and the prices of the houses varied depending on their proximity to the social complex (i.e. houses with pool view were the most expensive ones with respect to the ones viewing the squatter region).

The walls were the highest in the upper class targeting AR both preventing them to see any part of the regions outside while walking along and spending their spare time within the GC and strengthening the security controls for indicated potential threat of crime by the outsiders. Social facilities offered by the upper class targeting AR differentiates from the other two GCs in terms of exclusivity promises; they were larger in size, the largest pool and the longest walking roads were in AR, there were more specific courses and facilities there, all facilities were free of charge for both the residents and their visitors as well and all buildings as well as facility areas were designed in most luxurious style in AR.

Considering all these patterns, any uncontrolled interaction with the outside of gates caused displeasure and anxiety for the residents and there was demand for

more specific additional security controls. Public transportation was not preferred, rather most of the residents drove their private cars to reach and leave GCs. Points of engagement with the civic life was very limited for all of the respondents outside the GCs.

In the next section, perceptions of respondents about these observations will be analyzed in more detail.

## Narratives of the Respondents

Perceptions of respondents about living in GCs and about the outside world, their future plans about housing and their expectations from the city and city life of Istanbul were examined in this study. Answers to most of the questions were not so different from each other implying that there were some general tendencies and perceptions about being a GC resident and relations with outside and with Istanbul as a whole. The following sections summarize findings on reasons to move to GCs, perceptions of residents to live in a GC, their relations with neighbors, the HOAs as well as interactions with the outside including local authorities, physical space and people living or working in those regions.

### Previous Places of Living and Reasons to Move

The respondents were asked about their previous places of living and the reason why they preferred the indicated GC to move. Fifteen of the twenty-one respondents were living previously in GC or GC-like complexes (i.e. public houses). Their houses in

previous GCs were relatively small in size and had less or no social facilities compared to their houses in indicated GCs.

Two of the seven respondents in AR were living in self-contained houses in New York before returning back to Istanbul. When they were excluded, the ratio of previous GC experience in Istanbul rose to fifteen out of the nineteen.

The ranking of reasons to choose the indicated GCs to live on varied among respondents. The most common reasons were proximity to work place, safety for their children and existence of a reputable kindergarten within the GC, availability of parking lots, existence of social complexes and existence of an administration to solve possible conflicts among residents and to keep the place in order, tidy and clean all the time.

In terms of proximity to work place, the respondents usually meant they could easily arrive at the workplace with their private cars, i.e. the work place was in fact at a distance from the house. Social facilities privately served for them, safe social environment for their children were so much important for them that they tolerated the distance.

One respondent moved to AMY from *Bağlarbaşı* with her husband and five-year-old son. She indicated that they moved to a GC since they were very tired of arranging the day very carefully for all three of them at all times; each of them wanted to act freely within a controlled, safe environment instead. In other words, predictability and safety promises of the GC social life were main reasons to move for them.

Two of the eight respondents in AMY were previously living in public houses until they were retired from military services. They indicated that GC life was the only alternative for them to live in a harmonized way regulated by general

social rules of living together and provided security controls around. Predictable and controlled environment with security promises and living in a place where the homogeneity and harmony were guaranteed by general rules set by an authority were the main motives to move for the retired soldiers.

In terms of security concerns, only two of the twenty-one respondents had experiences of robbery before they moved to the GC although all respondents counted security systems among most important motives in moving to the GCs.

Single female respondents noted the promise of "safety" as the most important reason to move to a GC. One of them explained that she wanted to drive back to the house and enter safely at late hours without having to deal with alarm systems for the car and the house all the time.

Another respondent was living in *Ortaköy* before she moved to TAK and she described the social life in *Ortaköy* as too crowded and heterogeneous containing security risks for a single female living there. She considered living in *mahalle*s where lots of different kind of people lived and worked as unsafe for her. She added that she in fact would like to live in an old house of *Cihangir* with high ceilings if there were no crime risks of hanging around glue-sniffing kids or robbery or no risk of earthquake at all.

She added that having looked that heterogeneous socio-economic structure of Istanbul, in order to live in a civilized way one should prefer to live in ghetto-type housings once he/she had enough money to afford. She was not in fact glad with the situation but she could not see any other alternative for herself as a single female living in Istanbul, seeking for safety and harmony in the place of living and that disadvantage of distance could easily be tolerated in return.

One respondent denoted that he was displeased with the previous GC they were living where there was a public children's park and a public basketball ground where a lot of low-class people were coming to use. He found these unpredictable interactions with people from outside irritating and unsafe for himself and his family, so that they decided to move. His wife was pregnant and they wanted to raise their child in a more controlled environment with private social facilities offered for them.

Two of the twenty-one respondents counted concerns about a possible earthquake for preferring GCs to live. One of them considered TOKİ as a trustworthy company and believed that TAK would be much safer than any other housing alternatives within *mahalle*s.

When asked where they would prefer to live in the future, twenty of the twenty-one respondents stated that they would definitely prefer to live in a GC. One respondent noted that she would prefer to live in self-contained house much far away from the city center to raise her child provided that she did not have to work to earn her life.

Another interesting finding was that all twenty-one respondents were satisfied with the level of luxury of the facilities and the level of quality of the whole social environment within the GC. Only one of them added that he would prefer a more luxurious villa in a GC instead of a flat where would be much comfortable to live with his dog. In fact, AR was a much more luxurious GC with respect to TAK and AMY, and TAK had relatively larger social areas and new buildings with respect to AMY. However the respondents declared that they did not plan to move to a better, the upper scale version of their present housings.

Perceptions about the Social Environment within the GCs

All of the respondents were pleased with having private social facilities within the GC; since they felt themselves secure within the GC and they were satisfied with the exclusive services privately provided for them.

The respondents in AR were the most pleased group with social facilities offered within the GC. When explaining what they liked about AR the most, all of the seven respondents expressed that they could spend a whole weekend there without needing to go outside if not quite necessary. When asked about how much of their spare time they spent in the GC, six of the seven respondents replied as nearly 80%.

Five of the seven respondents in AR implied that their monthly condo fee of four-hundred TL was a bit high but regarding the social facilities offered within the GC, it was not very expensive. They added that it was much easier for them to stay in AR and used the facilities instead of going out somewhere else. Three of them exemplified as if they would be going out for a swimming pool or a café-restaurant as a family of three of four people, they would have to prepare themselves and the children first, then they would have to find a taxi or drive to the place and look for a parking lot and when arrived, they would have to pay for each one. Instead, they preferred to stay within the GC and utilize the facilities they paid in the form of monthly condo fee. They also denoted that it was much easier to arrange a meeting at the café of the GC rather than trying to meet outside. Three respondents indicated replied that what they did as a social activity was mostly going down the café of the GC rather than going outside.

One respondent from AR who was thirty-eight-year-old mother of two children declared that she chose AR since she would like to live in the way she deserved in terms of exclusive services provided and the largest green area compared to other similar GCs. She added that high quality people were living in AR since the prices were relatively high with respect to other GCs in *Ümraniye*. She said:

> I moved to AR since it was offering an appropriate life-style for me and I feel myself happy within AR. Moreover, the residents are at a certain level of quality here, prices of the houses are much more expensive with respect to the houses in other GCs in *Ümraniye* and such people who can afford come here to live.[229]

Three of the seven denoted that what else they would like to have in AR was a theatre since they did not prefer to go to the outside alternatives because of the above reasoning. They expected to do everything kind of social activity within the GC, rather than having to go somewhere else.

As noted before, social facilities were of extra charge in AMY and three of the eight respondents in AMY were displeased with this regulation. Five of the eight respondents were glad stating that there would be a lot people using the swimming pool at the same time making the area too crowded and dirty otherwise. In other words, they were willing to pay more for more exclusivity within the GC, differentiating themselves from some social groups living there.  All of the respondents in AMY stated that they preferred to spend the weekend (or at least one day of the weekend) outside the GC.

---

[229] Interview by author, tape recording, İstanbul, November 2009. "Antrium'a bana uygun bir yaşam biçimi sunduğu için taşındım ve içeride gayet memnunum. Burada belirli kalitede insanlar yaşıyor, buradaki dairelerin fiyatları Ümraniye'deki diğer sitelerden çok daha yüksek ve ona göre insanlar geliyor buraya."

One respondent in TAK who was forty-two-year-old, single and junior-level manager stated that she did not use any social areas except the café-restaurant. She preferred to spend time on her own at home to swimming with neighbors or playing any sports together with people. She disliked any kind of unpredictable interactions with "neighbors" which she clearly differentiated from "friends". She considered she had and would have nothing in common with the rest living there. Her reasons to move to the GCs were mainly her security concerns about arriving home safely. She added that she considered herself old enough to buy an appropriate house for herself. She noted that who bought a house from GCs with similar social facilities were mostly junior-level managers of private companies whereas high-level managers preferred more luxurious GCs offering more exclusive facilities like villas with their own garden in front. She noted that where you lived became a marker of status:

> Buying a house from such a place means that you have started to earn a certain amount of income. Houses are considered to be indicators of status, before the brand of your car was a symbol for your wealth, showing what you can afford to buy. Houses did not have brand names then, but with the development of GCs, now they have special names, sometimes names of developer companies are also mentioned. Today, I think the most important markers of status are where you live and to which school your children attend in Istanbul.[230]

One respondent from TAK was very pleased to live in such a GC where was highly reputable with its social facilities and newly built environment. She said that she was happy that all drivers knew where exactly the GC was located whenever she took on a taxi and that they were curious about the internal area of the GC,

---

[230] Interview by author, tape recording, İstanbul, November 2009. "Böyle bir siteden ev almak, artık maddi olarak belirli bir seviyenin üstüne çıkmak anlamına geliyor. Evler artık birer gösterge haline geldi, eskiden arabalar bunu yapıyordu. İyi marka arabalara sahip olanlar, neye gücünün yettiğini gösteriyorlardı. Sitelerin yaygınlaşmasıyla, artık evler bu hale geldi, artık marka olarak satılabiliyorlar. Günümüzde insanlar için en önemli iki şey, nerede yaşadıkları ve çocuklarının gittiği okullar."

especially the ones knowing the old shanty- town appearance of the area. She said it was nice to live in a GC which was attracted so much attention from the people. The study implied that moving to TAK was a sign of social mobility for her, who was thirty-five-year-old and mother of a four-year-old child. She said:

> Whenever I take on a taxi and say that I would like to go to *Avrupa Konutları*, all of the drivers know the way, I feel so comfortable. They all feel curious about the inside of the gates asking me whether the houses are beautiful and we are glad to live there, etc. Everybody pays attention to *Avrupa Konutları* there and it nice to see such interest.[231]

Fourteen of the twenty-one respondents had children where twelve of them were younger than nine-year-old. All of them noted that social environment was very appropriate for their children's development. They denoted that the child would learn how to socialize with other kids who were children of other residents in the GC, they would know each other, play together and even quarrel sometime. None of the residents stated that the child was in fact growing in a controlled homogeneous environment rather than experiencing the real life with its heterogonous structure occurring outside the gates which he/she would be joining sooner or later. As noted by Simons, these confinement and isolation attempts may have detrimental effects on the children's growth since they do not experience dynamics of the real world in fact.[232]

One respondent in AMY had a nine-year-old daughter, she told that her daughter knew some friends for six years within the GC that it would not be possible to experience if they had had lived in a self-contained house located in *mahalle*s

---

[231] Interview by author, tape recording, İstanbul, November 2009. "Ne zaman bir taksiye binip Avrupa Konutları'na gitmek istediğimi söylesem, tüm şöförler yolu biliyor, çok rahat ediyorum. Her giren taksici merak ediyor, evler güzel mi, memnun musunuz diye soruyorlar. Herkesin dikkatini çekmiş bir şekilde burası, bu şekilde bilinmesi, dikkat çekmesi güzel."

