ŞENTEPE IN MEMORIES: A FIELD RESEARCH ON *GECEKONDU*, MEMORY AND NOSTALGIA

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

BY

GÖZDE ARIK

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

NOVEMBER 2019

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Yaşar Kondakçı
Director

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

_____

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Saktanber
Head of Department

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

_____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Besim Can Zırh
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assist. Prof. Dr. Göze Orhon (Hacettepe Uni., İLE)

Assist. Prof. Dr. Besim Can Zırh   (METU, SOC)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Şen   (METU, SOC)

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

Name, Last name : Gözde Arık

Signature   :

ABSTRACT

ŞENTEPE IN MEMORIES: A FIELD RESEARCH ON *GECEKONDU*,
MEMORY AND NOSTALGIA

Arık, Gözde

MS., The Department of Social Anthropology

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Besim Can Zırh

November 2019, 185 pages

Gecekondu is one of the most frequently researched and much-debated phenomenona by the academia in Turkey. Within the frame of latest urban policies, gecekondu houses have started to be demolished and new apartment blocks have been constructed instead. However, when evaluated integrally, it could be seen that gecekondu and memories regarding gecekondu continue to affect dwellers' life. Moreover, how the life in gecekondu is remembered constitutes legitimacy ground for urban transformation projects. In present-day conditions, it requires to be analyzed through the conceptual tool memory due to physical demolition of gecekondus. In this study, Şentepe, a previous gecekondu neighbourhood under transformation in Ankara is studied. Through twenty-nine semi-structured in depth interviews with the previous gecekondu, current apartment residents have been conducted in order to look at the changes in the life of the dwellers. Consequently, in the narratives of dwellers, nostalgic tone carrying positive attributions on the previous solidarity and collective practices in gecekondus has been found. Lastly, meaning of this nostalgic tone is discussed.

Keywords: Gecekondu, memory, nostalgia, Ankara, Şentepe

ÖZ

BELLEKLERDEKİ ŞENTEPE: GECEKONDU, BELLEK VE NOSTALJİ ÜZERİNE BİR ALAN ÇALIŞMASI

Arık, Gözde

Yüksek Lisans, Sosyal Antropoloji Bölümü

Tez Danışmanı: Doktor Öğretim Üyesi Besim Can Zırh

Kasım 2019, 185 sayfa

Gecekondu, Türkiye akademisi tarafından en sık araştırılan ve tartışılan olgulardan biridir. Güncel kent politikaları çerçevesinde yıkılmaya başlanan gecekonduların yerine yeni apartman blokları yapılmaya başlandı. Ancak, değişikliklere bütünsel olarak bakıldığında görülebilecektir ki, gecekondu ve gecekondu ile ilgili anılar, sakinlerin yaşamını etkilemeye devam etmektedir. Dahası, gecekondulardaki yaşamın nasıl hatırlandığı, kentsel dönüşüm projeleri için meşruiyet zeminini oluşturur. Günümüz koşullarında, gecekonduların fiziksel varlığı kaybolduğundan, söz konusu gerçeklik bellek kavramı ile analiz edilmeye ihtiyaç duymaktadır. Bu çalışmada, Ankara'da dönüşüm altında olan eski bir gecekondu mahallesi olan Şentepe mahallesi incelenmiştir. Mahallede günlük yaşamın nasıl değiştiğine bakabilmek için, burada dönüşümlerden önce gecekondularda oturmuş, sonrasında apartmanlara taşınmış yirmi dokuz kişi ile yarı yapılandırılmış derinlemesine mülakatlar yapılmıştır. Sonuç itibarıyla, sakinlerin anlatılarında, eski gecekondu mahallesindeki dayanışma ve kolektif pratiklere olumlu bir atıf taşıyan nostaljik bir ton bulunmuştur. Son olarak, söz konusu nostaljik tonun ve atıflarının kentsel mekândaki güncel gündelik yaşam için anlamı tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Gecekondu, Bellek, Nostalji, Ankara, Şentepe

To my lovely family, Hülya and Halil İbrahim Arık

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE OF FIGURES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

It was not pure chance that I chose Şentepe neighborhood as my research subject. I have been living in Yenimahalle over twenty years. Though it is physically quite close to the place I used to live for years, I had not been in Şentepe until 2016, even just to walk around. It was due to the bad reputation of Şentepe as "jackals' nest". Since my childhood, grandmother had advised to keep away from the "man of Şentepe". This phrase refers to the "bad guys" who would not hesitate to trick "innocent people" for their own benefit. In time, this narrative from my childhood transformed into labels like "illiterate", "ignorant", "backward" used for people residing in Şentepe.

Since I was frequently exposed to such narratives on Şentepe, I have never wondered about the history of place, which was quite interesting to discover, in fact. My incuriousness due to my previously unnoticed assumptions turned to an attention because of possible reasons why the people around me constructed such a narrative on a very near neighborhood after I learnt that Şentepe was a "rescued region" before 12 September 1980 military coup. I was surprised when I learnt about its recent history since I have not seen any marks in any level when I first have gone to the neighbourhood. Though the aim here is not to exaggerate my experience in there, this could be called a "journey" because self-reflexive criticisms to my taken for granted knowledge enabled to construct a path.

With questions in mind, in 2016, I "climbed" to Şentepe just to talk to a couple of people. I was wondering about the roots for such distance having emerged between two neighborhoods that are physically so close. I was in search for an answer which would go beyond blaming residents as being "bad guys".

1.1. Research Question

At the initial stage, for a university term project, I interviewed with four people, some of whom were residing in Yenimahalle and some in Şentepe. I asked them to explain the reasons for such labelling mentioned in the previous section. Having interested in the answers I got, I decided to broaden my investigation to form a research question on this rich field.

The research question of this study formed after a pilot study. Within the scope of the pilot study, different questions were prepared in different themes such as migration; *gecekondu*, apartments, ownership; living in Şentepe, life in neighbourhood, *Şentepelilik*, belonging to the place; time, memory, transfer of memory; urban transformation and the changes in the daily life. These were bunch of topics that would be relevant to spatio-social transformation of the place. This stage was designed to find a research question on Şentepe. Though I was not aware of any nostalgic pattern before, during these interviews, surprisingly, the most frequently discussed context was "the good old days" while talking about the life in *gecekondu*. These narratives were about how good was the *gecekondu* life since people were in solidarity and shouldered the difficulties together. Without exception, all the former residents I talked at this stage stated that the previous life in neighbourhood was better despite the financial difficulties and physical challenges of *gecekondu* houses like freezing water in winter, damaged houses due to moisture etcetera. Then I started wondering why they talk in such a nostalgic tone after they sold their lands to the contractor firms for the construction of apartment buildings because it seems to me as a paradox that selling their lands and yearning for the life before selling the lands at the same time. Wondering about the previous daily life in the *gecekondu* times, I prepared questions focusing on "the past" of Şentepe around the formulated research question deduced from the mentioned paradox: Why people yearning for the *gecekondu* life while they have sold their lands to construction firms which would obviously cause radical changes in this daily life?

The interviewees narrated "the past" in relation with "the present" of the neighbourhood. This tendency necessitates a concept explaining the relation of these two. Therefore, memory, as a dynamic and socially constructed concept to explain to people's relation with "the past", was used as an analytical tool to answer the research question. Moreover, the conceptual potentialities of the nostalgia in terms of pointing out the utopian aspects of the narratives are also discussed in order to connect "the future", with "the past" and "the present". Therefore, the nostalgia emerged from the narratives were discussed in a context of future expectations rather than pointing out "what is irrevocably lost". In this way, it is aimed to problematize imposed life form through urban transformation projects and provide an alternative look to the modern conceptualization of the time as the disconnected fragmented periods of "the past", "the present" and "the future", which serves for the creation of an infinite homogenous unchanging present.

