

İ.Ü. Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi
No:44. (Mart 2011). ss.49-65.

GATED COMMUNITIES AS A REPRESENTATION OF NEW UPPER AND MIDDLE CLASSES IN ISTANBUL

Hatice KURTULUŞ*

Abstract

The changing fringes of Istanbul metropolitan area with the new transportation routes at the beginning of the 2000's has coincided with the rapid construction of gated communities, which were racing with the speed of the 1960's *gecekondu*'s (squatter housing). The number of these new settlements and their population, which have different sizes and characteristics, has reached to a significant level. This new way of housing which is quite different than mass housing projects of the 1970's in terms of number, mode of land usage, land development, and financing changed the habits of traditional neighbourhood in Istanbul. The main objective of this paper is to explore relation between new housing trends, changing class representations and spatial segregation in Istanbul.

Keywords: Istanbul, Gated Communities, Gated Enclaves, Housing, Urban segregation, New Upper Classes.

Yeni Üst ve Orta Sınıfların Temsili Olarak Kapalı Siteler

Özet

İstanbul'un metropoliten çevresinin yeni ulaşım bağlantıları ile değişmeye başlamasıyla, 2000'li yıllarda bu alanlarda 1960'ların gecekondu mahallelerinin oluşum hızıyla yarışır biçimde Kapalı/Korunaklı Yerleşmeler olarak tanımlanan yeni bir yapılaşmaya tanık olunmaktadır. Nüfus, büyüklük ve nitelik açısından farklılaşan bu yeni yerleşmeler günümüzde hatırı sayılır sayı ve büyüklüğe ulaşmıştır. Bu yeni konut sunum biçimi sayıları, arazi kullanım biçimleri, arazinin imara açılma biçimleri ve finansman yolları ile 1970'lerin toplu konut projelerinden çok farklı ve kentin geleneksel mahalle anlayışını değiştiren niteliktedir. Bu makalenin amacı, bu yeni konut sunum biçimleri ile kentin değişen üst sınıf temsilleri arasındaki ilişkiyi ve sınıfların mekanda ayrışma süreçlerini araştırmaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İstanbul, Kapalı Cemaatler, Kapalı Adacıklar, Konut Sunumu, Kentsel Ayrışma, Yeni Üst Sınıflar.

* Doç.Dr. İstanbul Üniversitesi, Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Öğretim Üyesi,
hat_kurtulus@yahoo.com

Introduction

Urban literature has a number of important developments to address, as political debate and government policy focused on social and urban transformation enters a new phase. Social scientists have been attracted to the wider public, political and spatial nature of this new socio-spatial moment since the end of the 1970's (Sassen, 1991). While social and physical fabrics of cities are changing rapidly in the global scale, Istanbul metropolitan area has started to re-formed and enlarged depends on this radical moment. Dynamic spatial structure is affected by the role of Istanbul in the integration of Turkey into the neo-liberal global policies. Urban space has become subject to the big capital investments with increasing housing demand of new middle and upper classes of the city. Hence Istanbul became a metropolitan area where gated communities have emerged extensively whilst there were only a few at the end of the 1980's. Spatial transformation has occurred not only in the metropolitan fringes but also in the central neighbourhoods in the city. Gated life styles have become widespread as a snowball effect among the new upper and middle classes of the city (Öncü, 1997; Bali, 1999, 2002; Bartu, 2000, 2008; Daniş, 2000; Kurtuluş, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2009; Perouse, 2005; Geniş, 2007).

The changing fringes of Istanbul metropolitan area with the new transportation routes at the beginning of the 2000's has coincided with the rapid construction of gated communities, which were racing with the speed of the 1960's *gecekondu*'s (squatter housing). The number of these new settlements and their population, which have different sizes and characteristics, has reached to a significant level. This new way of housing which is quite different than mass housing projects of the 1970's in terms of number, mode of land usage, land development, and financing changed the habits of traditional neighbourhood in Istanbul. As well as these housing projects that re-formed the fringes and geographically prestigious areas of the city (such as Bosphorus hills, woods, northern forests and lake districts), the metropolitan area with its old *gecekondu* districts, new shopping malls, and empty lands has taken a kind of patchy appearance (Kurtuluş 2002). With this new form of the city, the phenomena of modern city and being a town-dweller that have never been realised completely before have evolved to a different level. The main objective of this paper is to explore relation between new housing trends, changing class representations and spatial segregation in Istanbul.

The Phenomena of Gated Community and Socio-Spatial Transformation of Istanbul During Neo-Liberal Era

A brief review of writing on contemporary urban studies suggest that, in spite of differences in the national economical development levels, a new phenomenon of housing, gated community has been started to observe from the 1980's onwards in the many metropolitan areas of the World. These housing areas which were isolated from outside world with high walls and iron fences attracted the attention of journalists at first and several news appeared in the newspapers about them, and when it reached a significant level in the 1990's it drew the attentions of urban scholars. This new phenomenon create a new debate in urban sociology, planning,

political sciences and geography at first by Davis's "City of Quartz" published in 1990, McKenzie's "Privatopia" published 1994, and Blakely and Snyder's "Fortress America" published 1997 and it is attempted to be analysed from different angles that springs from these disciplines (Al-Hamarneh, 1999; Atkinson and Flint, 2003; Blakeley and Synder, 1997; Caldeira, 1999; Fainstein and et al.; Fishman, 1987; 1992; Garreau, 1991; Glazse and Mayer,2000; Guterson, 1993; Kruger and Landman, 2003; Lang and Danielson, 1997; Low, 2004; McKenzie, 1994; Salcedo and Torres,2004; Sabatini and Salcedo, 2007).