[232] Simons, Ben. 2006, p.19.

rather than a GC. Homogeneous demographic characteristics and similar levels of income of the residents helped their children have close relationships with each other. One of the two respondents with children older than nine-year-old said that her children were very happy to live there since she had a lot of friends at the same age whereas they had had very few friends when they were living in a *mahalle*. Two indicated respondents noted that they let the children stay outside late with the GC relying on safety regulations, which was another advantageous point of living in a GC for their children.

Two of the six respondents in TAK replied to what else they needed to have within the GC as ATM machines of several banks since they had to go outside the GC into *Gazi Mahallesi* with their luxurious cars in order to withdraw cash and they did not feel themselves safe there and they did not want to be there for any reason.

Shortly, social facilities of the GCs studied offered a new life-style for the residents as noted in literature stating that there would be a new and self-sufficient life within the boundaries of the GC, detached from the unknown outside effects.[233] The upper class targeting AR promises a more upscale and exclusive life-style with respect to the other two middle class GCs and most of the residents prefer to spend their time within the GC and they demanded more exclusive facilities in order to minimize the need to be outside. The social environment created inside was considered to be appropriate for children's learning the real life, choosing friends to communicate, interact with them and seek for ways of negotiation when required. None of the respondents stated that it was a biased and controlled environment

---

[233] Blakely, E.J., *Fortress America*, p.18.

where homogeneity among people was artificially created which was not the case for the real world in the city.

## Interactions with Neighbors

Respondents were asked about their interactions with their neighbors and other residents within the GC, whether they could easily communicate in social complexes of the community. For the ones with children, parents of the friends of their children were potential friends for them, too.

Five of the seven respondents in AR implied that they knew a few people in the GC and they met them because their children were friends. Two of the eight respondents in AMY replied the same way that they knew neighbors since their children were friends.

One of the seven respondents in AR denoted that they had plenty of nice and close friendships within the GC thanks to their children's friendship, and she classified her social environments as "friends from high school", "friends from work place" and "friends from AR". She added that sometimes their relatives complained about not having enough time together since they stayed in the GC with their friends instead. She added that her mother found the babysitter for her daughter by asking to the babysitters of other residents' children. She wanted them to recommend her someone else they knew, taking them as a reference point to choose the babysitter.

This is an interesting point as a sign of one important promise of GCs, as noted by Güzey, to live together with "like-minded" people within the GC where socio-economic levels of the residents are similar to each other; they all have a

minimum level of income in order to afford living there.[234] In the case of three GCs

studied, children's friendship with each other positively affected the parents' pre-

conceptions about each other that they would be like-minded, too. In fact, the only

thing they knew about each other at first were their approximate level of income and

being residents of the same GC. This biased situation is important very important in

terms of understanding the social segregation. The residents had positive

preconceptions about the other residents of the upper and the upper middle class

groups while they were highly prejudiced about the low income groups living

outside the gates and demanded to increase the height of the walls surrounding the

GC to minimize any contact with outside.

Two respondents in AR were from the same high school and they

coincidently met in AR. Until they met each other, they did not know any neighbors

the GC for over one year. One of them was thirty-four-year-old and mother of one

daughter; she stated that the problem with not knowing anybody within the GC was

mostly about her security concerns. She said:

> Before I met her, there was nobody I could call in case of emergency.
> Now I know that she is here and I feel comfortable. In fact, I do not
> need to know any more people living here; feeling safe here is enough
> for me and with her I feel myself safe.[235]

One respondent in AR replied that she did not prefer having close

relationships with neighbors within the GC since it might be problematic if she had a

conflict with them, she would feel herself uncomfortable in the social areas of the

---

[234]Özlem Güzey, p.3.

[235] Interview by author, tape recording, İstanbul, November 2009. "Onunla karşılaşmadan önce, başıma bir şey gelse arayabileceğim kimse yoktu. Karşılaşınca rahatladım, daha fazla birileri tanımakla ilgili bir ihtiyaç, eksiklik duymuyorum. Kendimi güvende hissetmem yeterli, onu da şu an hissediyorum."

GC since she spends most of her spare time there. She mentioned the potential of having conflicts but she did not mention finding or trying to find ways of negotiations about possible conflicts with neighbors. Desire for predictable and controllable environment where any kinds of conflicts were minimized was very high for most of the upper class residents of AR.

The study showed that the social relations in the middle class targeting GCs studied were relatively much closer with respect to AR. One respondent in TAK implied that she believed that people living there were mostly eager to communicate with each other since they were living a semi-island artificially built in the middle of *Gazi Mahallesi* where there were sharp contrasts between the inside and outside adding to security concerns about the areas outside. She said that fear of the outside brought the residents close to each other.

Statements of five of the eight respondents in AMY showed that they had much closer relationships compared to AR and TAK. One possible reason could be that AMY was the oldest of the three GC studied and the five were living there for a few years at least.

One of them explained the possible reason for close relationships within the GC as being far away from the city center. They needed to drive in traffic to reach their friends living outside if they liked to. Rather, they were more willing to have close relationships within the GC; having feelings of aspiration for old times where they were all grown up in *mahalle*s. For all of the five respondents, living in *mahalle*s was a nice thing where you knew, like and trust everybody living there and they saw the life in GCs as the recent alternative for previous promises of *mahalle*s. In fact, the only promise of the GC was living together with a selected group with

similar income levels from similar social-class groups rather any other similarity that could lead to potential trust or likeness among residents.

One respondent in AMY was among the first residents arrived in 2001. She told that the developer company had arranged boat trips and parties welcoming the residents at that time where they could meet and interact with each other. At the time of the interview, she was very happy with the social environment she had within the GC. She said:

> It was very nice of the developer company arranging such occasions for us to meet each other and had enjoyable time together. We have met with our neighbors before we moved to our houses and we have still close relationships with most of our old neighbors here.[236]

The study indicated that the developer was aware of the importance of the social capital in building a coherent and peaceful environment where relations based on solidarity and interactions among people for a long-time standing social life and he succeeded to create such an environment in order to keep property values of the GC as high.

She noted that she preferred the social life in AMY to the social life in most of the recently built self-contained houses where the residents did not know each other. She said that three people living in their block died recently and they were trying to help each other as much as possible since they had close relations with neighbors based on solidarity and cooperation in AMY. She added that these close relationships were the main motive for her to stay in AMY rather than moving to somewhere else. She said:

---

[236] Interview by author, tape recording, İstanbul, November 2009. "İnşaat firmasının bu tip organizasyonlar düzenleyerek biz yeni ev sahiplerini biraraya getirmesi, birlikte hoşca vakit geçirmemizi sağlaması çok hoştu. Biz daha evlerimize taşınmadan, komşularımızı tanıyorduk böylelikle ve birçoklarıyla halen yakın ilişkilerimiz devam ediyor burada."

Nowadays in apartment buildings, the neighbors usually do not know each other, they are unaware of each other's needs, health conditions etc. They even do not know who died one day ago in their block. Here, we are so close to each other and we know each other very well and we try to help each other as much as possible whenever needed.[237]

Briefly, interactions with neighbors were at minimum levels in the upper class AR compared to the middle class oriented AMY. The respondents in AR were not expecting to have closer relationships with neighbors in order to minimize conflicts they might have if they interacted. Children's friendship was an important reference for their further relations with the other parents where in fact the only thing they had in common before knowing each other was their level of income. This can be evaluated as a class-biased attitude for choosing people to interact while they were too frosty about the low-level outsiders prejudicially. *Mahalle*-like social life with close relationship based on solidarity and cooperation was still important for the middle class living in AMY and they were trying to build such close social environment within the GC.

<u>Interactions with the Outside</u>

Respondents' relations with the outside area of the GCs were analyzed; in general, most residents have been observed not to have any contact with the outside of the gates except when they were driving in and out the GC.

---

[237] Interview by author, tape recording, İstanbul, November 2009. "Günümüzde apartman dairelerinde insanlar çoğu zaman komşularını tanımıyorlar, birbirlerinden, birbirlerinin sağlık sıhhatlerinden haberdar değiller. Apartmanlarından bir gün önce cenaze çıksa hangi kattaki kim ölmüş onu bile bilmez oluyorlar. Bizler burada birbirimize gayet yakınız, birbirimizi tanıyoruz ve ihtiyaç duyulan her an birbirimize mümkün olduğunca çok yardım etmeye çalışıyoruz."

As noted before, two respondents in TAK noted that they had been to areas outside the GC only for using ATM machines nearby and that they did not feel comfortable with that. One of them added that twenty-four-hour surveillance of the driving police guards in *Gazi Mahallesi* pleased him since he did not feel himself safe when he was there, out of his private car, vulnerably standing for a while.

Five of the seven respondents in AR said that they had never been to the center of *Ümraniye* since they reached and left their houses by their private cars using the route of TEM nearby AR and there was nothing appealing them in *Ümraniye*. One of them said:

> Previously we were living in a GC in *Şişli* containing all sorts of social facilities. It was like a small village and it was at a very central place, five-minute walk to *Nişantaşı* and ten-minute drive to *Taksim*. Here in *Antrium*, it is again like a small village life but reaching to a certain place takes at least thirty-minutes from here. *Ümraniye* is in the middle of nowhere.[238]

It would be interesting to note here that four of the five indicated respondents were mothers and the babysitters they hired were living in nearby places of *Ümraniye*.

One respondent from AR went to the store of *Carrefoursa* nearby AR for several times and she was not glad with the quality of the vegetables sold there. She told that the salesmen agreed with her about the lack of quality of vegetables and added that they were targeting people of *Ümraniye* with low level of income but not residents of AR in that respect. She compared that store with *Erenköy* store emphasizing the quality.