It may seem that *gecekondu* was an outdated phenomenon to discuss today due to the lack of *gecekondu* houses at the present and extensive urban transformation projects to replace these houses. However, especially in recent years, the legitimacy of urban transformation projects which led production of apartments in the cities of Turkey, are being constructed on how the previous life in *gecekondu* is remembered and how these memories are controlled and being mediated by several social and political mechanisms in the society. Therefore, by questioning the approach stating that for a better housing conditions, *gecekondu* houses need to be transformed by the neo-liberal mechanisms of the market policies promoted by the government and municipalities through a developmentalist perspective; this study chases for alternative views of the dwellers, their yearnings, contradictions, concerns and belongings to the place. Precisely, that is not to say that memories of the residents are purely dissident by themselves and they are not being affected by the dominant ideas circulated in the society. Rather, the nostalgic look to the solidarity practices, as the emerged pattern in this research, indicates overlooked response of the residents to the changes in their living space. More than the nostalgic outlook itself, the meaning of this nostalgic pattern constitutes the core problematic of this

research. The problematic, in a nutshell, revolves around the question why former residents of *gecekondu* yearn for the practices of daily life in *gecekondu* in the neighbourhood despite the fact that they consented to sell their lands to the contractor firms during the transformation project.

1.2.Literature Review

There are seven dissertations on Şentepe. The first group of dissertations are in the area of health and education. In these studies, Şentepe as a field, has been discussed as a "semi-urban place" or "ghetto", i.e. places in the margins of the cities and having difficulties to integrate to the urban life. In the second group of dissertations, the issues like class stratifications in urban space, urban transformation and regarding socio-cultural changes are discussed and Şentepe as a place under transformation is selected as the field. Studies in the second group include more on the socio-political discussions of urban space and place. In the following paragraphs, the pieces from first and second groups are discussed in more detail.

The first dissertation of the first groups has been written in the area of the public health by Emine Aksoydan Mızıkacı (1993) with a specific focus on malnutrition of children in the low income neighbourhoods and Şentepe was selected as the field. In the introduction part of the dissertation, it has been stated that some health problems are related with living in "semi-urban districts" like *gecekondu* neighbourhoods by referring to a report published by World Health Organization in 1988 (Mızıkacı, 1993, p. 3). According to this discussion, poverty and "results related to poverty" such as "low education level, malnutrition, crowdedness, inappropriate and harmful environment, morbidity and mortality" has been detected in *gecekondu* neighbourhoods of Turkey as well (ibid). Şentepe, as a *gecekondu* neighbourhood, is defined as "semi-urban district" like an in-between place carrying a potential to have malnourished children. Interestingly, in the results part of the study, it has been discussed that out of 66% of the 745 children are "normal" while remaining 37% are "undernourished".

The second study is in the area of sociology by Güler Saygın (2003). In Şentepe and Akdere districts, as the different *gecekondu* districts of Ankara, the factors affecting women residents' health have been investigated. The conceptualization of the field as Şentepe is quite similar with the Mızıkacı's study. As the in-between place, Şentepe has been discussed in the context of integration to the urban space.

The last piece of the first group is from educational sciences by Damla Sevi Özçelik (2010) and aims to state "integration problems" and "education needs" of the residents of Şentepe Burç neighbourhood. The study based on the surveys done with 200 adults. The problem of the study is discussed through the "problems of urbanization", "ghettoization", "insufficiency of education level" by critisizing the views overlooking socio-cultural aspects of *gecekondu* phenomenon (Özçelik, 2010, p. 1-13). Though not clearly discussing where Şentepe stands in this discussion, Şentepe was selected as the field. Similar with the Mızıkacı's piece, also in Özçelik's research, Şentepe discussed as a "ghetto" and a district which failed to be integrated to the urban space.

To conclude, the first group of studies takes Şentepe as a *gecekondu* district as such and evaluate the neighbourhood in the context of integration to the already existing urban space.

When it comes to second group, three of them are from city and region planning by Yelda Özdemirli (2012), Nermin İveynat (2008) and Pınar Özcan (2005). Özdemirli's and İveynat's piece evaluate urban transformations in Şentepe. These two pieces review "the success" of the urban transformation projects implemented in Şentepe. This perspective does not question the transformation mechnanisms of the available market. Success of the transformation is discussed only how many *gecekondu* houses were able to turned to apartments. These studies seem to focus more on the establishment of the buildings and other facilities in the settlement. Accordingly, the relations between institutional actors were analysed. Socio-cultural transformations and reponds of the residents to these tranformations were not quite elaborated though these studies give a lot of concrete information about the

implementation stages of urban transformation projects in Şentepe. On the other hand, Özcan's piece investigates the applicability of "housing classes approach" on the transformation in Şentepe. By critisizing this approach which has its roots in Weberian social stratification model and states that housing is only an issue of distribution, Özcan reveals that this approach is deficient since it does not look at the relations of production (Özcan, 2005, p. 3) Selecting Şentepe as the field, she concludes that housing classes approach is not applicable in Şentepe. Rather, it has been stated that spatial stratification emerged from the housing ownership is parallel to the social divisions based on labor market.

It could be said that second group of studies focuses more on the transformations in Şentepe. Though they include important inferences on the political economy of the transformation projects in Şentepe and feeded this study considerably, the first two studies evaluate Şentepe as an inferior space that needs to be transformed in the existing market mechanisms.

As the most relevant study done on Şentepe, from anthropology discipline, Nilüfer Korkmaz Yaylagül (2008) provides a large body of relevant analysis on the cultural changes in the neighbourhood from shanty house to apartment houses through Bourdieusian types of capital. The study was not only conducted in Şentepe. It provides a comparative analysis by looking in two neighbourhoods of Ankara: Şentepe and Birlik Mahallesi. The main aim of the study is to investigate whether and how newly gained economic capital is transferred to other forms of capital and how residents experienced the transformation in their *habitus*. It could be said that this reseach approaches the transformation not only from a spatial perspective but also from a socio-cultural perspective. Moreover, through in-depth interviews and observations, social relations between the resident were analyzed and discussed in detail.

Therefore, it could be said that there are quite limited studies that evaluate the spatial changes in Şentepe from the socio-cultural perspective. Among the studies taking the social aspects into consideration, there is a gap for a study which problematizes

the developmentalistic approach for urban transformation projects. Such an investigation enables to question how the past is mediated and reveals the alternative responses of the residents to the imposed life forms through urban transformation projects.

When the literature on Şentepe is considered, except from the Yaylagül's study, which evaluate the socio-cultural changes in the neighbourhood with the Bourdieu's term *habitus*; other studies focus on transformation plans, strategies of institutions and the relations between them. Though they provide views of the dwellers to some extent, urban transformation projects were approached in the context of "being successful" or not. It could be said that urban transformation is not only the construction of new building and facilities but also a multi-dimensional shift and a series of changes in the lives of the residents. Depending on the spatial dimension, social, political, cultural aspects of daily life in the neighbourhood totally changes after the implementation of these projects. Though Yaylagül's study discusses these dimensions, her study is about a transition period from *gecekondu* houses to apartment flats. When the current situation in the district is considered, it could be said that there is nearly nobody residing in *gecekondu* houses. As the people started to live in flats for some time, the life in *gecekondu* houses is something discussed in the context of "the past" or "in the memories" due to the vanished spatial reality. This situation requires an analysis by using memory as a conceptual tool to evaluate social effects of urban transformation. Despite the changed spatial reality, memory is a framework plotted from today, rather than a crystallized past. Therefore, this study problematizes considering transformations of the neighbourhood in a developmentalistic framework by disconnecting "the past" of the place with "the present" and through these lines, it aims to reveal the future expectations of the residents'. In that vein, the nostalgic look of the residents to life in *gecekondu* and especially the previous commonality and solidarity practices in this life point out that residents question the imposed disconnection between "the past", "the present" and "the future" which implies that *gecekondu* neighbourhoods (like in the similar

7

transformation examples) should be transformed to pre-determined neighbourhoods left mercy of the neo-liberal market mechanisms.