Mostly three dimensions of this new housing called as gated communities, wealth enclaves, gated enclaves or walled cities has been examined. Firstly economical, social and global contingent factors that have led to new housing trends; secondly transformations in modern city and contemporary metropolitan areas and its possible results on modern society; and ultimately erosion of urban cohesion through the spatial segregation and the question of disintegrating public space under the threat of privatized urban lands. These dimensions that necessitates for approaching the emergence of the phenomenon and its effects within the framework of political economy, planning and social sciences has been attempted to be analysed by the theoretical and empirical basis.

Gated communities at first rapidly increased in California, from the 1980's onwards and it emerged in the following years in the rest of the US and in the countries of Europe, Latin America, Asia, Middle East and Africa that have different levels of economical development. Here, determining criteria is the degrees of metropolitan cities into the global market rather than general development levels of nation. Therefore gated communities have emerged not only in the metropolitan areas of existing capitalist countries but also in the certain cities of post- socialist countries that have become recently acquainted with the capitalist urbanization processes. (Al-Hamarneh, 1999).

Gated communities have been increasing rapidly in Istanbul similar to counterparts in the world, but the real boom in the end of the 1990's and 2000's. Istanbul has been witnessed a new dimension in terms of both metropolitan development dynamics and spatial segregation since 1980s. Within the framework of urban development sector, public resources and national-international capital flowing to Istanbul metropolitan area have initiated a radical transformation in urban spaces. In conjunction with the neo-liberal re-structuring process, urban space in Istanbul has been playing a dominant role in capital accumulation. Istanbul has been opened to global flows by removing the protectionist measures of import substitution period, while attractive to the national capital that became aware of the size of the urban rent. Local and central political authorities have been transferring large shares to the urban development sector in the form of financial credits, development plans and legal regulations that provided great opportunities for the real estate capital. At the beginning, foreign capital hesitated to invest in Istanbul metropolitan area because of complex property rights on lands and opportunity -led planning processes while investing in big urban projects in the cities of post- socialist countries. Newly emerged domestic real estate capital succeeded in determining the direction of the

process through the political patronage and land mafia. But the multinational real estate investment companies have come to the picture to get opportunity of profitable real estate market in Istanbul during 2000's. According to GYODER (Real Estate Investment Company Association in Turkey) real estate investments share a meaningful part of total direct foreign investment to Turkey (2010).

According to the new legal regulations the administration of metropolitan cities are becoming decentralized and transformation of construction permission's authorisation to the local municipalities is not only leading to create the lands without construction permission to development, it is also speeding up construction activities in wooded and water protection areas and on shores. Moreover the legal changes that contain construction permissions in historical urban spaces and in private wooded lands are being carried out by the Ministry of Construction and Development and the Ministry of Forest (Kurtuluş, 2005).

Gated communities have started to emerge initially in Istanbul and Ankara. The urban elites of the two metropolitan cities have different class characteristics and symbolical capital patterns. Also different physical, natural and cultural factors play role in the location of land for the gated communities in these two cities. Even though gated community areas in Istanbul and Ankara differs in some aspects, living in a gated enclave, represents a new lifestyle that cover urban elitism. Major similarity between the field studies on gated enclaves in Ankara (Ayata, 2002; Şenyapılı, 2003) and Istanbul (Bartu, 2000; Daniş, 2000, Kurtuluş, 2002) shows major similarities in this respect. But major differences are found in peculiarities of location and cultural capital of the project developers. The life in gated enclaves has started in Ankara and Istanbul towards the end of the 1980's and it sprawled to the surrounding lands in short time. In the last decade, more than 1000 mass housing projects of in different scales and costs completed or under construction in Istanbul (Kurtuluş, 2003; Perouse and Danis, 2005; Emlak Kulisi, 2010). This tendency has spread out to the developing medium scale cities and summer housing in tourism regions (Seymen and Koç 1996). Especially, the fringes of the popular cities and villages of Mediterranean and Aegean coast that don't have construction permissions, opened up to construction for gated summer enclaves by opportunity led planning.

The phenomenon of gated communities that indicates a new stage in the urbanization experience in Turkey has become the most popular and attractive housing form for the new urban middle and upper-middle classes. As a copy-cut action, lower cost middle class mass housing projects are including the cost of high walls and iron bars, landscape planning and security expenditures in their cost accounts as well. Similar to its counterparts in the world the middle and upper-middle classes of the Turkish cities want to distance themselves from the urban poor and its reflections on the urban public spaces. This distinction legitimized by the discourse of "security". Nevertheless, Turkey has salient differences in terms of urban violence and tension compare to the other Western and Eastern countries. For example, the assumption of urban violence originated from the black ghettos and directed to the white middle and upper classes can be argued as a legitimate ground for the security discourse in the American cities; wealthy white minority and poor

black majority in South African Cities; various ethnic tensions in Asian cities and *favelas* that are turned into crime areas in Latin America's cities can provide a legitimate base for the security discourse in these countries as well. But it can be clearly seen that ethnic, racial or class struggle based violence and tensions are much lower in Turkish cities compare to other world cities. The most salient aspects of Turkish experience are new housing demands of urban elite with their global culture of consumerism, and supplying capacity of real estate capital that aware of the accumulation opportunities in the urban space.