---

[238] Interview by author, tape recording, İstanbul, November 2009. "Buradan önce Şişli'de yine bir sitede oturuyorduk, her türlü sosyal imkanı içinde mevcuttu. Küçük bir köyde yaşamak gibiydi ve çok merkezi bir yerdeydi. Nişantaşı'na beş dakika yürüme mesafesinde, Taksim'e on dakikada varabildiğiniz bir yerdeydi. Antrium da küçük bir köyde yaşamak gibi ama burası her yere uzak, bir yere gitmek en az otuz dakika sürüyor. Ümraniye "in the middle of nowhere" bir yer."

Additionally, the residents of AR noted that they would not have felt themselves safe in *Ümraniye* since there were sharp contrast in terms of socio-economic status and life style of them and people living there. One respondent, who was a thirty-five-year-old mother, replied that she was very afraid of having to go to *Ümraniye* thinking that the people could attack her or could damage her goods there. She believed that the people living outside the GC were also unpleased with such a luxurious closed settlement targeting a special group built very near to them in sharp contrast with the general appearance of the region. She said:

> Within the gates, here is a different world. You should not go out here; inside here there is beautiful social environment. So it is like an open-air modern prison. I do not feel myself secure here in fact since here could be targets for possible attacks in the case of a social explosion. It is interesting that we have chosen to be isolated in fact and now we are complaining about being that much isolated.[239]

One of the five respondents in AR was a housewife and stated that she sometimes went to *Ümraniye* but that she did not feel herself comfortable there and that several times her bags and purse were stolen in the market. She added that when she had to go to the center with her children, she locked them up in the car to keep them safe and quickly returned back after she completed her errands and drove back to AR.

Another respondent implied that she did not feel herself safe outside the GC especially in evening times. She added that she heard of some babysitters' being assaulted indecently just outside the enclaves while returning to their houses. She

---

[239] Interview by author, tape recording, İstanbul, November 2009. "Burası farklı bir dünya,dışarı çıkmayacaksın, içeride güzel bir dünya var. Bildiğin hapis aslında, modern açık hapishane gibi bir yaşam. Burada aslında kendimi çok güvende hissetmiyorum, civarda en ufak bir olay olsa ilk saldıracakları yer burası olacak.Hem izole olalım diye geliyoruz, hem de izole olduğumuz için şikayet ediyoruz. Tuhaf bir durum"

said that she was taking her babysitter from the place she took off the bus in the mornings and driving her back to the bus station in the evening in order to keep her safe.

In middle class oriented AMY, most of the respondents replied that they did not have trouble when they were in areas outside the gates in *Ümraniye*. One of the respondents implied that the personnel of one of the local stores nearby were wearing turbans but that was not a problem for them since they did not interfere with each other's social and religious preferences. In other words, heterogeneity in terms social status did not raise need for isolation or fear about potential conflicts. However it would be important to note that every resident was very happy to live in a GC there and most of them replied that they felt very comfortable when they reached AMY. One respondent who was fifty-two-year-old female said:

> When I am in a minibus to AMY, I feel myself really depressed since people in the minibus talk very loudly, sometimes arguing with each other etc. I say "Oh!" whenever I reach to AMY. I see that some of the people living outside the gates park their cars in appropriate ways and walk on the roads rather than sidewalks, etc. If I would stay in *Ümraniye*, I prefer to live in AMY here.[240]

Two of the seven respondents noted that they often went to the open air market of *Ümraniye* to buy vegetables. One of them stated that she could find every kind of food she needed there where the variety and the quality of vegetables improved in time after more residents arrived to AMY.

---

[240] Interview by author, tape recording, İstanbul, November 2009. "Dolmuşla eve geliyorsam, moralim bozuluyor. İnsanlar yüksek sesle konuşuyor, zaman zaman birbiriyle tartışıyor. Siteye girince bir "Oh!" diyorum. İnsanlar dışarıda arabalarını sağa sola parkediyor gelişi güzel, yollardan yürüyor. Ümraniye'de yaşayacaksam, bu site içinde oturmayı tercih ederim bu yüzden."

One respondent stated that a few years ago she was getting on the service bus from the central bus station which was five-minutes-walk from AMY; along the one-floor self-contained squatter-like houses as indicated before. She added that she did not have any trouble while dressed in smart code because of her work. She and her husband also went to the service points around the GC such as hair dresser, tailor, pharmacy, camera store etc.

All of the respondents in AMY replied that the babysitters of their children were coming from nearby regions. Two of the eight respondents in AMY told that they hired the babysitter by means of security guards collecting CVs from the women requesting jobs of cleaning and babysitting. The parents examined the CVs, chose some of them to interview and finally decided to work with one of them and they were very satisfied with their babysitters' taking care of.

Briefly, interactions with the outside region was very low for the case of the upper class targeting AR both because of security concerns and the residents' desires about living a private, exclusive social life in a homogenous way within a controlled environment. Although most of them have never been to *Ümraniye* and they hired laborer coming from *Ümraniye* into their houses for babysitting and cleaning. The study showed that the upper class residents were aware of their need for low-class laborer for specific services while they were trying to disintegrate themselves as much as possible from them both psychically and socially. Having a controlled relationship with one of them rather than uncontrolled interactions with many of them made AR residents feel safer. Middle class residents of AMY did not feel that much fear about the outside and they do some of their shopping from the places around.

## Relations with the HOAs

The residents and the HOA members were investigated to understand their perceptions about the necessity and the role of the HOA in keeping order and creating a homogenous looking exclusive social environment within the boundaries of GC.

Each respondent agreed that there should be an administration to set out and apply rules for every resident to obey in order to live together in harmony although some of them were dissatisfied with some of the rules applied. Five of the twenty-one respondents added that they were pleased with the HOA mechanism that the residents did not have to try to negotiate with each other; rather the HOA was there to solve the conflicts. This was in fact minimizing any contact between the residents as well as service personnel working in the GC. This observation is parallel with examples of the HOAs in GCs of the United States.[241]

Only three of the twenty-one respondents replied that they would like to be a member of the HOA where opponents mostly implied that they did not want to try to solve various conflicts that might occur in such a crowded region where a few hundred people lived together.

When asked about the written covenant covering all the rules binding each resident within the GC, only five of the twenty-one respondents replied that they were given that kind of paper when moving to the GC. Two respondents not receiving the written covenants thought it was because they did not buy the house

---

[241]Blakely, E.J., *Fortress America*, p.35.

first hand although the rules were in fact binding them not the first owner by the time they moved to the GC.

When compared to the upper class targeting AR to the middle class GCs studied, the residents in AR were in a much more demanding position in terms of extra regulations in order to consolidate much more controlled environment. One respondent told that she was very unpleased with some residents' leaving towels for reserving spots near the pool in summer time. Instead of trying to find the one who left the towels and negotiate with him/her, she reported the situation to the HOA and there was a further regulation prohibiting leaving towels on the chairs for reservation.

Another respondent indicated that she was unhappy with the cleaning of the block they lived in; she thought that the cleaning-man was lazy and dirty and reported the situation to the HOA. Sooner the cleaning-man was replaced and the recent one was much more hard-working and clean according to the respondent's statement.

Another respondent complained about the stray cats walking along the social complexes near the children's playground since they were not probably vaccinated and that would be dangerous for the health of the kids. She reported to the security guards and they took action about it. It would be valuable to note here that there is a regulation prohibiting stray dogs and cats walking in AR, warning the residents that the security guards had the right to take dogs and cats with no collar out of the GC.[242]

---

[242] ANTRIUM, n.d. *Antrium Residence Yaşam Onerileri –Site Kuralları*. Available [online]: http://www.antriumresidence.com/site_kurallari.html [22 December 2009].

Respondents in AR additionally told that they protested the rate of increase in monthly condo fees, they gathered signatures and afterwards the fees were decreased from eight-hundred TL to four-hundred TL in 2009.

One respondent from TAK told that he reported to the HOA that some of the residents were leaving shoes in front of their house doors in his block which was not an aesthetic view for an apartment block. He implied that afterwards there were signs posted on the walls of the blocks stating that no shoes should be left in front of the doors of houses and that security guards would warn and take action if they saw any.

Although all of the residents were pleased with the high levels of security controls within the GCs, two of the twenty-one respondents experienced problems about application of these rules for them.

One respondent in AR was displeased with those high security controls that the cargo delivery man was not allowed to enter the GC or to leave the package to the security guards although the babysitter was at home and she was working at her office. Afterwards, she talked to the security guards and gave them a signed paper that she took the responsibility of the security risk about cargo delivery man and that he could leave the packages to the babysitter in her absence.

The other respondent was from AMY and she had problems about the babysitter's entering from the gate A, which was in fact for residents' use instead of the gate B which was reserved for visitors and service personnel. Her house was much close to gate A and she told that application of this rule that way was ridiculous since the babysitter had also a valid entrance card indicating that the resident approved her. She told the situation to some members of the HOA, they replied that she should petition for it and that afterwards it would be discussed on

monthly meetings of the administration as a part of the agenda. She did not take further action at the time of the interview.

Other complaints about some strict rules applied by the HOAs were such as size limitations about the storages to keep in the balconies as well as limitations about the materials to renovate the balconies, prohibiting distribution of handmade brochures into the mailboxes, etc.

Two respondents told that they had to throw away their storage cabinets since they were larger than the allowed size after insisted warnings of security guards; they were told that in order to keep the GC in homogenous appearance these kinds of rules should be applied.

One respondent in AMY wanted to sell her house and she and her husband distributed brochures they prepared for the sale into the mailboxes of the houses in their block. They were told that this was not allowed and the security guards recollected all of the brochures. They complained about not having a communication channel to reach all of the residents at once in order to announce or ask for something. Following their complaints, there were boards to post their requests at the entrance of each gate of the blocks. Additionally, it was said there would be a new website for residents to post their questions and requests, which would be moderated by the HOA. What was done in fact was again attempting to create a controlled environment to minimize all the risks about unpredictable happenings; the residents would announce their requests or complaints under the surveillance of the HOA.

One respondent in TAK was displeased with some of the regulations about social-life in the GC. She said that she often left her shoes in front of the door for a while before she took them inside and whenever a security guard realized that, he

knocked at the door; warned her about the shoes and asked her for taking them into the house. She told that since it was her own house, she wanted to behave comfortably and she found such insistence on this rule meaningless. She argued that they should have instead concentrated on more important problems of the GC such as parking cars in front of the blocks she said:

> I find some of the rules too strict to apply; you can not do whatever you want in your own house. It is like living in a semi-open prison here. In the future, if I could afford, I will prefer to live in a self-contained house with a private garden in front within a GC.[243]

In terms of relations with local governments; it is interesting to note that none of the residents except two experienced any direct relationship with the local governments. One respondent was called for the vaccine periods of her kids several times by local government agents. The other respondent told that he received SMS sent with the name of the mayor in order to congratulate the religious holidays.