On the one hand, by problematizing developmentalist approach stating *gecekondu* settlements needs to be transformed to apartments to become liveable places, this study attempts to reveal what former dwellers wish to "preserve" with the help of the concepts memory and nostalgia. Definitely, the residents desire to have better places to live. However, as memories and nostalgic look of the dwellers point out, this might not necessarily be in the way that Şentepe and similar other *gecekondu* neighbourhood examples have been through. With this, the study aims to propose an alternative view that may be taken into consideration during the urban transformation by paying regard to the dwellers' as the subjects of these transformation projects and the connection they established with their past. Furthermore, since I, as the researcher, am not a total outsider like in the case of anthropology studies of classical era, the study also aims to contribute to the methodological discussions of anthropology. Being an insider and having background knowledge on the research topic constitutes both the challenge as well as the contribution of this study because it is required to challenge this background knowledge, sometimes to break it down and constitute an alternative knowledge instead.

Looking to the urban transformation of *gecekondu* houses with the concept memory seems useful in two aspects. Firstly, though *gecekondu* and studies related to *gecekondu* seem to lose its relevance since there are few of gecekondu neighbourhoods remained due to the urban transformation projects, the legitimacy ground of most of these projects are being constructed upon the memories and previous perceptions on *gecekondu* neighbourhoods. The bad reputation of *gecekondu* neighbourhoods and the dwellers as being "poverty nests" and "people occupied with illegal businesses" legitimize the transformations done through the neo-liberal market mechanisms. While these mechanisms swallow the *gecekondu* houses on this legitimacy ground, it reproduces the inequalities in urban space. As

a result, the ones who afford to have houses are staying in the neighbourhood while dwellers who cannot afford were forced to live in other peripheries of the cities. Secondly, the concept memory necessitates a sort of agency to former *gecekondu* dwellers since edition of context of the recollections is up to the interviewees. This is not to say that the recollections are purely individually and independently selected. Since the memory is a socially constructed frame, rather than a body of mere subjective content, the memories of the dwellers were surely affected by the dominant ideologies. However, as the main pattern emerged in this study points out, the dwellers also reveal what do not function in these urban transformation projects. In other words, the agency of the dwellers shows up when analysed through the terms memory and nostalgia. Therefore, looking to the social changes as a result of urban transformation project in Şentepe with the concept memory seems important in order to provide an alternative look from the respondents themselves to these projects.

In addition to the literature on Şentepe, as the most relevant and current study in this context, the edited book *Bir Varmış Bir Yokmuş: Toplumsal Bellek, Mekân ve Kimlik Üzerine Araştırmalar* (Erman and Özaloğlu eds., 2017) needs to be mentioned. In this book, the editors compiled the article written for the *Memory and Culture Symposium* in 2013 organized by *Kültür Araştırmaları Derneği* and *Bilkent University.* They consisted of eight themes on the specific issues of Turkey's context and the book investigates the projections of economic, social, cultural and political changes on memory through the dialectical relationship between remembering and forgetting. With the purpose of drawing attention to the places which have been attempted to be erased from daily life, the book has an important place with its focus on place in contrast to the other studies on memory. For this reason, the book remains as the most relevant study for this research.

In the article *Belleklerdeki Gecekondu*, in the same book, Tahire Erman (2017) researches on Karacaören TOKİ (Housing Development Administration of Turkey) urban renewal project. Erman interviewed people whose shanty houses were

demolished and revealed their memories on *gecekondu* and the previous daily life in *gecekondu* neighbourhood by placing these recollections inside the life in apartment houses. Thereby, Erman highlights the "sense of collectivity of life in *gecekondu*" which started to disappear in today's more individualistic and isolated daily life in the cities. In contrast with today's more commercialized and commodified daily life, the life of urban poor in the *gecekondu* is discussed.

Erman deals with a neighbourhood changed with a TOKİ project. Accordingly, she starts with the applications and discourses on projects that are circulated by state. Though the results of the changed neighbourhood are similar, for Şentepe, transformation dynamics are different since it is not a TOKİ project and owners transformed their houses through separate agreements with contracting companies. Thus, it is difficult to encounter publicity and discourses by actors like ministries and municipality in the form of billboards in the neighbourhood. On the other hand, the nostalgia in the narratives of interviewees about the previous neighbourhood is similar as well as physical comforts and sense of welfare. In that vein, "garden of *gecekondu* in memories" is discussed as a phenomenon which points out how "green" was the settlement before. The economic contribution and the pleasure of the garden are also discussed. The garden image also recalls the sense of security when compares to present situation. As a conclusion, Erman states that in contrast to the image created in the renewal projects, former residents of *gecekondu* remembers the previous life with the attribution of collective, sincere, cheap, easy and secure. However, for the younger generations, *gecekondu* is obliged to be romanticized and old phenomenon. Due to desire for social mobility, the younger generations tries to live in new apartments. Erman concludes that the younger generations of former residents of *gecekondu* will live more isolated and alienated to the city and live more frustrated and therefore they will romanticize *gecekondu* more.

As another important study, article of Pınar Yelsalı Parmaksız (2014) *Ars Memoria'dan Postmnemonik Topluma Levent-Gültepe'de Kayıp Zamanın İzinde* is

also significant. In this research, by analysing urban renewal in Levent-Gültepe district, Parmaksız reveals how modern organization of urban space and time affects the understanding and experiences of daily life. In this way, she asserts that urban renewal transforms memory. Moreover, she discusses how modern practices shape the experience of time. In this vein, she uses Paul Connerton's definition of "post-mnemonic society" to define the society in Turkey since modernity and its practices cause discontinuities in meaningful memory line of individuals. As a result of disconnecting "the past" with "the present" in a developmentalist approach, it has been importantly stated that the society goes from art of remembering to forgetting. This article is crucial for establishing the bond between the experiences and micro narratives with the changes in global schema since neither urban renewal nor memory are floating phenomena independent of structural changes.

Last but not the least, study of Funda Şenol Cantek (2016) also needs to be mentioned. The edited book, *Sanki Viran Ankara* claims to be an alternative to official narratives of history through micro narratives. Especially for this methodological approach, this book is crucial for this study. Moreover, all the articles are on the capital city Ankara. The capital is described as the "city of forgetting" depending on the idea that becoming a nation is an act of collective forgetting, she refers to its role in the nation creation process. In the article "*Sel Gider Kum Kalır*", she traces a demolished district due to flood disaster in 1957 in Yenimahalle. As a result of this disaster, residents of the former houses needed to move into several types of housing from tent to *gecekondu*. In the end, the state designed a housing settlement for flood victims and they moved in there, namely *Seylap Evleri* (Flood Houses). Cantek analyses the effect of spatial organization to social relationships in these housing settlement. As it is stated, methodologically being close to ethnographic research through analysing micro narratives, the study remains an important methodological guide for this study. Theoretically, as she traces the role of space for memory, this study is crucial for the theoretical ground of this study.

1.3. Organization Rationale of the Chapters

This text consists of six chapters in total. After the general introduction to the object of study in the first chapter has been done, next chapter elaborates on the details of field experience and methodological issues. The phases of the research, demographic data of the interviewees, conceptualization of "the field" and my position in this study are discussed in this chapter.

In Chapter 3, *gecekondu*, memory and nostalgia were discussed as the three conceptual tools to analyse the data from interviews. In the first section, the analysis of Tahire Erman (2001) on previous *gecekondu* studies has been introduced. In this study, the look of *gecekondu* studies to the dwellers as "inferior others" were contextualized within different periods. This is analysis is important in order to form the ground for the contextualization on which Şentepe and its change from 1923 to 2000s are presented in Chapter 4. Moreover, socio-political factors affecting squatting in Ankara from 1923 to 1960 are discussed through important study of Tansı Şenyapılı (1985). In the following two titles under section, transformation and changing context of *gecekondu* and urban space and place conceptualization of this study are discussed. In the second section, the concept memory is argued in detail to be able to look through it during the analysis of the narratives. Starting from the approaches to memory in the literature and continuing with the changing paradigms, the appropriate operational perspective is discussed. Moreover, as a relevant part within the memory studies, memory place relationship is also discussed in this section. In the third section, in order to be able to reveal the meaning of the emerging pattern in the interviews, the concept nostalgia and its utopian context are argued.