Gated communities have determined the new form of the Istanbul metropolitan area and social-spatial segregation patterns of the city since 1990's. Not only in the super-luxury gated communities but also in new suburbia are that built for the new middle classes, the phenomenon of being gated has become salient to the certain extent in urbanization process of Istanbul (Kurtuluş, 2005). During the same period the new rich of the city who were able to integrate into the global markets through their economic capital, but at the same time in the need of transforming their cultural capital, while the traditional upper classes who have already integrated into the global market through their economic and cultural capital, were demanding new housing. Gated communities that are the new symbol of global consumerist culture are ideal form of lifestyle for the newly rising classes to show off their economic and cultural capital. Owning a house in a natural environment with a perfectly designed living spaces of new life style and distance from the urban poor are important parts of being a new elite for the old and new riches of the city (Bali 1999, Bartu, 2000, Kurtuluş, 2003). In another words urban elites who could increase their economic capital due to new economic policies were trying to complete also their cultural capital with the global consumerist symbols. With the new opportunities provided by the new neo liberal economic policies and legal regulations, and the demands of new urban elite coming together directed the big capital groups in the construction sector and the new groups entering the sector towards building gated communities. The new gated settlements as well as satisfying demands of new rich, but also can play determinant role on this demand. These new estates that are designed according to the class position of new urban elites not only represent a dwelling, it also presents completely designed new life styles with prestigious environment.

Istanbul has witnessed three types of gated communities in scale and status in the last two decade. First type is the gated suburbia of new wealthy middle class that came to the picture in the second half of the 1980s on historical farm land in metropolitan fringe (Kurtuluş 2005a). As a result of the neo-liberal economic policies income of the waged workers has decreased rapidly and sub/sub-middle classes were the most affected from this decrease. However, wages of a different group of the middle classes has increased during the same period. This is the group of young professionals who had an important role in the changing economic structure of Istanbul within global flows. The numbers has increased in relation to the pace of transference of capital from productive sector to finance, services and real estate. Aged between 30-50 well-educated professionals, employed by international commerce, banking, brokerage firms, financial and investment

consultation companies, advertisement and public relationship and multi-national and trans-national companies. They are also the pioneers of global consumption culture (Öncü and Weyland, 1997). This new wage class emerged as a new middle class is different from the traditional middle classes which consist of public/private sector workers. Successful public school teachers left for jobs offered by the private sector because of the commercialisation of the education system; doctors, some with academic titles, moved to private hospitals; successful public lawyers moved to the private offices and military pilots left for international airline companies who paid high wages; young and successful personnel and managers who worked for specialised public banks, left for to transferred to private banks and financial institutions. Two other groups that could meaningfully included within this new middle class. One is the medium size producers of textile, leather, shoes, plastic construction materials and distributors who produce by mostly subcontracting for national and international market, and the other is the owners of medium size companies of architecture, interior design, decoration, advertisement, restaurants, cafes and clubs.

In contradicting to the traditional middle class, the social status of this new middle class has increased. This is related to both the high-income level and the change in the consumption pattern. The easiness of access to financial credit (credit cards and bank loans) assisted this new class in accepting to global consumption culture and thus helped increase their social status. The condensed neighbourhoods where the traditional middle classes lived side by side with the lower classes do not represent this new middle class identity. The criteria for choosing a residential location for this class have changed rapidly. New middle class have a need to separate themselves not only from traditional middle class but also from the urban poor. Distant from the crowded, polluted and violent city life crystallize the emergence of the new middle class identity. Gated enclaves have provided a prestigious housing environment for new middle class since the 1980s.

Gated suburbs have been designed with the landscape arrangement that has modern block of flats with different sizes of apartments and villa dwellings that forms low and high density plots. Empirical researches implemented in this subject indicate that the people live in this kind of community has developed common identity pattern and community ties amongst them (Danış, 2000; Kurtuluş, 2003). Although population is over 10 000 and entrances controlled by the private security personnel, gated suburbs can not be strictly isolated from outside world and with the public services such as schools, hospitals, pharmacies and the social functions such as shopping centres, recreation areas, it has certain level of flexibility for the people entering from outside.

The second type of gated communities satisfies the demands of secure investment needs of new rich of the city who have rapidly increased their wealth and who are in the need of transforming their cultural capital through the conspicuous consumption. The new rich are the upper-middle classes of the city have re-formed since 1990s. The former upper/middle classes (merchants and tradesmen, high income private doctors, lawyers, architects, the owners of medium scale industries, high level

managers of big industry and service sectors, whose income and resources were relatively visible, has been replaced by a very obscure new upper middle class called *businessman*. These new *businessmen*, on one hand, are mainly the bosses or top managers of show-business, advertisement, public relation, finance, brokerage and marketing companies; on the other hand privately working doctors with academic titles serving for this class; lawyers specialised on legal matters by this class; the owners of international companies; and mafia leaders. Another groups of this upper-middle class are high-level managers of media and TV stars, film directors and actors/actresses of new TV soap operas and cinema, showmen/women, pop singers, models and footballers whose income are speculative and astronomic.

The distinctive characteristic of this new upper-middle class is its attempt to present itself with the way of consumption. The pattern of consumption and its density are the most important elements in determining the social status of this class. In other words the determining factor for their social status is how they consume, rather than how they earn their income. The maintenance of their level of income and wealth is closely related to this group's ability to establish clientalistic relationships with the political elite, therefore any change in these networks and balances of power carry great risks for this group. For this reason, real estate is the most secure investment for the new upper/middle classes. The main criteria for the investment in property are the popularity and advantages housing areas that are gated communities. This type of gated enclaves are mainly located in the Bosphorus Hills, Etiler, Levent, Black Sea Coast, historical forests and woods of Istanbul. Most of these enclaves are built on land with partial development plan in formerly urban protection areas. The most parts of these lands are collected by the land mafia and opened to development either by mafia or the networks of clientalistic relationships of the construction companies.