In terms of cooperation between the HOAs and the local governments, there was only one example told by a HOA member that they were engaged in charity works in cooperation with the local government. They were buying some cloths and books for the poor people living in the region of *Ümraniye*. Interestingly, none of the residents interviewed mentioned about this charity work while talking about their relations, point of contacts with the outsiders living in *Ümraniye*.

Respondents in AR said that before the local elections of 2009, the local government built a bus stop near the GC and promised following improvement in terms of transportation and other public needs of the residents of AR. The

---

[243] Interview by author, tape recording, İstanbul, November 2009. "Bazı kuralları çok katı buluyorum, kendi evinizde rahat hareket edemiyorsunuz bu yasaklar sebebiyle. Yarı açık cezaevinde yaşamak gibi geliyor bazen. İleride, eğer maddi olarak mümkün olursa önünde kendine ait bir bahçesi olan yine bir site içinde olacak müstakil evde oturmayı tercih edebilirim."

respondents said that none of the residents voted for the governing party's candidate and after the elections the bus stop was dismantled. They also said that the borders of *mahalle*s were redefined after the elections; the whole GC was redefined as a single *mahalle* containing the opponents according to the respondents' statement. In 2009 local elections, *AK Parti* had 43.9% of votes whereas *CHP* 22.3% in *Ümraniye*.[244]

None of the respondents declared that they thought the local government represented them or took their priorities or needs as residents of GCs into consideration. Additionally, one of the seven respondents in AR believed that the local government represented the locals of *Ümraniye* but not them. In fact they did not expect anything particular from the local government since they thought it was the HOA who should answer all kinds of social and spatial needs required within the GC. Since they did not spend any time in the local region outside their GC, they did not feel any need for local governments' interference or expect any kind of additional services from them.

This observation is parallel to the scholarly literature on GCs implying that GCs in fact take the burden from the shoulders of local governments, providing all the social services for the residents privately while they go on paying the taxes.[245] The GCs in fact create large tax reserves for municipalities since there are large numbers of people with high levels of income moving to the communities as tax payers for that local government.

---

[244] İHA.n.d. *29 Mart 2009 Belediye Seçimi*. Available [online]: http://www.iha.com.tr/e2009/Secim2009/2009-34-BELEDIYE.XML#ÜMRANİYE İlçe Belediyesi [14 November 2009].

[245] Evan McKenzie, p.4.

One respondent in AMY told that once they requested provision of traffic lamps for the crossing road in front of the GC from the agents of local government. They were told that they had to pay a huge amount of money for that provision so they gave up and this was the only interaction attempt with the local government. This can be considered as an example of reluctance of the local government to provide such public services for the residents since there was a HOA as alternative provider within the GC. If the need for that provision continues, she believes that the HOA will provide the service, financed by extra fees to be collected from the residents although it will be a public service affecting everybody passing by that road.

The respondents were asked whether local promises would be effective on their decision of vote. The question asked whether they would vote for a candidate who they were ideologically apart with if he was promising some environmental improvements about the infrastructure, esthetics etc. of the district. Eighteen of the twenty-one replied that it would not be effective on their decisions since they would not find the promise convincing and that the social environment they needed was already provided within the enclaves by the HOA.

Respondents were told about the additional urban tax collected in some states of the United States to improve the environment and to invest in the infrastructure. They were asked how they would respond if urban tax collection was applied for their district or Istanbul as a whole in order to create a better place to live both for them and for the outsiders. Surprisingly, none of the respondents supported the application since they could not trust the government's spending the money for the right purposes adding that they were giving large amounts of taxes in terms of VAT as well as income taxes.

Shortly, HOAs are the regulating bodies of the GCs and they set the rules binding every resident to keep the promises of the GC about a sterile life-style where like-minded people live together in harmony within a controlled environment. Any kinds of heterogeneous factors are tried to minimize by strictly applied specific rules such as the ones about the sizes of the storages in balconies, not allowing stray cats and dogs into the GC, prohibiting residents' distribution of handmade brochures, etc.

This study found that these standardization attempts for the social life within the GC in fact were limiting the residents' social life preferences and hence their freedom to move. As implied by Blakely and Snyder, another promise of the HOAs besides regulating the social life was that it took the responsibility of solving the conflicts that might occur between residents by setting new extra rules.[246] The tendency of the residents was parallel to this promise, instead of trying to negotiate with each other or developing relations based on tolerance, cooperation and solidarity for each tiny disturbance, they reported the situation to the HOA for solution. This tendency was valid mostly in the upper class targeting AR. What is problematic about this is that peoples' ability to negotiate is weakened even among like-minded people as members of the same social class.

When considered the attempts of minimizing any kind of relation with the regions outside the GCs mostly with security and exclusivity concerns, the basic definition of living in a metropolis together with heterogeneous groups in harmony, respect, tolerance, cooperatively full with solidarity is violated. It was also observed that none of the residents were interested in or had any relation with the local authorities and they did not expect any kind of service from them, either. Different

---

[246] Blakely, E.J., *Fortress America.*

social groups are socially segregated from each other and the increase of GC adds up to this segregation.

## Understanding Marketing Strategies

In order to understand the promises of the GCs and the targeted home buyer profile in for the developers, several marketing professionals including ad agency professionals working in GC projects were interviewed. Additionally limited text analysis of ads and some statistical data about the ratios of printed media expenditures on GC sector in total printed media expenditures were examined.

Several professionals working in the marketing sector were interviewed including ad agency professionals, marketing managers and marketing specialists working for GC projects in order to understand the basic messages to communicate with potential buyers of GCs.

When asked about the most significant features of GCs for potential customers, three respondents replied that the most important one was the social environment governed by a private administration consisting of professional staff where the resident had every kind of social service he would instantly need and spent all his spare time in an enjoyable environment. The second important promise was implied as living near similar neighbors with him in terms of socio-economic status.

One of the respondents denoted that living with neighbors who earned a certain amount of income was in fact the only reliable promise of GCs. He explained that the GCs would not guarantee living with "polite, trustworthy, friendly" people but they could promise a life-style for the homebuyer in controlled environment with

security guards and a governing body where he could rely on in any case of trouble with neighbors. Additionally he stated that the promise of "security" mostly referred to living together with similar people like you where your neighbor would not be thinking of attacking you or stealing from you, etc. He said:

> When it is said that you would live with élite neighbors in a GC, it is usually meant that you would be safe there since your neighbors would be good people and you would have a stabilized life with them within the GC. Mostly it is promoted against crime news on the papers that the neighbors did not hear that the resident killed his wife with an axe previous night in a self-contained apartment flat. GCs are introduced as remedies for such unpredictable events.[247]

He also noted that printed media ads on newspapers and magazines as well as online ads were the most appropriate ways of communication to sell a house in a GC rather than one-two-minutes-length TV ads. The reason was that the ads would try to convince the potential home buyer to the new life-style he would be experiencing within the GC, to the ideal house myth as indicated by Öncü.[248]

It would be much easier to describe and make the potential home buyer believe in this promise in printed media ads since the potential home buyer could pay attention for a longer time by looking at the ad on the paper. He would see the ad, read the promises and try to figure out himself in described social the social environment and he would also try to figure out how he would feel himself about living there. For all this myth formation processes, printed media was considered to be the best option.

---

[247] Interview by author, tape recording, İstanbul, November 2009. "Güvenlikli bir sitede elit komşularınız olacak dendiğinde, bu aslında iyi komşularınızla burada güvende olacaksınız, stabil bir hayat yaşıyor olacaksınız anlamına geliyor. Genellikle, üçüncü sayfa haberlerine konu olan 'adam karısını evde baltayla öldürdü, apartmandaki alt komşuları hiçbir şey duymamış' vs gibi haberlere karşı pazarlanıyor siteler; bu tip beklenmedik olaylara karşı çare olarak sunuluyor."

[248] Öncü, A., "The Myth of the Ideal Home Travels Across Cultural Borders to İstanbul".

One marketing executive described their potential customer as a middle or upper middle class married person having one or two children, university-graduate and working as an executive or medical professional.  She added that their main promises were security and living with similar people in terms of socio-economic status. She explained that GC developments were increasing in suburban areas since there were no more large entire terrains to build such large complexes at the center of the city. As a result, the promise of security became more and more important in terms of the prevention of possible security risks from the outside regions.

Additionally she said that compared to some cases of *mahalle*s where one was unaware of the burglary at the next door, in a GC at least you would know who your neighbor was and what he was like.

All of the respondents indicated generally there were no big differences between promises of GCs from each other except their locations and the luxury level of social facilities they offer. One respondent added that the name of the developer company could be also a marketing tool as a brand name which was also indicated by one of the residents interviewed. He gave the example that saying that you were living in a GC of *Ağaoğlu* Group; this would indicate a sign of status and that you were living with élite people like you.

He indicated that trying to sell GC life style was in fact selling a product like "Mc Donald's menu" where the customer surely knew what to expect from it since the product offered a certain taste and that it would make you full. He added that the potential buyer had a vision of his demands about living in an élite place with "good" neighbors within a social complex governed by professional staff and that he believed once these demands were fulfilled he would be happy.

Point of illusion was that while "Mc Donald's menu" guaranteed the taste and that you would be full, the GC could not guarantee that you would be "happy" with the social environment offered to you. Marketing strategy of GCs was relied on convincing potential buyers that they would be happy there within a controlled environment.

In terms of printed media communication, 6% of all ads were about GC projects by 2009. Within all GC project related printed ads, 13% was of *Ağaoğlu* Group followed by *Sinpaş GYO* with 7%, *Fi Yapı* with 5% ratio and *Dap Yapı* with 4% ratio.[249]

The marketing promises of the GCs studies were mostly about offering a life-style within a socially controlled environment with many social facilities. The regions outside the GCs were never mentioned; in fact the GCs were introduced as if they were detached from the surrounding regions; "…What do we offer to you? … How about neighbors? A four-star hotel nearby, and *Ikea* and *Meydan* Malls in two-minutes-driving distance…"[250]

When looked at the promises of *Stargate, Kozyatağı* which was mentioned before as hiring the same private company for the administration of social facilities with the upper class oriented AR, it was observed that most of the important findings of previous scientific researches on discriminating concerns of GCs in terms of exclusivity and privacy was existing in the ads of this GC, too:

> …*StarGate* addresses the upper level…*Stargate* will reflect your prestige…. *Stargate* will make you reach the élite life-style you would like to have in an elitist region of Istanbul…*Stargate* will make you

[249] This data is retrieved from Bileşim Medya AdExplorer

[250] http://agaoglumycity.org/default2.aspx, retrieved 10 April 2010, "...Sitemizde başka neler mi var?... Peki komşularımız? 4 yıldızlı Ağaoğlu MyCity Otel, iki üç dakikalık mesafede IKEA ve MEYDAN alışveriş merkezi..."

live in your ideal house…Image of your house: living room where you can reflect your good taste and your personality.[251]

Promises of the middle class targeting TAK was about good neighbors and proximity to various places rather then exclusivity or privacy; "Your house and your neighbors are waiting for you! You are in the middle of Europe! Here is a self sufficient place fulfilling all your needs!"[252]

Prestige and exclusivity is described as living together with élite people and it is promoted with that promise:

> You will be living together with élite people of Istanbul in a place where you can experience life-style of the future in *Dragos* Royal Towers at ninety-eight step distance from the sea which is one of the most considerable GC projects in the world.[253]

Another example from a project of *Sinpaş GYO* declares that important people of Istanbul would be living in that GC with a new life style:

> In *Marenegro*, there are élite people shaping the city life of Istanbul. *Marenegro* is four minute-distance to *Zekeriyaköy* where is the backyard of working centers and malls of the Europe side of Istanbul. This place is full of facilities that you won't be able to have in *Zekeriyaköy*, offering you the new life-style trend of Istanbul.[254]

---

[251] www.stargatekonutlari.com, retrieved 10 January 2010, "StarGate konutları, yüksek gelir grubuna hitap ediyor....StarGate sizin prestijinizi yansıtacak....StarGate, İstanbul'un gözde semtinde, seçkin yaşam alanı ile ilgili yüksek standartınızı gerçekleştirecek... Hayalinizdeki evde yaşayacaksınız... Evinizin imajı salon: zevkinizi ve kişiliğinizi yansıtacak en sıcak mekan."