In Chapter 4, under four titles, *gecekondu* phenomenon in Şentepe neighbourhood is discussed from 1960s to the beginnings of 2000s. This chapter starts with discussion of social border between Yenimahalle and Şentepe. This part aims to elaborate on the methodological approach self-reflexivity, explained in this chapter, i.e. Chapter 2. After this, under four different titles as "Şentepe in 1960-1970", "Şentepe just before 1980 military coup: Between the years 1970-1980" and

"Şentepe after 1980"; the emergence of gecekondu in Ankara with the related social and political dynamics and the transformation of the neighbourhood from "rescued region" to urban transformation projects are presented in line with the contextualization logic done by Erman's study.

Chapter 5 starts with the urban transformation done after 2000s and the present conditions in the neighbourhood. This part is discussed under Chapter 5 since the narratives of the interviewees are highly related with what has been recently changed and what they could not find in the neighbourhood now. In the following sections of this chapter, the four patterns of the interviews were analysed together with the gendered experiences through the concept memory and the meaning of these patterns were discussed with the opened conceptual space by the term nostalgia.

In Chapter 6, the main results and the answers for the research question have been discussed together with the general summary of the text.

CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, the aim is to discuss the stages, evolution, and methodological approach of this study. In order to be able to investigate the research question mentioned in the previous section, I conducted semi-structured in-depth interviews with the people who resided in Şentepe in *gecekondu* houses before the transformation projects and then moved in to the apartments in there. The demographic details of the interviewees and the access channels are discussed. In the next section, the relationalities regarding field conceptualization of this study and my position discussed in detail.

2.1. The Research

The research question of this study sprouted after some of the interviews has been conducted. Therefore, the study consists of different parts. I call them phases of the research and discuss them in section 2.1.1 in detail. In total, twentynine interviews were carried out. In the following two sections, the phases and demographic data of the interviewees are discussed in more detail.

2.1.1. Phases of the Research

There are three phases in this study. It is appropriate to call them as phases since they were not strictly planned. Rather, they evolved in a particular way as the research was proceeding.

The first phase is related to my position as the researcher. In this phase, after selecting Şentepe as the object of study, the focus was on the multi-faceted contradiction between the residents of Yenimahalle and Şentepe in which I, as the researcher, also do have a place. In this phase, four sessions of interview have been conducted with six people in total. The first two were long interviews with two male

interviewees who has been living in Yenimahalle since the establishment of it. Furthermore, the set of interviews were with the same woman in her forties who migrated from Kars to Şentepe in 1990s. The sets of interviews done with her include the recorded and unrecorded short and long daily talks. The other interview is with four people in a coffeehouse in Şentepe, to which I had a chance to enter with the help of the woman from Kars.

In the second phase, I have decided take Şentepe as the subject of study and in order to form a research question, I prepared a tentative interview structure. The sets of questions consisted of themes like migration, shanty houses/home/land ownership, Şentepe/being from Şentepe/the neighbourhood, time/memory/memory transfer and urban transformation were prepared according to the knowledge in the first phase[1]. In this phase, as the pilot study, three interviews have been done. These were three people who had been randomly chosen by the mukhtar of their neighbourhood in Şentepe.[2] All of them were male and they told their memories regarding Şentepe in a nostalgic manner. At the end of this phase, the research question was formulated.

In the third and last phase, according to the research question, I have planned to talk with the people were residents of *gecekondu* houses in Şentepe before and now live in flats in apartment blocks of the same place. In this scope, I talked with twenty people. This is with the exception of two, one male and one female, who were among the organized youth at the end of 1970s and helped to build the houses in Şentepe. Nine of the people in this phase were female while eleven were male. I reached them through the channel of familiar people I know in Yenimahalle. For the further interviews, snowball sampling has been followed.

---

[1] The interview questions and interview structure has been given in Appendices section. This structure has also been used for the second phase of study. In the second phase, the questions related with the memory were asked though exactly all of the questions were not asked.

[2] Through the connection of the people I personally know from Yenimahalle, I first have gone to mukhtar of Güventepe neighbourhood, told the research and asked for help on finding interviewees.

2.1.2.Demographic Data of the Interviewees

In the three tables below, the demographic data of the interviewees are presented phase by phase.[3]

Table 1: Demographic data of the interviewees from 1st phase, the pilot study

Nickname	Gender	Age	Occupation	Still living in Yenimahalle/Şentepe	Date of Migration to Yenimahalle
Mehmet	Male	55	Retired civil servant	Yes, in Yenimahalle	Beginning of 1960s
Ali	Male	57	Retired inspector	Yes, in Yenimahalle	Beginning of 1960s
Habibe	Female	42	Working in informal sector	Yes, in Şentepe	Mid-1990s
Man 1 in coffee house	Male	No informa-tion	Seller in Şentepe Market place	Yes, in Şentepe	Mid-1990s
Man 2 in coffee house	Male	No informa-tion	Seller in Şentepe Market place	Yes, in Şentepe	Mid-1990s
Man 3 in coffee house	Male	No informa-tion	Seller in Şentepe Market place	Yes, in Şentepe	Mid-1990s

---

[3] As a note, for the second phase, I do not know the names and ages of the man I interviewed in the coffee house. I only know their occupation. They are sellers in marketplace in Şentepe. In the record, there are three of them (who clearly speaks, though more people participated during the conversation), who migrated in 1990s from Kars to Şentepe and still living in there. There was also another woman, Habibe, among the people who migrated from Kars. In fact, with the elder brother's reference of her, I was able to talk with the people in this coffee house to which women were not quite welcomed. Because of this, I had very little time in there, in a hurry. Since I do not have age and occupation data, I could not put them in the table.

Table 2: Demographic data of the interviewees from 2nd phase

Nickna-me	Gender	Age	Occupati on	Still living in Şentepe	Date of migra-tion to Şentepe	Date of migra-tion to apart-ments	Migrated from
Cabbar	Male	72	Trades-man	Yes	Begin-nings of 1960s	After 2000	Güdül
Bahtiyar	Male	55	Retired civil servant	No, but still visiting Şentepe	1967-68	In 1980s	Çamlıdere
Murat	Male	68	Retired civil servant	Yes	1970	2008	Erzurum

Table 3: Demographic data of the interviewees from 3rd phase

Nickna-me	Gender	Age	Occupati-on	Still living in Şente pe	Date of migrati-on to Şentepe	Date of moved to apart-ments	Home-town
Kemal	Male	54	Constructio n subcontract or	Yes	1974	1990	Kırşehir
Yusuf	Male	63	Small business enterprise manager	No	First arrived in Şentepe in 1977	-	Sivas
Halit	Male	56	Small business owner	No	1968	Not stayed in the apartmen ts in Şentepe	Kars
Hıdır	Male	42	Small business owner	Yes	1977	2006	Çamlıdere

Table 3 (Continued)

Hasan	Male	56	Small business owner	Yes	1976	After 1980	Kazan
Kahram an	Male	46	Worker in private sector	Yes	1995	After 2000	Sivas
Mustafa	Male		Small business owner	Yes	1975	After 1980	Tokat
Yunus	Male	56	Retired military man	Yes	1976	After 1980	Tokat
İbrahim	Male	28	Working in the private sector	Yes	Born in Şentepe	After 1980	Tokat
Mahmut	Male	57	Retired worker	Yes	1976	After 1980	Tokat
Çiğdem	Female	62	Small business enterprise manager	No	Lived in the years 1978-1980	-	Ankara
Güler	Female	54	Retired worker	Yes	1969	1997	Sinop
Sultan	Female	49	Working in the services sector	Yes	1971	2017	Konya
Sevinç	Female	32	No occupation	Yes	Born in Şentepe	2017	Konya
Sevgi	Female	39	No occupation	Yes	Moved in Şentepe in 1987	After 2000	Bolu
Hülya	Female	67	No occupation	Yes	1977	2013	Konya
Nergis	Female	45	No occupation	Yes	1990	After 2000	Kars
Gül	Female	55	No occupation	Yes	1975	After 1980	Tokat
Hale	Female	18	Student	Yes	Born in Şentepe	2013	Ankara
Gonca	Female	5	No occupation	Yes	1978	After 1980	Tokat

2.2.Relationalities in the Research

I was born and raised in Yenimahalle. This very fact makes discussing my position in this reseach inevitable against the danger of taking the object of study as it has been previously constructed. Rather, I put a question mark next to the common sensical ideas on Şentepe and raised suspicion. Questioning these preconstructed ideas requires to take social construction of the ideas regarding Şentepe, rather than taking Şentepe as such. Following the critical position stating that reality is relational (Bourdieu&Wacquant, 1992, p. 230-232), there are two points that I need to touch upon for this research: (1) Şentepe as the object of study and (2) My position as the researcher. By the title "Relationalities of the Research", I point out these two spots.