Since consumption of fashionable and label goods are the symbols of this new upper/middle class identity; these people are in constant move in between the popular residential areas. The security and the type of neighbours are the most important criteria for selecting a house a certain gated community protected by private security systems and forbidden entry to the outsiders. This class is culturally, ethnically, and politically heterogenic in itself, but distinguishes itself from other classes by a clear consumption culture, which both explain and enact these differences (Kurtuluş, 2005). These kind of gated communities are smaller compare to the suburban types and different characteristics. They use the public and private services like schools, hospitals and shopping from outside world and they meet their labour needs for cleaning, maintenance of landscape and security services from the poor neighbours nearby, rather than from the specialized private companies (Kurtuluş, 2005). Majority of gated enclaves are in this type and contains luxury flats and single villas.

The third kind of gated communities that have emerged in Istanbul are radically secluded from outside realm and they create strong spatial identity for the dwellers. This type of gated enclaves is limited in numbers compare to the others, and they contain the most expensive houses in the real estate market of Istanbul. They

provide prestigious social status rather than investment for their residents. These privilege gated enclaves in Istanbul have meaningful similarities with the other examples in the world: To have a geography with a view, such as sea, lake, forest or nature; to have an ownership or type of land structure which belong to an old-aristocratic class; to distance itself from the lower and middle class' crowdedness; to have a living environment, secured by an private security unit, walls, barricaded doors, electronic surveillances and outside the reach of strangers, especially urban violence; to have a reliable construction plan and an architectural plan which uses high quality and esthetical construction materials; to have a landscape designed and managed by professionals; shopping centres, playgrounds, luxury social associations; and even to have plans to establish private primary and secondary schools and to have a selling strategy which excludes the others. This type of gated enclaves has emerged since 1990s related to the new privilege upper class (Bali, 1999). The identity of this class covers the rich who are defined as A type consumers by the big advertisement and public relations companies after 1980 (Kurtuluş, 2005). They are the owners of production, finance, services, and media companies, their high-level income managers and political elite. The rich of this class are regarded in terms of their income and property ownership, but another differentiation reflects itself on the space. The enclaves of pure-Istanbul bourgeoisie and Anatolian-Istanbul bourgeoisie are segregated. One side of the upper class of Istanbul represents itself with Western cultural symbols, while the other side originated from Anatolia symbolizes itself with signs of Ottoman culture. For example *Kemer Country*, designed as gated community for pure- Istanbul bourgeoisie in Kemerburgaz village of the North forests of European side of Istanbul. A famous American architecture company in a neo-traditionalist style designed it, and all the settlement signs and names are in English (Bartu, 2000). On the Anatolian side of Istanbul, another enclave, named *Beykoz Konaklari*, was designed for Anatolian-Istanbul Bourgeoisie. It was built in a wood that belonged to the Ottoman elite, *Saip Molla Pasha* in the one of the Bosphorus villages of Istanbul. This enclave contains mansions, built in an Ottoman architectural style and names and signs are in Ottoman (Kurtuluş, 2005).

Living in a privilege- gated enclave means that assuming to the most prestigious class identity in Istanbul. While these enclaves are designed and constructed by large investment, construction companies present to this class a privilege life style as well which has not been seen before. This given life style is previously designed, planned and constructed due to the demands and needs of this class. This is a presentation of a complete life style rather than a house or a residential environment. To buy a house in this kind of gated enclave is not only related to the income. This presentation is very strict. It does not include any flexibility, since any flexibility embraces the possibility of others, rather than the guaranteed customer group, entering into the settlement, which would destroy the totality of the space, thus have a preventing effect on the guaranteed costumers. The only flexibility for the customer in these enclaves is the interior designs. This strict presentation type is part of the differentiation in class segregation in urban spaces in Istanbul.

These settlements contain limited number of high cost flats, villas and mansions on big lands and gardens compare to the other two types. They are radically closed to the outside with high walls and strict security controls at the closed iron gates. They acquire the services from the prestigious private schools and hospitals of Istanbul or they open branches of these in their enclave rather than acquiring them from the schools and health services nearby. They meet their labour needs for cleaning, maintenance of landscape and security services from the specialized companies as well as from the poor districts nearby.

Location of Gated Communities and Land Developers

Similar to counterparts in the world, gated communities in Istanbul located in geographically or historically prestigious lands. This privileged location is important for the target group of this global trend of housing. This location has a kind of class representation feature. Geography with a view such as sea (Bosporus), lake, forest or nature and property rights or land use pattern that belong to a former aristocratic class of the city take precedence. It looks important that the location of land to separate itself from the lower and middle classes of the city with natural and physical barriers. Besides it is necessary for the land to be appropriate size and their ownership right to be easily transferable (property rights not be shared by many of the heirs)

The process of the land development for gated communities has several operations in the General Law of the Forest Protection which include construction prevention in public or private forests and woods and also in the master and partial urban development plans led to construction on peripheral private farms. Former owners of these private lands such as forest, historical wood and farms have private property rights generally with construction prohibitions. Public Forest Protection Law covered the private woods located Bosporus Hills in 1948. The owners of these lands sued the Forest Administration for subdivision and construction permission for their lands in many times before 1980s. But the courts rejected all these cases. Land developers (or land speculators) have started to buy these lands since the middle of the 1980s when the former owners had given up their hope for construction permission. After that the strict statues of the private forests and woods were changed by the operation within General Law of Forest in 1986 (Kurtuluş 2005). The operation created an opportunity to construction in private forests and woods within certain conditions such nearby to urban fabric. The new law code gives a right for six percent of construction in private forests and woods that gated communities have built by this way.