[252] http://www.avrupakonutlari.com.tr/eng/anasayfa.html, retrieved 3 September 2009.

[253] Jetlife, Atlasjet Magazine, September 2009, "İstanbul'un seçkin isimleri ile bir arada zamana meydan okuyun; gelecekteki yaşam anlayışı ile tanışın, geleceği şimdiden yaşayın! Dünyanın sayılı projeleri arasında yer alan Dragos Royal Towers, denize sadece 98 adım."

[254] Skylife, Turkish Airlines Magazine, September 2007, "Creme de la Marenegro. Şehir hayatını biçimlendiren, renklendiren özel insanlar Marenegro'da.... Maranegro, Avrupa yakasının iş ve alışveriş merkezlerinin arka bahçesi sayılan Zekeriyaköy'e sadece dört dakika mesafede ve Zekeriyaköy'de bulamayacağınız olanaklarla... Maranegro; İstanbul'da yeni yaşam trendi."

These examples also show that, as Bali denoted, the developer companies prefer to use airlines magazines to reach their potential home buyers and convince them about the exclusive promises of the indicated GCs since travelling by plane is mostly a kind of status and wealth indicator.[255]

---

[255] Rıfat N.Bali, p.42.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

This study investigated the GCs in Istanbul and their likely effects on social division within the society. Since the number of GCs has been continuously increasing since the 1990s and there are various kinds of GCs targeting people from different levels of income (and, thus, social class); analyzing the social effects of this new form of residential differentiation is important.

GCs construct physically privatized areas, segregating people as insiders and outsiders with a promise of a new life style, involving security and prestige. Living with like-minded people is promoted by the GCs where the prices of the houses and the monthly fees are set so high that they can only be afforded by certain social classes. This new way of living where exclusive services are privately provided and the region is surrounded by walls and barbed wires so that the outsiders can not voluntarily enter is introduced as a main symbol of status, encouraging more and more people –particularly those with upward mobility aspirations--to own a house within a GC.

The results of the study indicate that both the upper class and the middle class groups prefer living in exclusive GCs to living in apartment flats in *mahalle*s. This insistence on exclusivity is usually explained by the fear of crime in the city center where people from different social groups live together.  However, when asked about their crime experiences only two of the twenty-one respondents replied that they had experienced crime before in Istanbul. For the rest, security concerns were not directly related with any previous experience or potential threat. Moreover, all of the respondents from different social groups were planning to live in GCs in

the future, too. Exclusivity and security promises were highly demanded by all social groups.

When the respondents were asked about their interactions outside the GC, they reported to expect similar parameters of exclusivity and predictability as they have within the GC. They did not prefer to use public transportation; they did not prefer their children to attend to public schools or public kindergartens; they did not prefer to spend times in public areas like open-markets, bazaars, parks, playgrounds etc. Instead, they expected to have additional private social services within their GCs such as theaters, more specific courses etc.

All these attempts indicate that there is an increasing expectation for the middle and the upper classes to privatize and detach their social life from the lower classes. While describing AR, the upper class residents said that they liked AR since they did not need to go outside of the GC for a whole weekend; they could do whatever they needed within the GC. The promise of a self-sufficient social life within a GC where all social services are privately provided for the residents only and minimizing contact with the outside region is promoted as the new life-style for the wealthy people. Parallel to Öncü's statements, in this study the myth of ideal home was an important and valuable desire for all of the respondents.[256]

When the residents were asked about their relations with local authorities and their expectations from them, none of the residents were interested with local affairs. They noted that the HOA was the governing body within their GCs and that they were providing all the social services and facilities for them; they didn't need to interact with local authorities. None of the residents claimed any sense of belonging

---

[256] Ayşe Öncü, "The Myth of the Ideal Home Travels Across Cultural Borders to İstanbul".

to the district they lived in; they were totally detaching the GC region from the outside region in their minds. As in the case study of Candan and Kolluğlu in *Göktürk*, the GCs studied did not have distinguishable markers of identity related with the regions they were built in; they could be replicated endlessly in different places as well.[257]

One distinctive feature about the regions where all three GCs studied were built was that they were surrounded by shanty towns. The luxurious design and totally different physical appearance of the GCs made high levels of security controls necessary for the residents since there was a clear contrast between the inside and the outside. The security services like all other additional social services were increasing the property values of the houses within the GC, as McKenzie analyzed for the case of GCs in United States where the developers providing additional amenities and creating common ownership of social areas and hence setting the prices of the houses as high.[258]

The demand for more specific security controls within the GC was important for all respondents of three GCs studied; however, the upper class residents of AR were at even a relatively more demanding position. They were expecting to have CCTV camera system for the surveillance of the children's playground; they were not satisfied with the numbers of CCTV cameras in closed parking garages; they were not content with the security guards. The middle class residents of the other two GCs were also expecting more specific security controls like identity-card control for the people using the service lines for TAK, identity-card control for the

[257] Ayfer B. Candan and Biray Kolluoğlu.

[258] Evan McKenzie, "Private Gated Communities in the American Urban Fabric: Emerging Trends in their Production, Practises and Regulation".

people subscribed to the sport complex within AMY, prohibiting boys dropping brochures to the mail-boxes in TAK and demanding ATM machines in TAK to prevent the residents having to go to the center of *Gazi Mahallesi* to withdraw cash, etc. Furthermore, expressions of the respondents about security measurements indicated that the existence of security controls at the entrances like walls and barbed wires made the residents think that they were necessary and believe that the people living in areas outside the GC were potential threats. This fear continuously reproduced itself and created demand for extra security controls for more specific conditions. The more security controls and regulations were set, the more the residents felt insecure and anxious about the outside and the more they demanded for extra security measurements.

While trying to detach themselves from the lower class and describing the public spaces as dangerous, all respondents had to consume some service provided by the lower classes, such as baby-sitting or cleaning. Most of the babysitters of the respondents in AR were living in *Ümraniye,* while six of the seven respondents considered *Ümraniye* as very insecure and inferior place to be there. As Calderia denoted for the case of GCs in Sao Paolo, the need for low-class services were increasing in areas where high-income residents were concentrating.[259] As in Sao Paolo, the GCs included in this study also embodied upper classes' need for (and dependence upon) cheap labor for basic services while at the same time not mixing with them -- different gates and different security controls were instituted for laborers.[260]

---

[259] Caldeira, Teresa, P.R. "Fortified Enclaves", p.84.

[260] Ibid.

Living within a predictable and controlled environment was another distinctive motivation for the respondents. The HOAs were the regulating bodies setting the standards, rules and regulations binding all the residents in order to keep the whole community in harmony. The upper class residents of AR were in relatively more demanding position for more specific rules to regulate their social lives within the GC. They did not want stray cats walking within the GC; they did not want to see "lazy" cleaning man within their block; they did not want the other residents' leaving towels on the beds near the pool; hence new rules and regulations were set as after their reporting the situations to the HOAs. These rules regulating social life within the GCs had the ironic consequence of minimizing capacities of the residents to negotiate or co-operate on common goals. Rather than trying to find ways of resolving conflicts within the GC, they were reporting the situation to the HOA to solve. As Blakely noted for the case of the GCs in United States, residents in the three GCs studied in Istanbul were expecting the HOA to solve all conflicts, and they were demanding to interact as little as possible with the other residents for problem-solving.[261]

All of the respondents described the social environment as a place where their small children would learn how to socialize by choosing friends to communicate, interacting with them and seeking for ways of negotiation when required. None of the respondents stated that it would be unhealthy for the children since they grew up while they did not interact with the outside world.

In terms of relations with neighbors, minimum level of interaction was observed in AR. In fact the respondents in AR were mostly reluctant to engage in

---

[261] Blakely, E.J., *Fortress America*, p.35.

interactions with neighbors stating that they had no time and that they preferred to minimize the risk of having conflicts. They met with their neighbors mostly because of their children's friendship. This was an important reference for further relations with the other parents where in fact the only thing they had in common before knowing each other was their level of income. This can be evaluated as a class-biased attitude for choosing people to interact while they were too frosty about the low-level outsiders.

When the middle class targeting GCs were examined, memories about *mahalle* life of old times seem to be important. They believed that the social environment within the GC was offering new version of *mahalle* life-style stating that relations based on trust and likeness among people were built in GCs rather than *mahalle*s now.

Since there is not yet any extensive research on the role of the HOAs in GCs in Istanbul, further analysis would contribute to an understanding of whether these regulations are democratic. Fine mechanisms and decisions on new rules which are binding for all residents could further be investigated. In addition, lack of legal regulations specifying the jurisdiction areas of the HOAs could also be examined as they are full of ambiguity regarding the validity of their applications.

The standardization attempts for the social life within the GCs are in fact limiting for the residents' social life and hence their freedom to move. When the attempts of minimizing any kind of relation with the regions outside the GCs were considered, the basic definition of living in a metropolis together with heterogeneous groups in harmony, respect, tolerance, cooperation and solidarity is violated.

This study was a first attempt at understanding how GCs marketed to different social classes, and particularly those offering the middle classes a promise

of social status, exclusivity and a homogenous life space, are changing the social and political landscape of urban life in Istanbul. The study was exploratory and limited on several aspects.

First, it was based on interviews of only twenty-one residents from the selected GCs. Secondly; the researcher could not reach local government bodies to interview them in order to understand their perceptions of GC developments within the selected districts. Moreover, additional interviews with people from the upper class and the middle class residents living in the city center would enrich the study, showing a different point of view regarding civic life. Interviews with the people living outside the gates of the selected GCs would deepen the analysis examining the reciprocal perceptions of different social groups and their attitudes to each other and their civic engagement experiences.