2.2.1."The Field"

The idea of "the field" for which isomorphism of space and culture is assumed, has been widely challenged by the anthropologists from the beginnings of 1970s. In this context, looking to the space of social reality as not discrete but interconnected has emphasized by several thinkers.

The isomorphism of the space and culture, i.e. the assumption that individuals living in the territories of a nation state have a homogenious "the culture" specific to this country, is criticized from several aspects. In addition to the fact that nation state is a project of imagination rather than a fact, globalization and flexible accumulation of wealth that the world experiences now, challenge the convenient story that maps cultures onto places and spaces (Gupta & Ferguson, 1997, p. 2). Therefore, any social reality needs to be taken in historical context which enables one to understand how the cultures has been formed in an interconnected space.

In such conceptualization, "the field" is also an intersubjective space in which the positions of the subjects are interactively negotiated (Orhon, 2014, p. 55-56). This also carries a critical stance to the method of non-participant observation since it is

impossible for researcher not to "participate in". In other words, researcher is also a part of this intersubjective space as a social category.

For such concerns, Şentepe as the object of study has been discussed in an historical context in this study. Moreover, methodologically, data gathered by interviewing with the people cannot be considered disconnectedly from the global changes which the country and city of Ankara have been through. In other words, what is acquired from "the field" as the knowledge, needed to be analysed within the relationality of global and national scale changes, as dynamic forces affecting the ordinary actors' life and being affected by actors' actions. Thus, starting from the micro universe, i.e. neighbourhood, it has been attempted to connect the changes in the neighbourhood with the changes in more macro scale.

Şentepe as a field of study, had a quite rich history in which one can study all the stages of the recent history of Turkey. As a unit of analysis, the neighbourhood reflects the changes and socio-political dynamics in micro level. For this reason, it is illustrative to study Şentepe as neighbourhood.

Besides, though this study is on a specific place, it was not always required for me to "go" to the neighbourhood since there were people who had memories on Şentepe and not living in Şentepe presently. Therefore, the field consisted of people who carries memories on Şentepe.

In this study, I have conducted twenty-nine semi-structured in-depth interviews with the former *gecekondu* dwellers of Şentepe who moved in to the newly built apartment blocks in the same neighbourhood after the urban transformations in post-1980s. While there were dwellers who moved in exactly the same location, there were also the ones who moved different locations in Şentepe.

Since I talked with former *gecekondu* dwellers now dwelling in the apartment flats constructed on the lands of *gecekondu* houses, they were able to compare the daily life in the neighbourhood as "before and after".

I got in contact with these people from several channels. For example, with the ones in the second phase, I contacted through mukhtar of Güventepe. The ones in the first phase were the people I know from Yenimahalle. The woman from Kars was a former neighbour of my family from Yenimahalle and she was also a channel for several further contacts. The ones in the third phase, I contacted through the people whom I know from the social events regarding Yenimahalle like the events of associations and municipality.

The questions asked to the interviewees has been formulated around central question "How was the life in Şentepe when it was a *gecekondu* neighbourhood?". I do not intend to intervene the flow of the interviews, trying the keep Şentepe and *gecekondu* in focus at the same time. The central question brought the comparisons with the current situation with the previous daily life in Şentepe. It could be said that, since this study is on the memories attached to a place, my questions themselves were carrying mnemonic means on *gecekondu* life. This is valid for the third phase of the study. On the other hand, as it is discussed in the previous section, the research question itself was originated from answers themselves given in response to the set of questions from different themes. Therefore, although the interviews were designed to stay in focus of the central issue about the recollections of previous life in neighbourhood, any intervention on the answers were not done. Accordingly, a concrete structure and set of questions were not prepared, I only tried to keep the focus on Şentepe. In line with the flow of each interview, the interviewees often associated the recollections with their personal lives as the central question implies since the memory is an unending work of the self, embedded in the cultural world (Misztal, 2003, p. 76-77).

In addition to the narratives, in Chapter 4, where the history and emergence of *gecekondu* settlement are discussed, the books providing knowledge on Şentepe were used. Old photographs from these books were also included. Depending on the knowledge in the books, the representations of Şentepe as "*gecekondu* settlement of Yenimahalle" were discussed in the same chapter. Some photos were also provided

by the interviewees. Besides, the valuable knowledge on urban transformation in previous studies on Şentepe was also used as resource.

During the interviews, I tried to hold the memories of *gecekondu* in focus. Moreover, thanks to the interviews to which more than one person attended like in the one in coffee house and one with the women in their home, I had a chance to see how they discuss the memories on *gecekondu* amongst themselves. They sometimes included me in these conversations as a person who has been staying in Yenimahalle for ages. This also approaches the methodology of the study closer to the ethnography.

2.2.2. Position of Me as the Researcher

This study has been conducted by a person who has been living in Yenimahalle over twenty years. This means that I am not a complete stranger to the object of this study. Though I have not been in Şentepe over the years until the 1st phase of this study, I am familiar with what has been rumoured about the place and its dwellers due to my position as resident of Yenimahalle. In fact, there has been a bad reputation of Şentepe (which has been elaborated in Chapter 4) among the residents of Yenimahalle. The rumours state that the dwellers of Şentepe as "rural population could not be integrated to city life/culture", "dangerous", "*varoş*", "backward", "illiterate", "occupied with illegal businesses". In fact, as one of the resident of Yenimahalle states during the research, the dwellers in Yenimahalle express even a pity for the ones who move in a house in Şentepe though the houses are now new and luxurious.

Having such background knowledge carries a danger of looking to the object of study through my presuppositions and prejudices unless being critically evaluated. At this point, being self-reflexive, i.e. thinking on my presuppositions and prejudices, revealing my position as the researcher and reflecting the roots of this bad reputation on the main of the study, is crucial. Therefore, the critical look to the border between Yenimahalle and Şentepe is elaborated in Chapter 4 under the first section.

This methodological position requires to assume that the researcher cannot be an "objective observer" who are able to discuss the object of study neutrally. On the contrary to the methodological position that takes the researcher as the reference point for the reality, rather, this study intends to take researcher as another social category and includes this category into the relationality lines through which the analysis has been done. This requires to question, analyse and sometimes breakdown my own identity as the resident of Yenimahalle throughout the research.

As another social category, I had several identities in the field. I am a young woman who is continuing her education in a university known with its leftist tendency. Moreover, on several counts, I seem like a "modern" urban dweller. These multiple identities, i.e. being young, woman, leftist, modern, urban dweller; were negotiated in a context-based way. Depending on the social characteristics of the community I talked with, I witnessed that my identity is discussed, exchanged and challenged. In several parts of this text, I mentioned how these identities were negotiated. This also implies that the position of the researcher is not a crystallized one but a liquid, dynamic and negotiated one depending on the context.

It could be said that I have reached the people who are willing to interview easily due to the references of the people I know from Yenimahalle. There is a border between Yenimahalle and Şentepe. For this reason, presence of the reference persons played an important role. By the interviewees, it has been stated several times that without these persons, they might choose not to talk with the complete stranger. Moreover, looking at the channels through which I was able to find the reference persons, it could also be said that the social border is not a strict border which prevent any bonds at all. This complicated and dynamic relation brought the difficulties on distancing.

On distancing, I felt several moments in the study that "nothing will come out" since the answers I got were not quite surprizing and unfamiliar ones. I was familiar to rumours, labels and clichés. Several times during the research, I had difficulties to

see social relations between the positions. Also, I had difficulties due to my overmuch association and affection to narratives during the interviews.