On the other hand, historical private farms –called *çiftlik*- played an important role in order to new middle class to move to metropolitan fringe away from the metropolitan centres (Kurtuluş 2005a). There were widespread privately-owned farms which responded to requirements of the new demand emerged as a result of the changing urbanization patterns in the metropolitan area (Kurtuluş, 1999). These private farms (such as *Ferhatpaşa çiftliği*, *Cicoz çiftliği*, *Tatarcık çiftliği*, *Dereköy çiftliği*, *Ispartakule çiftliği*, *Ada çiftliği*) possessed large and relatively undivided

property rights provided the land for gated mass housing projects. It has been seen that a large number of private farms were transformed into urban land as they provided the legal land necessary for mass housing projects (Kurtuluş, 1999). This historical landownership patterns were accorded with the newly emerging land demands. Therefore, it is quite possible to claim that private farms have constituted an important example for the contingencies observed in the formation of new suburbia of Istanbul since the middle of the 1980s. Not only the land size, but also the property status is taken into consideration in location for the suburban-gated communities. The land demand of big construction companies that do not have a power such as expropriation is determined by the ownership status that preferred to be less divided. They attracted to less divide large lands of nineteenth century private farms (Kurtuluş, 1999). Real estate investors who had bought the private farms when it didn't have construction permission were in a very advantageous position to develop the lands for their suburban projects. As it can be seen in both examples, historical property patterns of Istanbul created large land advantages and opportunities for the different projects of gated community.

Ownerships and land- use patterns in gated communities

Gated communities are built in Istanbul on lands opened to development by the collaboration bases on common interests of real estate investment capital and the local and central political authorities. These lands are bought in advance by land developers and by real estate brokers and people who buy the houses built on these lands get shares in the ownership. It is a kind of shared ownership and the whole has common land use except houses. Management plans are made in gated communities to arrange these common land use and the owners of the houses sign this management plan. Therefore individual rights in gated communities are restricted through leasehold covenants (a kind of partnership agreement). These restrictions brought up by parallel ownership (enlarging a house or a garden, enlarging a swimming pool, putting a private garden fencing) causes serious conflicts between the residents and the management that sometimes lead to court cases. For example, popular politicians, businessman, and media stars who have property in *Beykoz Konakları*, one of the most famous gated communities are warned by the management or taken in to the court in connection with these kind of activities such as enlarging a garden, building walls around a garden, building conservatory, garage, adding rooms, etc. (Kurtuluş, 2005).

Space as a Representation of Whiteness for the New Upper and Middle Classes of the City

In majority of gated communities the architectural style is new-traditional architecture that is a global trend in the luxury housing. Gated communities presented to its target group through attractive marketing campaigns at the project stage by famous advertising and marketing agencies. The target of these campaigns is the new upper classes of Istanbul. A new bourgeoisie has come to picture since the middle of the 1980's. Cultural differentiation observed clearly in the 19th century Istanbul, wasn't so visible from 1960's until 1980's on the space and in the

social life, the years when the city caught up with the dynamics of capital accumulation. The reason of this was bourgeoisie created by import substitution economic policies were the new bourgeoisie class of the nation state. In fact especially in the second half of the nineteenth century the elites of Istanbul divided into two groups. These were power elites of Ottoman Palace and newly establishing mercantile bourgeoisie. These elites were segregated on the space. Istanbul's bourgeois class that consist of European merchants settled in *Galata*, *Pera* and *Tarlabaşı* and other Muslims and non-Muslims left their traditional districts based on ethno-religious identity to live in rapidly increasing modern apartments blocks based on class identity. This was another aspect of spatial segregation (Ortaylı 1977; Tekeli 1994). On the other hand the family members of Empire, military and bureaucratic power elite of Palace's high bureaucracy as well as living in their traditional mansions of *Fatih*, *Üsküdar* and in the historical peninsula, they were living also in their summer houses (*yalı*) on the shores of Bosphorus and near the private forests and woods. This spatial fragmentation looked like based on religion at first sight, but in fact it emerged due to modern life styles and tastes of bourgeois class of Istanbul that emerged in connection with the city's new role in the world trade and traditional life styles, and tastes of power elites. The different cultural capitals of these two elite groups in the nineteenth century Istanbul could stay alongside each other without competing. In the context of changing conditions of post first world war era, these two elite groups disappeared in Istanbul at the same time. The segregated spaces left from the nineteenth century bourgeois, who lost their accumulation opportunities due to Istanbul's fading role in the world trade in connection with the emerging international division of labour; and from power elites of Ottoman Empire who lost their function, and the transference of capital city to Ankara, turned into twentieth century depressed areas of the city.