An additional topic of investigation could include GC residents' experiences with civic affairs—to question whether they get involved with any local or national movement, if they have ever been part of a collective action or worked with different social groups for the same goals.

Analyzing whether supply or demand factors are more effective on GC developments would also contribute to scholars' understanding the reasons for the rapid increase of GCs in Istanbul.

Finally, a study, particularly observing children growing up within GCs would contribute to an in-depth understanding of the possible effects of GC life on the socialization of children; how they grow up to interact with different socio-economic groups within the city.

Istanbul as the most crowded city of Turkey with high rates of unevenly distributed income is a valuable space to study the effects of GC developments on

social, political and economic interactions. All these suggested themes of analysis

could contribute to figuring out possible ways of preventing further social

segregation.

APPENDIX A

Interview Questions for the GC Residents

1.  How old are you? / Are you married? / What is your occupation? (own business, private sector, public sector etc.)

2.  (If married) Do you have children? (If yes) How old are they /is he?

3.  Are you a home owner or a tenant?

4.  How long have you been living in this GC?

5.  Why do you think you preferred this GC to any other alternatives?

6.  Is your house far away/close to your work place? How do you evaluate this distance, advantageous or disadvantageous?

7.  At what kind of place were you living before you moved to here? (another GC, a self-contained house in a *mahalle* etc).

8.  How would you compare these two? What are advantages and disadvantages of living here and there?

9.  For how long do you plan to live here in the future?

10. At what kind of place do you dream of living in the future? (in a GC, in a more luxurious GC, a self-contained house in a *mahalle* etc)

11. Do you know your neighbors? Do you have close relationships with them? Are you glad with these relations? Would you prefer to be closer or more distant with them?

12. Do you think you are similar with the other residents in this GC? Do you think most of the residents are like-minded people here?

13. Do you feel yourself as distant from the rest of the city? How do you evaluate that?

14. Which social facilities about the GC do you like the most? Why?

15. Do you interact with the other residents in the social facility areas within the GC?

16. What do you mostly do in your spare time? Approximately how much of your spare time do you spend outside the GC?

17. Do you use any other means of transportation rather than private car to reach your house?

18. How do you prefer to do your grocery shopping? (Do you prefer to go to the supermarket within the GC/near to GC or well-known supermarket chain or online shopping or phone-and-delivery services etc?)

19. Are there general rules and regulations relating to the social life within the GC? How many of them do you know? Can you give a few examples of these rules? Are there punitive sanctions about these regulations?

20. Were you given a printed document about the rules when you moved here?

21. How is your relation with the HOA? Do you attend to regular meetings or are you regularly informed about the results of the HOA meetings?

22. Are you satisfied with the regulations and actions of the HOA in fulfilling your social needs within the GC? Are you glad with the HOA in general?

23. Do you involve in collective action with the other residents when there is a conflict about the rules and regulations set by the HOA?

24. Would you like to be a HOA member?Have you ever been a member before?

25. Suppose that you are an authorized person about the civic life in Istanbul, what would you to improve at first?

26. What do you think about the security rules and regulations? Do you think they are necessary/unnecessary/sufficient/not sufficient etc?

27. How are your relations with the local authorities? Do they interact with you? How do you feel about your closeness with local authorities?

28. Do you feel yourself represented by the local authorities in your district?

29. In the election time, suppose that one party promises of urban improvement projects within the district (i.e. environmental regulations/public areas, city planning etc.), would you prefer that party or would you vote for your ideological party instead?

30. Do you use the public spaces (parks, gardens, bazaar etc.)? How often?

31. Do you hire any service personnel for babysitting, cleaning, etc? (If yes) How did you find them? Do you know where they live? Where do they come from to your house?

32. How would you define "stranger" in Istanbul? Are there any situations, environments that you feel yourself as a stranger?

33. Would you like to raise your kid in this environment/society within the GC?

34. Under what conditions would you decide to leave this GC and you'd say "I don't want to stay here anymore?"

35. Are there any social facilities in Istanbul that you would like to involve more?

36. In some states in the U.S. "urban tax" is collected in order to finance improvement projects regarding the civic life and urban landscape. How would you feel if this kind of a tax was introduced in Istanbul or in your district? Do you think it would necessary/ helpful/convincing?

Interview Questions for the HOA Members

1. How would you desribe your relations with local government bodies? How often do you have contact with them, on what subjects? Do you have any trouble with your relations with them?

2. How would you evalute the relations of residents of the GC with the HOA, do you think their needs are fullfilled by the HOA? Are there any conflicts among the residents on social issues? When there are, how would the HOA help with solving it?

3. Do you organize social activites to make residents close to each other? If yes, how do you evaluate the responses of the residents to these activites, do they find them useful and meaningful? What's your opinion about this?

4. What do you think about the level of the security services provided for this GC compared to the other GCs around? Do you think there is a real security thread in the region around the GC?

5. What are the positive/negative parts of living in a GC compared to *mahalle*?

6. Considering the public life and interactions of different social groups with each other, what kind of effects do you think GC life has on the whole civic life? Do you think the residents demand such interactions with the outside?

7. Suppose that you are an authorized person about the civic life in Istanbul, what would you to improve at first?

8. How would you describe the residential life of Istanbul for ten years from now, more GCs, residences, more in-city projects or mahalle settlements, etc.?

APPENDIX C

Interview Questions for Marketing Proffesionals

1. Do you think there are demographic commonalities for people preferring to live in GCs, what kind of people do you think mostly prefer GCs in Istanbul?

2. What are the main motivations to move to GCs in Istanbul do you think?

3. Do you think the residents of the GCs are like-minded people or totally different social groups are living together witthin the GCs?

4. In what terms the indicated GC offer differing promises with respect to its competitors? What can be the differentiating points of GCs from each other?

5. Are the names of the GCs important marketing tools addressing potential customer?

6. Which means of advertisement do you mostly prefer for GC projects to reach your potential customers? Why?

7. What are the positive/negative parts of living in a GC compared to *mahalle*?

8. What do you think about the level of the security services provided for this GC compared to the other GCs around? Do you think there is a real security thread in the region around the GC?

9. Most of the GCs are located in the periphery. Do you think this is an advantage or disadvantage and in what terms?

10. Suppose that you are an authorized person about the civic life in Istanbul, what would you to improve at first?

11. How would you describe the residential life of Istanbul for ten years from now, more GCs, residences, more in-city projects or mahalle settlements, etc.?

Kapalı Site Sakinleriyle Mülakat Soruları

1. Yaşınız, medeni durumunuz, mesleğiniz (kendi işi, kamu/özel sektör)

2. (Evli ise) Çocuğunuz var mı? (Varsa) Kaç yaşlarında?

3. Ev sahibi misiniz, kiracı mısınız?

4. Bu siteye ne zaman taşındınız?

5. Bu siteye taşınmayı tercih etmenizdeki en önemli kriterler neler oldu?

6. Bu site, çalıştığınız yerden uzakta mı, bu uzaklık/yakınlık sizce bir avantaj mı yoksa dezavantaj mı?

7. Buraya taşınmadan önce nasıl bir yerde oturuyordunuz?(başka bir kapalı site, mahalle, müstakil ev, kasaba vs)

8. Eski yerleşiminizle şimdikini karşılaştırma yapabilir misiniz? –her birinin iyi kötü yanları gibi.

9. Ne kadar daha burada yaşamayı planlıyorsunuz?

10. Gelecekte nasıl bir yerde yaşamayı düşünüyorsunuz? (daha lüks site, mahalle vs)

11. Komşularınızı tanıyor musunuz, yakın olduklarınız var mı, ilişkilerinizden memnun musunuz, daha yakın/daha uzak olsun gibi bir ihtiyaç/beklenti duyuyor musunuz?

12. Diğer site sakinleriyle benzer olduğunuzu düşünüyor musunuz, ne açılardan?

13. Şehrin geri kalanından kopuk/uzak hissediyor musunuz?

14. Site aktivitelerinden en çok nelerden memnunsunuz/kullanıyorsunuz?

15. Site içindeki sosyal alanlarda diğer site sakinleriyle ilişki/dialog içine giriyor musunuz?

16. Boş vakitlerinizde ne yapıyorsunuz/zamanınızın ne kadarını (iş ve meşguliyetler dışında) site dışında geçiriyorsunuz?

17. Siteye ulaşım için özel araç dışında servis/otobüs/dolmuş vs var mı, kullanıyor musunuz?

18. Market alışverişlerinizi nasıl yapıyorsunuz (site market, yakın market, uzak hipermarket, telle sipariş, internetten sipariş, servis elemanlarından destek), sözkonusu markette aradıklarınızı buluyor musunuz, ürünler yeterli mi?

19. Site içinde uyulması gereken genel site kuralları var mı, varsa bunların tamamını biliyor musunuz, bu kuralların cezai yaptırımları var mı?

20. Siteye taşındığınızda bu kurallar dökümanı vs teslim aldınız mı?

21. Site yönetimiyle ilişkileriniz nasıl, toplantılar oluyor mu, katılıyor musunuz, ne sıklıkla? Sizi toplantı sonuçları hakkında bilgilendiriyorlar mı?

22. Site yönetimi sizce tüm ihtiyaçlarınızı karşılıyor mu, genel olarak yönetimden memnun musunuz?

23. Site yönetimi anlamında memnun olmadığınız kurallar vs sözkonusu olduğunda diğer sakinlerle birlikte bir aksiyon alıyor musunuz?

24. Site yönetimine dahil olmak ister miydiniz, böyle bir deneyiminiz oldu mu, planlıyor musunuz?

25. Şehir yaşantısında etkin bir rol oynuyor olsaydınız, Istanbul ile ilgili en çok neyi değiştirmek/iyileştirmek isterdiniz?

26. Güvenlik kuralları ve kullanılan sistemler hakkında ne düşünüyorsunuz/memnun musunuz? (aşırı, gereksiz, yetersiz vs nasıl buluyorsunuz?)

27. Yerel yönetim/yerel belediye ile ilişkileriniz nasıl, neler yaptıklarından haberdar mısınız, size ulaşıyorlar mı? Durum hakkında ne hissediyorsunuz?

28. Yerel yönetimde temsil edildiğinizi düşünüyor musunuz?

29. Yerel seçimde partiler, çevre düzenlemesi/kamusal alanlar ve servisler/şehir planlama vs hakkında geliştirmeler yapacaklarını belirtse ideolojik tercihlerinizden ziyade vaatlere gore oy verir misiniz?