In fact, my interest to Şentepe has started during a project of *Yenimahalle Dostları Derneği* (Yenimahalle Friends Association-YENDER) in 2015. Within the scope of volunteer mathematics lectures to secondary school children residing within the borders of Yenimahalle district, I started to work with children residing in the remaining *gecekondu* houses in Şentepe. As a student of Middle East Technical University (METU), I was tutoring children whose family were able to "pay the price" just to get an amount of pocket money. At the same time, I thought that it is also my responsibility to support the children from poor neighbourhoods since they are more disadvantaged. These workshops, I met with the children from Şentepe, their families and relatives and I found chance to look my taken for granted ideas regarding to them and finally in 2016, I decided to go Şentepe and talk with a couple of people for thesis study. However, after choosing Şentepe as the subject, I had to look at residents of Şentepe as object of study regardless of being in solidarity with them. This difficult situation made me feel awful especially at the very beginning of the research since taking them as research objects were irritating. For several times, I had problems with distancing. Therefore, being a partial insider constitutes both the challenge and the contribution of this study.

On the other hand, my identity as *Yenimahalleli*, i.e. a person residing in Yenimahalle, made interviews with other *Yenimahalleli* interviewees quite rich since they felt comfortable. It also due to the fact that I was familiar with the issues they told. They called me as "*Yenimahalle'nin çocuğu*", i.e. a person who born and raised in Yenimahalle, and they appreciated my effort on researching an issue on Yenimahalle.

Except from my *Yenimahalleli* identity, there were other identities negotiated in the field. My gender identity often eased to find the interviewee to talk since I was seen as "harmless". However, there has also been cases in which I needed a presence of a man, like in the case that I went to a coffeehouse in the neighbourhood. Moreover,

24

their narratives were mediated by this unusual event of a woman came and asked questions. Furthermore, it was easy to talk with the women in their houses especially in the absence of men. In one case, a woman interviewee has even advised me not to go to the unfamiliar people's house for the research after she was irritated by the unannounced arrival of her husband during the interview. In another case, the father of a woman interviewee has tried to intervene to what her daughter was telling since he wanted to present his family as "modern" to where he thinks this image is on the opposite side of being *gecekondulu*.

My identity as being a student of Middle East Technical University (ODTÜ), gave the impression that I am "leftist" due the image of my school in the eyes of the interviewees. This eased my interviews with Alevi population who resided in *gecekondu* in Şentepe and moved in flats. In their association, the interviewees sympathized me due to this since they think that we share the similar values.

CHAPTER 3

GECEKONDU, MEMORY AND NOSTALGIA

In this chapter, under three sections, the aim is to plot the theoretical and conceptual framework of the study. In the first section; *gecekondu* studies, the relation between *gecekondu* and urban transformation, urbanization history of Ankara and shantytown urbanization, the theoretical ground for urban space are discussed through scientific studies and conceptual tools. In the second; the conceptual framework of memory, the relation between memory and space are plotted through previous relevant studies in this area. In the third; the term nostalgia is mentioned in order to be able to provide a conceptual ground to discuss the yearning pattern of *gecekondu* dwellers.

3.1. *Gecekondu,* Urban Transformation and Urban Space

Literally, *gecekondu* means "built overnight". Especially in 1960s and 1970s in the metropolitan cities like İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir and Adana; it was likely possible to encounter *gecekondu* neighbourhoods in the peripheries of the cities. As a specific form of shantytown, these houses were the shelters of the families who had to migrate from rural areas to the cities due to financial difficulties. When these families arrived at the city, they first looked for a shelter and mostly they built houses with their own means. The lands, on which the houses were built, were mostly the public lands. As the name implies, the houses were built in a hurry during one night. For this reason, they have one or two rooms due to the immediate need for shelter of the migrated rural population. Since *gecekondu* dwellers have not taken any legal permission during the construction, these buildings were "illegal" in the eyes of the state and local authorities as well as the "legal" residents of the cities.

Mud, water carried from outside, bathrooms outside of the houses, moisture, freezing cold are the themes that were identified with the *gecekondu* neighbourhoods in the eyes of the former residents. In the eyes of "legal" residents of cities, on the other hand, *gecekondu* neighbourhoods were labeled as "slum", "dirty", "muddy", "under developed".

In the Turkish cinema, the issues regarding *gecekondu*, such as domestic migration, have been most popular subjects in the movies of 1960s and 1970s. In movies like *Sultan* (1978), *Canım Kardeşim* (1973), *Düttürü Dünya* (1988); economic and socio-cultural inequalities, social injustice and social differentiations in urban space have been traced (Öztürk, 2004). In these movies, which contributed to formation of common sense on *gecekondu* in Turkey, there were *gecekondu* dwellers who were resisting against destruction vehicles coming to *gecekondu* neighbourhoods. In this way, there was a legitimate representation of the dwellers as the urban poor until the mid-1990s. Then it comes to 2000s and 2010s, image of *gecekondu* and *gecekondu* neighbourhoods have shifted and discussed on a different basis. They started be used as the ground for the discourses legitimizing mega urban transformation projects. Transforming "muddy", "moist" and "dirty" *gecekondu* neighbourhoods to "modern", "clean" and "liveable" was the fundamental message of this discourse.

In sum, beyond being a form of shelter or a physical orientation, *gecekondu* and *gecekondu* neighbourhoods are social and political phenomena in Turkey. For this reason, it has drawn the attention of sociologists and anthropologists. Accordingly, as a specific concept for shantytown phenomenon in Turkey, *gecekondu* has already an extensive literature. In order to discuss the transformations of them and the memories on *gecekondu*, firstly, the *gecekondu* phenomenon and the related studies should be contextualized. Here, Tahire Erman's model of contextualization of *gecekondu* studies discussed. This will provide a theoretical ground for the contextualization and periodization of Şentepe. Erman's model offers a context until the changes in 2000s. Then, to be able to explain the context after 2000s, changing

image of urban transformation and political aspects of this image is discussed. Finally, theoretical approach to urban space is argued.

Thus, in this section, through three titles convenient and useful framework of *gecekondu* neighbourhoods for this study is plotted.

3.1.1. *Gecekondu* Studies in Turkey from 1950s to 2000s

Starting from 1940s, with the impact of agricultural mechanization, rural population started to migrate to the urban areas due to financial difficulties. Accordingly, Turkey has witnessed a sharp increase in rural population coming in the cities in those years. The impacts of these changes directed the attention of anthropologists of Turkey to the urban sphere when the country experienced the failure of agricultural reform resulting in extensive migrations from villages to cities (Birkalan-Gedik, 2011, p. 13).

While social scientists study the living conditions and social integration of *gecekondu* dwellers within their area of expertise, urban planners focused more on physical orientation of *gecekondu* houses. As a critical approach coming from urban planning discipline itself, in two different studies (1981, 1985), Tansı Şenyapılı emphasizes that *gecekondu* is not merely a physical phenomenon but also a social and political phenomenon. Thus, he states that a more integrative approach is required. Moreover, he suggests that, as spatial data, *gecekondu* should not be considered as an independent entity as such. Indeed, it is a spatial orientation which can be considered as a reflection of abstract economic and social relations. In other words, as a social phenomenon, *gecekondu* is not a independently emerged phenomenon, on the contrary, a functionally used part of the liberal economic model.

Kemal Karpat (1976, p. 23) also states that shantytowns are "by-product of rapid economic development and industrialization, of changes in agriculture and shortage of housing". It has been clearly stated that they are not the outcome of "communal or psychological disintegration in the village or in the city" (ibid). Karpat makes a

distinction between shantytowns and slums and reveals that very limited features ascribed for slums are applicable for shantytowns. Especially in terms of social and psychological disintegration, moral depravity and crime; shantytowns are different from slums and ghettos. For the case of Turkey specifically, Karpat (ibid, p. 24) clearly states that "In the squatter settlements there is poverty but no culture of poverty.", with due exceptions surely. This makes life in the *gecekondu* neighbourhood different than slums or ghettos. In Turkey, *gecekondu* dwellers more mostly optimistic people desiring to live better standards. In this way, *gecekondu* settlements are not a problem as such, rather, they are solution to a problem (ibid, p. 25). Furthermore, rural migrants have a clear concept about the city before their movement. While city represents better living conditions; the village is perceived as materially deprived, educationally underdeveloped, full of boredom and frustration. Therefore, migration from village to city means an improvement in the eyes of rural migrants. Accordingly, *gecekondu* dwellers mostly believe that the life of their children will have better living conditions than them in the future (ibid, p. 35). As a result, it could be said that the core issues regarding the *gecekondu* do not lie in the settlements themselves but in the relations between the settlements and the city and between the corresponding residents of these two. As this statement implies, *gecekondu* is a phenomenon regarding the city more than the rural areas and it requires taking the urban and the rural as a continuum.