Intra-class cultural capital differences that has become clearly visible since the 1980's in Istanbul tried to be compensated by using nineteenth century elite symbols. Radically changing economic policies and dynamic role of Istanbul in the new capital accumulation processes have created a new cultural division in upper classes of Istanbul. The representations of old and new bourgeoisie have differentiated. The first one represents the traditional elites of Istanbul whose cultural capital have integrated into the modern bourgeois values, while the second one represents the new elites of the city from rural origins whose economic capital increased through the clientalistic relationships but their cultural capital can not compatible with the modern bourgeois values. Even though their economic capital close to each other, the differences in their cultural capital of these two groups of upper class give rise to a crisis in representation of class that reflects itself to different types of gated enclaves. The living styles and tastes of two different elite groups of the 19th century Istanbul, which didn't create representation crisis, would help to overcome the current representation crisis of the new elites in Istanbul. The European cultural values of merchants bourgeoisie in nineteenth century, have replaced by industrial bourgeoisie who has American cultural values in the twentieth century. The names of buildings, streets and public areas are English in *Kemer Courty* which is the leading most popular gated enclaves of this class Among the property owners of this gated enclave there are many prestigious private school

graduates such as Robert Collage and members of TUSIAD (Turkish Industrialists and Businessmen Association) and 33 % of the residents are textile industrialist, 17 % industrialists, 50 % doctors, lawyers and high level managers of multinational cooperation (Bali 1999).

The new bourgeoisie, which consists of the new rich who ascended through the fast economic capital but hasn't been able to integrate with the traditional bourgeoisie through their cultural capital, has been trying to overcome the question of representation with the help of nineteenth century Ottoman power elite's cultural symbols as a whitener of the class. Majority of investors of these gated communities designed for the new elites are the construction companies, which entered the development sector of the city in the 1980's and rapidly increased their capital. These investors have had clientelistic relationships with the power elites of the neo liberal period and they have different opportunities in the large lands to develop their mass housing projects. The target group of these investors are the classes who ascend quickly like them. These gated communities are designed for the new elites mentioned above and in their all advertising campaigns use the traditional Ottoman symbols that aim to eliminate the cultural representation problem of the new bourgeoisie. They are generally located in the Anatolian side of Bosphorus Hills and near the Black sea coast. The leading and the most popular example of this type of gated enclaves is *Beykoz Konakları*. The land of this project is the wooded area that belongs to one of the power elites of Ottoman Empire, *Saip Molla Pasha* and it contains a historical hunting chalet and a horse stable, which are renewed for the resident's collective use. For the names of the dwellings it is chosen to say *konak* (mansion) that is a traditional name of the Ottoman elite's houses and different types of houses distinguished by the names of the tunes of the Ottoman Classical Music (such as *segah konak*, *nihavent konak*). All these are aimed at the targeted group that has been mentioned above. The owners of the mansions in this enclave are not consist of a homogeneous group of elites with respect to their professions, income sources, and education, but they have certain level of homogeneity with respect to their economic and cultural capitals. Hence it is difficult to say clearly for *Beykoz Konakları* that it has characteristics of homogenous community like *Kemer Country*. As for the professions of the property owners and tenants, on the contrary to *Kemer Country*, there is no significant concentration on certain types of professions and work categories. Only significant homogeneity is that the majority of the property owner's economic capitals have been accumulated rapidly after the 1980's. If it has to be talked about being a community, it can only be talked about an identity that originates from the mode of capital accumulation.

Gated Communities and New Urban Life Style for “White Turks”

According to Perouse who developed a 5 years' database for real estate market by August 2005, there are more than 650 gated communities in Istanbul metropolitan area (2005). This number was 150 in 2003 (Kurtuluş, 2005). According to the new data from Real Estate Associations in 2010 the projects have reached a thousand in Istanbul Metropolitan Area. The rapid increase indicates that the supply capacity exceeds the demand for housing in Istanbul. It is possible to say that especially in

the last five years there is a parallel increase between the rising interest of international real estate capital for Istanbul, and increased number of gated communities. The sector magazines indicate that house prices in gated communities range between 300 thousand -6 million US Dollars. But buying a house from a gated community means beyond buying physical living environment, it also represents buying a prestigious lifestyle. Therefore one of the main determinants of the price in the market is this lifestyle that is the symbol of being white. Buying a house in a gated community means that buying a ready designed life style that consists of created aesthetic feelings and routines. The presentation of dwellings there goes beyond the presentation of high quality, planned and aesthetically designed houses it also means representation of whiteness.

This life style presented with the built environment in an affluent enclave is presented as a new product produced for the market. This built environment and the life style is bought with an agreement that includes no flexibilities. The management plan signed by the residents is an agreement for acceptance the rules of built environment and the life style presented readily. The other participants of this built environment and the life style warn people who doesn't confirm with the agreement or they can use legal means when it is seen necessary. It can be clearly observed that the conflicts between the bought lifestyle and the former life style through the participated observations and interviews applied in different gated communities. According to Bourdieu, this is a tension between the economic capital and cultural capital (1982;1984). The conflict between 'habitus' and 'practice' emerges in its full form in here.

New Urban Segregation and Deciphering Modern Public Space

Aristoteles, points out in *Politics* that the city is a place where different kinds of people live, a place where same kind of people live can't be called as a city. The assumption lies under modernity is social classes stay together under a social contract in an integrated social system (Saunders, 1990). But at the end of the twentieth century, urban space has been divided to homogenous enclaves of urban social classes.

The social and spatial results of gated communities can be observed in two scales in Istanbul. In the metropolitan scale it is observed that after the self-help urbanization era metropolitan macro-form re-shaped as new dense settlements. In the 1960's and 1970's when *gecekonu* (squatter-housing) was the main factor in shaping the metropolitan fringe, the policy of decreasing the cost of labour through overlooking occupation of public lands played an important role. This invisible policy was an indirect transfer of resources from the public to the private sector. The metropolitan fringe was formed with the *gecekonu* neighbourhoods which are unplanned and built on the public lands without permission. The metropolitan fringes after the 1990's have been re-shaping with a new form of housing, gated communities. In this period, new urban policies that functions as a means of direct transference of metropolitan urban rents to the real estate capital has been implemented. These policies have brought a radical spatial segregation process alongside itself. Even

though the squatter housing and the gated communities create a picture of mounds situated side by side in the same geographical area that are segregated through strict geographical, physical and cultural barriers. The spatial segregation on the metropolitan space is crystallised by the *gecekondu* neighbourhoods who are not able to integrate into the city and by the gated communities who don't want to integrate into the city (Soytemel,2002). This new spatial segregation gives Istanbul metropolitan fringes a patchy look.