30. Gündelik yaşamınızda, kamusal alan (park, bahçe, pazar vs) kullanıyor musunuz? Ne sıklıkta?

31. Çocuk bakıcılığı/temizlik vs için servis elemanı tutuyor musunuz, hangi kanallar ile buluyorsunuz, nereden geliyor?

32. Istanbul'da size gore yabancı/başka kimdir? Kendinizi yabancı hissettiğiniz ortamlar varsa tanımlar mısınız?

33. Çocuğunuzu bu sitede/bu ortamda yaşatmak ister miydiniz?

34. Bu siteden ayrılmanız gerekse bir gün, sebebi ne olur/Hangi durumda "Artık burdan taşınıyorum ben!" dersiniz?

35. Istanbul'daki günlük yaşantınızda; eksikliğini hissettiğiniz, yeterince faydalanamadığınız vs sosyal imkanlar/aktiviteler var mı? Varsa ne gibi şeylerdir bunlar?

36. Amerika'da bazı eyaletlerde "urban tax/şehir vergisi" adıyla toplanan ekstra bir vergi, şehirle ilgili yatırımlar, sosyal ve kamusal hizmetler için kullanılıyor. Böyle bir uygulamaya Istanbul'da da geçilse nasıl karşılarsınız? Faydalı/gerekli/inandırıcı bulur musunuz?

EK B

Site Yönetimi Üyeleriyle Mülakat Soruları

1. Yerel yönetimle ilişkileriniz nasıl, işbirlikleri sözkonusu mu, hangi
   konularda yerel yönetimle temas içinde olmanız gerekiyor, ne sıklıkta, bu
   ilişkilerde herhangi bir sorun/sıkıntı yaşıyor musunuz?

2. Site yönetimiyle site sakinlerinin ilişkisi sizce nasıl, talepler, ihtiyaçlar
   karşılanıyor mu, sakinler arası sık problemler yaşanıyor mu, çözüm
   bulunabiliyor mu?

3. Site sakinlerini tanıştırmaya, kaynaştırmaya yönelik aktiviteler organize
   ediyor musunuz? Genelde sizce site sakinlerinin bu tip aksiyonlara karşı
   tepkileri nasıl, gerekli, anlamlı, faydalı buluyorlar mı, siz faydalı görüyor
   musunuz?

4. Sitedeki güvenlik önlemlerini civardaki /benzer diğer sitelerle
   karşılaştırırsanız daha çok/daha az/daha gerekli buluyor musunuz? Civar
   bölge sizce güvenlik açısından ciddi bir tehdit unsuru yaratıyor mu?

5. Bu tip bir kapalı sitede yaşamın, şehir merkezinde mahalle içindeki bir
   yaşama gore artıları sakinler açısından eksileri neler olabilir?

6. Kamusal alan kullanımı, farklı sosyal grupların karşılaşmaları/ilişki içinde
   olmaları açısından kapalı sitelerde yaşam sizce şehir yaşantısı üzerinde nasıl
   bir etkiye sahip? Site sakinleri bu tip kamusal ilişkilere ihtiyaç duyuyor mu?

7. Şehir yaşantısında etkin bir rol oynuyor olsaydınız, Istanbul ile ilgili en çok
   neyi değiştirmek/iyileştirmek/güzelleştirmek isterdiniz?

8. Bir 10 yıl sonrasına bakarsak nasıl bir şehir resmi çizebiliriz? Daha çok
   yatay/dikey site, daha lüks kompleksler, daha şehir içinde yapılanma vs?

## Pazarlanması Alanında Çalışanlarla Mülakat Soruları

1. Kapalı siteleri tercih eden kişilerin sizce ortak demografik özellikleri var mı? Sizce daha çok ne tip insanlar yaşamak için kapalı siteleri tercih ediyor?

2. Sizce Istanbul'da sakinlerin konut olarak kapalı siteleri tercih etmelerinin en öncelikli sebepleri neler olabilir?

3. Genel olarak kapalı site sakinlerinin sosyal anlamda birbirine benzediğini düşünüyor musunuz yoksa yoksa çok farklı sosyal gruptan insanların birada yaşadığını mı düşünüyorsunuz?

4. Sözkonusu kapalı site, bu site diğer benzer sitelerden farklı neler sunuyor, vaatler neler? Kapalı siteler, sizce hangi özellikleriyle birbirlerinden ayrışabilir?

5. Kapalı sitelerin isimleri, hedef kitleye seslenirken önemli rol oynuyor mu?

6. Reklam anlamında daha çok hangi mecralar, ne tip iletişim faaliyetleri daha çok tercih ediliyor? Neden?

7. Bu tip bir kapalı sitede yaşamın, şehir merkezinde müstakil apartmanlarda mahalle içindeki bir yaşama gore artıları sakinler açısından eksileri neler olabilir sizce?

8. Sitedeki güvenlik önlemlerini civardaki /benzer diğer sitelerle karşılaştırırsanız daha çok/daha az/daha gerekli buluyor musunuz, nasıl değerlendiriyorsunuz? Civar bölge sizce güvenlik açısından ciddi bir tehdit unsuru yaratıyor mu?

9. Kapalı site projelerinin çoğu şehir merkezinden uzakta konumlanıyor, sizce bu durum bir avantaj mı dezavantaj mıı nasıl değerlendirirsiniz?

10. Şehir yaşantısında etkin bir rol oynuyor olsaydınız, Istanbul ile ilgili en çok neyi değiştirmek/iyileştirmek/güzelleştirmek isterdiniz?

11. Bir 10 yıl sonrasına bakarsak nasıl bir şehir resmi çizebiliriz? Daha çok yatay/dikey site, daha lüks kompleksler, daha şehir içinde yapılanma vs?

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aksoy, Asu (1996, June).*Küreselleşme ve Istanbul'da İstihdam*, translated by E. Zeybekoglu. Retrieved 5 August 2009, from http://www.festr.org/panel/resim/f06536b7e64e3ca713f3d809286ff857.pdf

Antrium (n.d.). *Antrium Residence Yasam Önerileri –Site Kuralları*. Retrieved 22 December 2009, from http://www.antriumresidence.com/site_kurallari.html

Atkinson, Rowland and Blandy Sarah. "Introduction: International Perspectives on the New Enclavism and the Rise of Gated Communities", *Housing Studies,* 20(2) (2005, March): 177-186.

Avrupa Konutları  (n.d.). *Avrupa Konutları.*Retrieved 3 September 2009, from http://www.avrupakonutlari.com.tr/eng/anasayfa.html

Bali, Rıfat, N. "Çılgın Kalabalık'tan Uzak...", *Birikim*, (123) (1999, July): 35-46.

Bartu, A. "Dışlayıcı Bir Kavram Olarak Mahalle", *ISTANBUL,* (40) (2000, January): 84-86.

Bauman, Zigmund. "Making and Unmaking Stranger", *Thesis Eleven,* (43) (1995, January): 1-16.

Beilharz, Peter, ed. *The Bauman Reader.* Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.

Berköz Lale and Türk Şevkiye Ş. "Yabancı Yatırımların Yerseçimini Etkileyen Faktörler:Türkiye Örneği", *itüdergisi/a,* 6 (2) (2007, September): 59-72.

Bıyık, Zeynep (2009, February 16). *Kapalı Bir Kent Mekanında Direniş: "Tarlabaşı".* Retrieved 25 September 2009, from http://www.planlama.org/new/konuk-yazilar/kapali-bir-kent-mekaninda-direnis-tarlabasi.html

Blakely, Edward, J. and Snyder, Mary G. *Fortress America, Gated Communities in the United States.*Washington D.C.: Brookings, 1999.

Blandy, Sarah and  Lister Diane. "Gated Communities: (Ne)Gating Community Development?" In *Gated Communities*,  edited by R. Atkinson and S.Blandy. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Bridge, Gary and Watson Sophie, ed. *The Blackwell City Reader.* Malden: Blackwell, 2002.

Cabinet Office of UK (2002, April). *Social Capital, A Discussion Paper*. Retrieved 10 November 2009, from http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/media/cabinetoffice/strategy/assets/socialcapital.pdf

Calderia, Teresia P.R. *City of The Walls: Crime, Segregation, and Citizenship in Sao Paolo.* California: Berkeley University of California, 2000.

Caldeira, Teresa, P.R. "Fortified Enclaves: The New Urban Segregation" In *Theorizing the City: the New Urban Anthropology Reader,* ed. S. M. Low. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 2005.

Candan, Ayfer B. and Biray Kolluoğlu, "Emerging Spaces of Neoliberalism: A Gated Town and a Public Housing Project in Istanbul", *New Perpectives on Turkey*, (39) (2008): 5-46.

Candan, Ayfer, B. and Biray Kolluoğlu (2009, February 11). *Kentsel Değişim Sürecinde Yer Değiştiren Yoksulluk.* Retrieved 7 November 2009, from http://www.obarsiv.com/pdf/Kolluoglu_Bartu_NB.pdf

Danış, Aslı D. and Pérouse Jean-Francois, "Zenginliğin Mekanda Yeniden Yansımaları: Istanbul'da Güvenlikli Siteler", *Toplum ve Bilim,* (104) (2005): 92-123.

Danış, Aslı D. "Bahçeşehir Bir Mahalle mi?", *ISTANBUL,* (40) (2002, January): 102-105.

Davis, Mike. *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles*. New York: Verso, 1992.

Davis, Mike (2009, January 7). *The New Ecology of War*, interview by Mattias Hagberg. Retrieved 20 March 2009, from http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2009-01-07-davis-en.html

Davis, Mike and Monk Daniel B., ed. *Evil Paradises: Dreamworlds of NeoLiberalism*. New York: New Press, 2007.

Derek, Hook and Vrdoljak M. "Gated Communities, Heterotopia and a "Rights" of Privilege: a "Heterotopology" of the South African Security Park", *Geoforum,* 33 (2) (2003, May): 195-219.

Eqpark (n.d.). *Profesyonel Sosyal ve Spor Alanları İşletmeciliği.* Retrieved 10 November 2009, from http://www.eqpark.com

Erder, Sema. *Istanbul'a Bir Kent Kondu: Ümraniye.* Istanbul: İletişim, 1996.

Erder, Sema. "Küresel Düzlemde Yerel Eğilimler", *ISTANBUL,* (7) (1993, October): 50-55.

Erişen, Oya. Suburbanization in Turkiye within the Process of Integration to Global Development and New Life-Style Settlement, (Ph.d diss., Middle East Technical University, 2003).

Erkip, Feyzan. "Global Transformations versus Local Dynamics in Istanbul – Planning in a Fragmented Metropolis", *Cities,* (17) (5) (2000, October): 371-377.

Erman, Tahire (2004).*Gecekondu Çalışmalarında "Öteki" Olarak Gecekondulu Kurguları.* Retrieved 20 April 2009, from http://ejts.revues.org/index85.html

Frantz, Klaus, "Private Gated Neighbourhoods, A Progressive Trend in US Urban Development." In *Private Cities,* edited by George Glasze, C.Webster and K. Frantz. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Günal, Asena, trans "Duvarlar İnşa Etmek", *Birikim*, (123) (1999, July): 87-96.