Tahire Erman (2001) looks at the paradigm shifts in *gecekondu* literature. As the theoretical base, she adopts the Foucauldian view of knowledge stating that knowledge cannot be discussed separately from its use. Erman reveals that *gecekondu* dwellers viewed as "inferior other" in a large scale of studies in academia of Turkey from 1950s to 2000s (ibid, p. 983). She identifies four major time periods to define the shift in the representation of *gecekondu* residents in academic discourse: "the rural Other" in the 1950s and 1960s; "the disadvantaged Other" in the 1970s and early 1980s; "the urban poor Other(s)" versus "the undeserving Other(s)" and "the culturally inferior Other(s) as sub-culture" in the mid-1980s and mid 1990s; and finally "the threatening/*varoşlu* Other") in the late 1990s.

In order to talk about these shifting paradigms, it is necessary to look at the recent history of Turkey from 1950s to the present. This context plots the periodization logic of the evolution of *gecekondu* and urban transformation in Şentepe.

From the establishment of the republic to 1950s, it was single party rule by People's Republican Party in Turkey. During this period, the ruling class targeted the modernization of Turkey's society. Especially, they prioritized the cultural aspects of daily life in the cities. As a result, a top-down, elitist model of everyday life has been adopted. As the capital city, Ankara had a special place since it was the headquarter of the new state and its government. More importantly, the city was the spatial representation of the new ideology. In other words, Ankara in 1930s had a mission as not only being the capital city of the new republic but also reflecting its values spatially. By positioning the life style foreseen in Ankara on the opposite side of the one in İstanbul, the military and bureaucratic ruling elites of the new republic have created a new class of national elites. Mostly having the petit bourgeois roots (Tekeli, 1982, p. 51), new national elites and their life style in Ankara would be the new model for life style for the cities of the country. To put it differently, the new ruling class located itself on the opposite side of the center of Ottoman Empire, i.e. İstanbul; and reorganized the national bourgeois. Ankara, as the spatial representation of such organization, has been made the capital city (ibid, p. 53). The values of new Turkish state were the adaptation of the values of sample European modern nation states. Within this framework, the ruling elites has engineered themselves the mission of being "teacher" of the rural population for "teaching" how they should live in the new republic, especially in the urban area. In this new, glorious and modern story, *gecekondu*s and the dwellers were seen as the obstacles against promotion of the modern way of life in cities. For this reason, when the rural population came to Ankara and they build *gecekondu* houses, those shanties were viewed as an emergent situation by the state.

Between the 1950 and 1960, there was the ruling of Democrat Party (DP) which adopted liberal policies. As United States (US) being the world's number one power,

Turkey positioned on the US's side. Development model was based on the import of foreign technology. As a result, the agricultural mechanization in rural areas, implementation of Marshall Plan, welcoming private and foreign investments to the country have led the migration from rural area to urban area. As a result, from 1950s to 1960s, the few and scattered shanties started to turn to shantytowns in especially undesired peripheries of the cities.

This period has been followed by a military coup in 1960. After this coup, policies of planned economy model have been implemented. After the military coup, in 1961, Turkey has seen one of the most democratic constitutions, the Constitution of 1961. The effect of it in the area of social rights has shown itself in the youth and student movements of 1968 and 1970s.

In 1966, the first Gecekondu Act has been enacted which defines the *gecekondu* neighbourhoods as a serious problem. In one way or the other, through this law, *gecekondu* neighbourhoods were recognized and municipalities started to take services to these areas. In this period, the function of *gecekondu* dwellers was consumers in domestic market (Erman, 2001, p. 986).

As also Şenyapılı (1985) stated, in *gecekondu* studies of this era, the main paradigm was "traditional versus modern" paradigm. In other words, in academia, the studies in this period were under the hegemony of modernization theory for which data was collected from surveys, and not much attention has been paid to in-depth interviews. Accordingly, the academia viewed *gecekondu* dwellers as in-between people who were mostly failed to integrate the city life. The studies of İbrahim Yasa (1966, 1970, 1973) can be shown as the example. Likewise, in the study of Emre Kongar (1973), the main problematic was the "integration" of immigrants to urban areas though he is stating the disadvantaged position of the *gecekondu* residents in the process of integration. In these studies, *gecekondu* dwellers viewed as homogeneous and abstract population (ibid, p. 991).

Gecekondu was widely discussed also in anthropological studies and writings. Starting from 1960s, the studies changed from "villager monography" to *gecekondu* studies which means that more detailed researches have been done for a single topic (Birkalan-Gedik, 2011, p. 16). Anthropological studies on *gecekondu* also started to be done in this period. The work of Turhan Yörükhan (1968) can be counted among these works. With a holistic approach, he studied socio-cultural dimensions *gecekondu* neighbourhoods and defined them as lower income neighbourhoods.

Tansı Şenyapılı (1981) has stated that in 1960s, *gecekondu* has been an important phenomenon not only in Turkey but also in the world with the policies of the "developing countries" which aimed at rapid increase in national income. As a result, there emerged an unequal employment distribution due to unhealthy industrialization (ibid, p. 14). At the international level, International Labour Organization (ILO) has approached the issue by looking to the countries separately. The suggestions of ILO in 1974, 1975 and 1976 for full employment contradicted the profit maximization and polarization targets of capitalist economies since the suggestions foreseen the reforms in land ownership and industrialization. Then the solution attempted to be solved in more restricted scale, namely, in urban scale. Then the studies, including the ones done by ILO, focused on these marginalized regions in urban area in order to produce knowledge for solution. While these studies approach from the several different perspectives, they agreed on the important and supportive role of small sized producers within economy. However, the suggestions were in two groups: The ones that suggesting the development and integration of the small scale producers and the ones supporting the autonomy of small scale producers against industrialized producers (ibid).

In the studies of 1970 and 1980, the paradigm shifted from modernization theory to dependence theory, which was developed by Latin American scholars as a critique to modernization theory. In Turkey in this period, there was high influence of Marxist critique and leftist ideology. Accordingly, highly dynamic period in terms of social movements and public oppositions has been emerged. Several *gecekondu*

neighbourhoods were "rescued regions" in which the residents were organized the daily life according to particular rules differently than the law and official forces like police cannot enter. These neighbourhoods were the urban places which witnessed armed conflicts and highly violent proptests due to sharp political polarization. In sum, in *gecekondu* studies of this period, a more sympathetic approach to *gecekondu* dwellers has been adopted and they viewed as "disadvantaged others". In this era, Kemal H. Karpat (1976) and Tansı Şenyapılı (1981, 1985) have contributed to the area with the studies approaching in the context of broader social, economic and historical forces (Erman, 2001, p. 991).

In 1980, the 12 September military coup has happened and the effects of it were extensive. After the coup has dissolved itself three years later, a new government has been elected. Led by Turgut Özal, the new government adopted liberal policies in the economy. As a result of these policies, the gap between the poor and rich has widened. At the same time, Özal government has enacted several laws regarding *gecekondu*. With these laws, land certificates have been given to *gecekondu* residents. Through these certificates, "the illegal" status of shanty houses was transformed to a "legal" status. The new policies permitted to build up to four-storey houses on these lands. With such policies, "apartmentalization" of gecekondu houses have been done. Moreover, government were silencing the ones who suffered the most from the policies of the new government by giving hope to own flats (ibid, p. 987).