Gated communities go by dramatic socio-spatial segregation processes in the local scales. Privatizing of public lands by building walls and iron barriers exclude the local neighbours. Historical woods, forest or farm lands, where the local people could have picnic or wander around, gated to the public by gaining a private property status. It means that not being able to seeing the urban cultural values on these lands such as historical buildings, gardens and woods especially designed for nineteenth centuries Istanbul and some endemic plants and trees (Kurtuluş, 2005). The fragmented spatial pattern in the fringe indicates to an increasingly deepening social segregation in the metropolitan scale. This kind of gated community create a private world that shares little with its neighbours and with the larger political system and urban life (Bartu and Kolluoğlu, 2008, 2010; Kurtuluş 2009). This segregation brings along corrosion of the “modern society” as well, which is idealized by the terms of “civil society” and “public space”. When it is considered that capital accumulation that led to gated communities originated from the social surplus produced in Istanbul and rents extracted from the land through the development plans and legal regulations based on public sources, the erosion deepens further.

Poor urban settlements provide a cheap labour for rapid capital accumulation of existing and newly emerged upper classes in Istanbul. In the contrast, upper classes are avoiding any social and economic contribution to the city, except their enclaves and their daily life map. They also would like to avoid paying urban taxes by the reason of not using these urban-public services. Sennett explains this process as a dilemma that all the world cities are going through due to globalisation: People, whom get share from the global wealth, behave like tourists in their own cities and they shut themselves in wealthy enclaves. They don't even contribute to the city as much as an ordinary tourist (Sennett, 2003). In Istanbul case, it is clearly observed that the residents of the gated communities are not feeling any urban identity to the whole city in contrast to have strong living-place identity (Kurtuluş, 2005, 2005a; Bartu and Kolluoğlu, 2010).

Urban segregation has eroded the modern city in social and ideological levels. The main factor that transforms the modern city to an ideal form of modernity is “the myth of modern city”. It described the modern city as an integrated social-spatial space. In the modern city integration succeeded through sharing of economic and cultural capital, regulation of class inequalities through the planning so that it can be compensated to a certain extent; and creates of public space where the social classes contact each other. In spite of the rules of free market economy, modern cities were built under the active intervention of modern planning for the public interest. In this

way city instead of being a space for class conflicts became a place where classes settled suitably in the space and a place where classes can have contact in between. In the re- structuring process of capitalism planning has become a means of development planning that facilitates commoditization of urban lands and urban space instead of ideal of creating a modern city. Not only the urban lands but also historical, cultural and geographical capital of city has been transformed in favour of wealthy class through the planning in a way possibilities keeping the large proportion of the population excluded. The large lands of the nineteenth century historical farm lands on the fringes of Istanbul or woods, hills of Bosphorus and lake and forest districts that are the most distinguished historical and geographical parts of the city has been transferred to the use of new upper classes and closed to the public use and ice by the partial development plans. On the other hand they have been looking for new security systems and technologies against the violation escalated by social “exclusion” created by the gated paradises where are paradoxically created to escape from the urban violence. Permitting entrance of one privileged class to a public space and forbidding other classes to enter open the concept of “citizenship” to the discussion that is one of the pillar of modern society.

KAYNAKLAR

- Al-Hamarneh, A.(1999),The Development of Gated Communities in Russia and Ukraine. *Workshop: Gated Communities as a Global Phenomenon; Hamburg*. Unpublished conference paper.
- Atkinson and Flint (2003). Fortress UK? Gated communities, the spatial revolt of the elites and time-space trajectories of segregation. Gated Communities Conference, University of Glasgow, 19th. Sept.2003.Unpublished conference paper.
- Ayata,S. (2002), The New Middle Class and the Joys of Suburbia, *Fragments of Culture*, eds: Kandiyoti,D. Ve Saktanber, A.,Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, New Jersey.
- Bali, R. (1999), Çılgın Kalabalıktan Uzak , *Birikim*, Sayı.123, Temmuz, Sf. 35-46,
- Bali, R. (2002), *Tarz-ı Hayat'tan Life Style'a Yeni Seçkinler, Yeni Mekanlar, Yeni Yaşamlar*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Bartu, A. (2000), Kentsel Ayır(ş)ım: İstanbul'daki Yeni Yerleşimler ve Kemer Country Örneği, *21. Yüzyılda Kent ve İnsan* , Bağlam Yayınevi, İstanbul.
- Bartu, A. ve Kolluoğlu, B. (2008), Emerging spaces of neoliberalism: A gated town and a public housing project in Istanbul, *New Perspective on Turkey* no.39, 5-46.
- Bartu, A. ve Kolluoğlu, B. (2010), Güvenlikçiye Güvenmeyenler: Kapalı Siteler ve Sosyal Tabakalaşma, *2010 Avrupa Kültür Başkenti (AKB) Ajansı, Çarşamba Söyleşileri*, 3 Aralık 2010, www.mimdap.org, 20.12.2010.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984), *Distinction : A social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, Routledge, London.