Gürkaş,Tayfun (2007, March 22). *Interview with Murat Belge and Uğur Tanyeli.* Retrieved 12 September 2009, from http://www.metropolIstanbul.com/public/temamakale.aspx?mid=24

Güzey, Özlem (n.d.). *Development of Gated Communities: Social and Spatial Segregation in Ankara, Turkey.* Retrieved 23 September 2009, from http://sadapt.agroparistech.fr/ersa2007/papers/983.pdf

Harpham, Trudy and Boateng Kwasi A. "Urban Governence In Relation to The Operation of Urban Services in Developing Countries", *Habitat International,* (21)(1) (1997, March): 65-77.

Harvey, David. "Globalisation in Question", *Rethinking Marxism*, (8)(4) (1995, Winter): 1-17.

Harvey, David. *Spaces of Neoliberalization: Towards a Theory of Uneven Geographical Development*, Heidelberg: Franz Steiner Veriag, 2005.

Harvey, David. "The Right to the City", *New Left Review*, (53) (2008, September-October): 23-40.

Harvey, David (n.d.). *Megacities Lecture 4.* Retrieved 10 April 2009, from http://www.kas.de/upload/dokumente/megacities/MegacitiesLectur4Worlds.pdf

Holston, James. "Spaces of Insurgent Citizenship". In *Cities and Citizenship,* edited by J.Holston. Durham: Duke University Press, 1999.

İBB (03 April 2008). *Istanbul'un Yeni İlçe Haritası Çizildi.* Retrieved 3 September 2009, from http://www.ibb.gov.tr/tr-TR/Pages/Haber.aspx?NewsID=15773

İHA (n.d.). *29 Mart 2009 Belediye Seçimi.* Retrieved 14 November 2009, from http://www.iha.com.tr/e2009/Secim2009/2009-34-BELEDIYE.XML#ÜMRANİYE İlçe Belediyesi

İşbir, Eyüp G. *Kentleşme Metropolitan Alan ve Yönetimi.* Ankara: A.İ.T.İ.A. Yay:1982.

Jetlife, Atlasjet Magazine, September 2009.

Jill, Grant, "Planning Responses to Gated Communities in Canada", Paper Presented at the Conference: "Gated Communities: Building Social Division or Safer Communities?", Glasgow (2003, 18-19 September).

Kaya Arıkoglu, "Kapalı Banliyöler ve Suça Bakış", *Arredamento Mimarlık,* (7-8) (2003): 48-55.

Keyder, Çağlar. "Globalisation and Social Exclusion in Istanbul", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research,* (29) (1) (2005, March): 124-134.

Keyder, Çağlar, "Enformel Konut Piyasasından Küresel Konut Piyasasına" In *Istanbul, Küresel ile Yerel Arasında,* translated by S. Savran. Istanbul: Metis, 2000.

Keyder, Çağlar and Ayşe Öncü, "Globalization of a Third-World Metropolis: Istanbul in the 1980's", *Review: A Journal of the Fernand Braudel Center,* (17.3) (1994): 383-421.

Keyder, Çağlar and Ayşe Öncü, "Istanbul Yol Ayrımında", *ISTANBUL*, no.7 (1993, October), pp.28-35.

Kıray, Mübeccel. "Squatter Housing: Fast Depeasantization and Slow Workerization in Underdeveloped Countries", Paper Presented at Research Committe on Urban Sociology of the 7th World Congress of Sociology, Varna (1970, 14-19 September).

Kurtarır, Erhan, Seçilmişler Töre and O.M.Doruk, "Spatial and Cultural Impact Assesment of Symbol Replacement in Istanbul", Paper Presented at 42nd ISOCARP Congress, Istanbul (2006).

Kurtuluş, Hatice, ed. *Istanbul'da Kentsel Ayrışma*. Istanbul: Bağlam, 2005.

Le Goix, Renaud. "Gated Communities: Sprawl and Social Segregation in Southern California" In *Gated Communities*, edited by R. Atkinson, and S. Blandy. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Lefebvre, Henri, *The Production of Space,* ed. Donald Nicholson-Smith. Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.

Lefebvre, Henri, *The Survival of Capitalism,* trans. Frank Bryant. London: Allison & Busby, 1976.

Leonie, Sandercock, *Cosmopolis 2: Mongreal Cities in the 21st Century.* London:Continuum, 2003

Louis, Wirth. "Urbanism as a Way of Life" In *Classic Essays on the Culture of Cities,* ed R. Sennet. New York: Meredith Corporation,1969.

McKenzie, Evan. "Private Gated Communities in the American Urban Fabric: Emerging Trends in their Production, Practises and Regulation", Paper Presented at the Conference: "Gated Communities: Building Social Division or Safer Communities?", Glasgow (2003, 18-19 September).

McKenzie, Evan, "The Dynamics of Privatopia" In *Private Cities*, ed G. Glasze, C.Webster and K.Franz. New York:Routledge, 2006.

MIMDAP (5 December 2005).*Rant Odaklı Bir Kentsel Donusum Projesi: Gaziosmanpaşa*. Retrieved 15 October 2009, from http://www.mimdap.org/w/?p=469

Newman, Oscar. *Community of Interest*, New York: Anchor Press / Doubleday, 1980.

NTVMSNBC (2008, April 14). *Gaziosmanpaşa'da "Kentlilestirme" Projesi.* Retrieved 20 August 2009, from http://arsiv.ntvmsnbc.com/news/442611.asp.

Oscar, Newman, *Defensible Space*. NewYork: The Macmillan Co, 1972.

Öncü, Ayşe, "The Myth of the Ideal Home Travels Across Cultural Borders to Istanbul", In *Space, Culture and Power: New Identities in Globalizing Cities* ed Ayşe Öncü and P. Weyland. London: Zed Books, 1997.

Öncü, Ayşe. "İdealinizdeki Ev Mitolojisi Kültürel Sınırları Aşarak Istanbul'a Ulaştı", trans. Hayrullah Dogan. *Birikim*, (123) (1999, July): 26-34.

Özer, Ahmet. *Kentleşme ve Yerel Yönetimler.* Ankara:Ürün, 2000.

Özyurt, Cevat. "Yirminci Yüzyil Sosyolojisinde Kentsel Yaşam", *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi,* 10 (18) (2007, December): 111-126.

Pamuk, Orhan, "Bir Istanbul Romancısıyım", *ISTANBUL*, (29) (1999, April): 59-107.

Park, Robert. "The City: Some Suggestions for the Study of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment" In *Classic Essays on the Culture of Cities,* ed R. Sennet. New York: Meredith Corporation, 1969.

Parker, Simon. *Urban Theoıry and the Urban Experience, Encountering the City.* New York: Routledge, 2004.

Quintal, Dana and Susan Thompson (2007). *Gated Communities: The Search for Security*. Retrieved 15 December 2009, from

http://www.fbe.unsw.edu.au/cf/publications/presentations/attachments/SOA
C07Quintal%26Thompson.pdf

Sastrosasmito, Sudaryano.(2008, 11-13 November). *Rethinking Theory, Space, and Production: Henry Lefebvre today.* Retrieved 5 May 2009, from http://www.henrilefebvre.org/hlt/fls/Lefebvre_program2008.pdf

Sennet, Richard, ed. *Classical Essays on the Culture of Cities.* New York: Meredith Corporation, 1969.

Sennet, Richard. *The Uses of Disorder, Personal Identity and City Life.* Newyork: Knopf, 1970.

Sennet, Richard. *The Fall of Public Man: On the Social Psychology of Capitalism.* New York: Vintage Books, 1978.

Sennet, Richard.interview by Yuri Kazepov, tape recording, New York, USA, 24 October 2002. In Kazepov, Yuri, ed. *Cities of Europe. Changing Contexts, Local Arrangements and the Challenge to Urban Cohesion.* Oxford: Blackwell, 2004.

Setha, Low,*Behind the Gates: Life, Security and the Pursuit of Happiness in Fortress America.* New York: Routledge, 2004.

Sırma, R. Turgut, *Istanbul'un Yönetimi, Bir Kent Planlama Yönetimi Denemesi.* Istanbul: Anahtar Kitaplar, 2004.

Silke B. Lank (2004). *The Impacts of Video Systems on Architecture* (Ph.d diss., Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich, 2004). Retrieved 10 December 2009, from http://graphics.ethz.ch/Downloads/Publications/Dissertations/Lan04.pdf

Simmel, George. "The Metropolis and Mental Life" In *Classic Essays on the Culture of Cities,* ed R. Sennet. New York: Meredith Corporation,1969.

Simons, Ben (2006). *The Grass is Always Greener in Gated Communities: The Social Segregation and Construction of Difference in the Urbanizaciones Cerradas of the Buenos Aires Metropolitan Area.* Retrieved 20 November 2009, from http://digitalcollections.sit.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1373&context=is p_collection

Skylife, Turkish Airlines Magazine, September 2007.

Sonia, Roitman, "Who Segrates Whom", Paper Presented at the Conference: "Gated Communities: Building Social Division or Safer Communities?", Glasgow (2003, 18-19 September).

Stern, Robert, A. M. ed., *The Anglo-American Suburb*. New York: Academy Editions, 1981.

Şenyapılı, Tansı."Economic Change and the Gecekondu Family", In *Sex, Roles, Family and Community in Turkey*, ed Ç. Kağıtçıbaşı. Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies 3, 1982.

Tekeli, İlhan. "Geleceğin Istanbul'u", *ISTANBUL,* (8) (1994, January): 114-116.

Tekeli, İlhan, *Kent Planlaması Konuşmaları.* Ankara: TMMOB Mimarlar Odası, 1991.

Tonnies, Ferdinand. *Community and Society (Gemeinshaft und Gesellshaft)*, trans. and ed. Charles P. Loomis. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1957.

Tüzin, B. Levent and Gülümser Aliye A. "Production and Marketing of Gated Communities in Istanbul", Paper Presented in 44th European Congress of the European Regional Science Administration, Regional and Fiscal Federation, Porto, Portugal (2004, 25-29 August).

Tuik, *HaberBülteni*, (15) (2010, January 25).

Tuik, *HaberBülteni*, (221) (2009, December 17).

Yased (2009). *Investment Environment in Turkey.* Retrieved 10 September 2009, from http://www.yased.org.tr/webportal/Turkish/Yayinlar/Documents/YASED%2 0Investment%20Environment%202009.pdf

Yılmaz, Nail (n.d.). *Farklılaştıran ve Ayrıştıran Bir Mekanizma Olarak Kentleşme.* Retrieved 20 October 2009, from http://iibf.kocaeli.edu.tr/ceko/ssk/kitap48/08.pdf