- Blakeley, E.J.ve Synder, M.G. (1997), *Fortress America: Gated Communities in United States*, Brookings Institution Press, Washington D.C.
- Caldeira, T. (1999), Duvarlar İnşa Etmek, *Birikim*, Sayı.123, Temmuz, 87-96.
- Daniş, D. (2000), İstanbul'da Uydu Yerleşmelerin Yaygınlaşması: Bahçeşehir Örneği, *21. Yüzyılda Kent ve İnsan*, Bağlam Yayınevi, İstanbul.
- Davis, M. (1990), *City of Quartz : Excavating the Future in Los Angeles*, Verso, London ; Short, J.R., 1996, *The Urban Order*, Blackwell.
- Emlak Kulisi, www.emlakkulisi.com, 10.12.2010.
- Fainstein S., Gordon I., Harloe M. (1992) *Divided Cities: New York and London in the Contemporary World*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Fishman, R. (1987), *Bourgeois Utopias, The Rise and Fall of Suburbia*, Basic Boks, NewYork.
- Garreau, J.(1991), *Edge City: Life on the New Frontier*. New York. Doubleday.
- Geniş, Ş. (2007), Producing Elite Localities: The Rise of Gated Communities in Istanbul, *Urban Studies*, 44, 4, 771-798.
- Glazse, G. ve Mayer, G. (2000), Workshop: Gated Communities - Global Expansion of a New Kind of Settlements. *Davo –Nachrichten*, 11, 17-20.
- Guterson, D. (1993), Home, Safe Home. *Utne Reader*, March-April.
- GYODER (Real Estate Investment Company Association in Turkey), www.gyoder.org.tr, 20.12.2010.
- Kruger,T, and Landman, K.(2003), Living in an Enclaved Society: Practical Implications of Environmental Design. The Institute for Municipal Law Enforcement of Southern Afrika Conference, 30-31 October 2003.Unpublished conference paper.
- Kurtuluş, H. (1999), *The Roles of Çiftliks on the Formation of The Metropolitan Fringe in the Expansion of Istanbul Metropolitan Area*. Unpublished PhD Thesis METU, Ankara.
- Kurtuluş, H. (2002), İstanbul'da Ayrıcalıklı Konut Alanları ve Yoksulluğa Kentsel Kaynak Transferleri Çerçevesinden bir Bakış: Bahçeşehir, Kemer Country, Acarkent, BeykozKonakları, *Yoksulluk, Kent Yoksulluğu ve Planlama*, TMMOB-Şehir Plancıları Odası Yayını.
- Kurtuluş, H. (2003) Mekanda Billurlaşan Kentsel Kimlikler, *Doğu Batı*, 23, 75-96.
- Kurtuluş, H. (2005) İstanbul'da Kapalı Yerleşmeler Beykoz Konakları Örneği, ed: Kurtuluş H., *İstanbul'da Kentsel Ayrışma*, Bağlam Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Kurtuluş, H. (2005a), Bir Ütopya Olarak Bahçeşehir, ed: Kurtuluş H., *İstanbul'da Kentsel Ayrışma*, Bağlam Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Kurtuluş, H, (2009), Refahın Yeni Mekansal Temsili Olarak Kapalı Yerleşmeler, *Mostar*, 55, 34-42.
- Lang, R.E. and Danielson, K.A. (1997), Gated communities in America, walling out the world, *Housing Policy Debate*, vol.8, 4, 867-99

- Low, S. (2004), Imprisoned by the walls built to keep “the others” out. *Los Angeles Times*, 19,10,2003.
 - McKenzie E.(1994), *Privatopia: Homeowner Association and the rise of Residential Private Government*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
 - Ortaylı, İ. (1977), İstanbul’un Mekansal Evriminin Tarihine Bir Bakış, *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, Ankara, No. 2, 77-97.
 - Öncü, A. (1997), The Myth of the ‘İdeal Home’ Travels across Cultural Borders to İstanbul, *Space Culture and Power :New Identities and Globalizing Cities*, Eds: A.Öncü and P.Weyland, Zed Books, London-New Jersey.
 - Perouse, J.F. and Daniş, D. (2005), Zenginliğin Mekanda Yeni Yansımaları: İstanbul’da Güvenlikli Siteler, *Toplum ve Bilim*, 104, 92-123.
 - Sabatini F. and Salcedo R. (2007), Gated Communities and the Poor in Santiago, Chile: Functional and Symbolic Integration in a Context of Aggressive Capitalist Colonization of Lower-Class Areas, *Housing Policy Debate*, 18, 3, 577-606.
 - Salcedo, R. and Torres A. (2004), Gated Communities in Santiago: Wall or Frontier? *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 28, 1, 27-44.
 - Sassen, S. (1991) *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
 - Saunderr, P. (1990), *Social Class and Stratification*, Routledge, London.
 - Sennett, R. (2003), *Respect*, Penguin., London.
 - Seymen, Ü.B. ve Koç.H. (1996), *Türkiye’de Kıyı Yerleşmelerinde Tatil Konutları*, Başbakanlık Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığı, Konut Araştırmaları Dizisi, 17 Ankara.
 - Soytemel, E. (2002), Beykoz Bölge Parkı Planlama Çalışması, Unpublished Field Study Report.
 - Şenyapılı, T. (2003), Kaçış Adaları, *Arredamento Mimarlık*, 100, 57-61
 - Tekeli, İ. (1994), *The Development of Istanbul Metropolitan Area: Urban Administration and Planning*, IULA-EMME, İstanbul.
-