As a result of the policies of Özal government, commodification and commercialization of *gecekondu* neighbourhoods have happened. The owners of the lands gained high profits during the transformation period. Since the people who moved on from *gecekondu* houses to apartments were seen as the ones who carried "their culture" to apartments, they have seen as "culturally inferior others" (ibid).

When it comes to 1990s, it was rise of identity politics as it is the case all over the world. The world witnessed events like fall of Communism in Soviets, fall of Berlin wall and major ideological shifts like collapse of meta-narratives. In that vein, the

discourse in academia has been shifted from modernism to post-modernism which challenged these grand narratives (ibid, p. 988). At the same time, in this era, Turkey has witnessed forced migration of Kurdish community, Alevi-Sunni conflicts as a result of Sunnification of the state, emergence of radical Islam and rise of women movements. In this period, the commodification of *gecekondu* neighbourhoods has accelerated. As a result, *gecekondu* houses more intensively turned to the resource of profit rather than immediate need for shelter. At the same time, due to forced migration of Kurdish communities from eastern part of Turkey to metropolitan cities, a second wave of migration has happened in *gecekondu* neighbourhoods. These populations mostly rented the houses of the people who got the land certificates in 1980s. In their study *Nöbetleşe Yoksulluk* (2001), Oğuz Işık and Melih Pınarcıoğlu defines this relationship network among urban poor after 1980 as "poverty in turns". It refers to a network that allows early migrants and privileged groups in city to produce income through new comers and unprivileged groups. By this means, early comers can transfer poverty to the new comers and have done their turn.

These changes caused a shift from "the Other" to "the Others" in *gecekondu* discourse and some approaches have even created "the threatening other" (ibid). As a result, micro analysis replaced with the holistic approaches of the previous era. *Gecekondu* studies continued to be a remarkable area of research, but with a different focus (Birkalan-Gedik, 2011, p. 22). The focus has shifted to how social organization mechanism is different from equivalent studies in Western contexts in terms of the ideological commitments of *gecekondu* residents as well as the pragmatic issues (ibid).

In late 1990s, *gecekondu* neighbourhoods labelled as *varoş* as well as the residents of *gecekondu* dwellers were labelled as *varoşlu,* meaning residing *in varoş*. The word *varoş* has Hungarian origin and means the settlements outside of the city walls (Nisanyan Sözlük, 2002-2019). In Turkey, the word has negative connotations. It is used to define the outer neighbourhoods of the cities in which illegal businesses

have happened. The dwellers were labelled as *tinerci*, who are addicted to a chemical material used for thinning the paints, and this bad reputation frequently appeared on Turkish media. *Varoşlu* were rebellious, outlaw and misfit people of outer skirts of the cities and their neighbourhoods were the ones for which families advised their children not to hang around. These neighbourhoods, *varoş*, viewed as if they are against the very existence of the city (Erman, 2001, p. 996). There was city in middle and these regions perceived as if they are against the fundamental operation of the cities. Furthermore, "their culture" was viewed as an inferior one lacking of taste and refinement (ibid). Thus, the homogeneous view of *gecekondu* neighbourhoods shifted from rural migrants to *varoşlu*. Under this overarching category, once again, the residents of *gecekondu* neighbourhoods collected under one single label.

With the effect of globalization in 2000s, gentrification and transformation started to be discussed for the urban areas. On Ankara, specifically, the works of Özlem Dündar (2004), Funda Şenol Cantek (2006), İlhan Tekeli (1991), Tahire Erman (1998) had the specific focus on *gecekondu* (Birkalan-Gedik, 2011, p. 26). The works of Tahire Erman (1998) discuss the idea of "village" in "city" and residents of *gecekondu* as the "other" in the researches and literature; while the works of Mübeccel Kıray (1964) Ayşe Güneş-Ayata (1990) and Sema Erder (2006) cover the importance of networks of survival immigrants of village in city (ibid, p. 8).

3.1.2. *Gecekondus* in Ankara: Socio-political Factors Affecting Squatting in Ankara from 1923 to 1960s

Ankara has a unique place in the urbanization history of Turkey. *Gecekondu*, as a part of this process, has also a specific place. Though there were few and scattered shanties in 1930s in Ankara, these shanties turned to shantytowns especially in 1960s. In other words, *gecekondu* houses have not been appeared all of a sudden in Ankara. The reasons for the emergence of shanty town urbanization in Ankara is discussed under the following two titles.

3.1.2.1 Ankara in 1923-1950

In between the years 1923-1930, the new government faced with the challenges of planning the capital city Ankara in a modern, glorious and sustainable way in such a manner that reflects the ideology of the new regime. However, the World War I has just been finished and due to the limited resources in several dimensions, housing problem emerged in cities.

Tansı Şenyapılı (1985) in his extensive study, *Ankara Kentinde Gecokundu Gelişimi 1923-1960,* discusses the emergence of *gecekondu* phenomenon in Ankara by specifying Ankara's position in comparison to other metropolitan cities like İstanbul. This book is one of the most illustrative and rich books written arguing the issues of this study. In this resource, Şenyapılı summarizes the dynamics that leads to the emergence of gecekondu in Ankara city in between the years 1923-1930 (1985, p. 43-45). First of all, Ankara shoulders a mission: being the new capital of the nation state instead of İstanbul. With the policies organized in accordance, three new sectors have been emerged: construction, trade and services sectors. On the other hand, despite the high development goals targeted by the government, the developments in the industry sector remained limited and one-sided including only the investments done by the hand of the state while also there was almost no remarkable change in agriculture technology.

Secondly, poverty after the war has been forced rural unqualified labour to migrate urban area while capital city Ankara is not ready in terms of housing settlements to the new comers. The only sector that this population can make a living was construction sector although they do not have the specialized knowledge for the construction. Instead, the population had unqualified agricultural knowledge while at the same time the sector that they can work had already other expensive inputs apart from the work force. Accordingly, labour cost should have been minimized and also there could be no investments for them since the existing infrastructure was not appropriate. Thus, the coming population did not find appropriate housing settlements.

Thirdly, there were vast uncontrolled lands near old town. One good example is Altındağ hill which hosted squatter settlements for long. In contrast to İstanbul, which was able to provide employment in the peripheries like Zeytinburnu, in Ankara, there were no such opportunities in the periphery. Hence, the first squatter settlements developed in peripheral lands in Ankara.

Fourthly, the governors had two overlooking attitude to squatters. One is seeing *gecekondu* as a temporary solution to housing problem for the rural comers to city. Obviously, this rural population was in need of shelter when they arrived to city. On the other hand, there were no actions taken for their housing problems. Şenyapılı states that if this population itself propose a solution for this, it needs to be responded positively. This legitimacy was also expressed in 1930s, by Interior Minister Şükrü Kaya (ibid). The other attitude by the governors was seeing these areas as controllable. At this point, it is important to state that the migration wave to this era was not as extensive as the one in 1945 since the latter changed the social structure of the cities radically, differently from the former. In other words, migration wave in 1930s caused emergence of few and scattered shanties in the cities while the one in 1945 caused the formation of shanty towns and neighbourhoods.

Finally, squatting was ignored by the government back then since it was bureaucratically undesired phenomenon. The municipalities have taken modern Western cities as the examples. However, in these examples, there were no remarkable migration wave of rural population to urban areas. For this reason, *gecekondu* was rarely mentioned in official resources of the state until 1950. When mentioned, *gecekondu* settlements have been discussed as marginalized areas that can be solved by replanning at the urban planning level or by violence if needed at the sociological level. As a result, all these reasons paved the way for squatting.

The first document mentioning "squatting" in Ankara is the one dated 1933. Then, the phenomenon was started to be discussed in Grand National Assembly (TBMM). Interior Minister of that time, Şükrü Kaya talks about the existence of "Third Ankara" in 1934. "Third Ankara" is the houses which the people constructed

overnight and sold for 4-15 liras (ibid, p. 56-57). The years between 1930 and 1940, the world has witnessed World War II. Though did not actively participated, Turkey has been inescapably affected by the economic conditions. The vast investments have not been done in neither urban nor rural areas. In rural areas, since the agricultural technology did not change radically, labour intensive work was continuing and remarkable migrations to urban areas did not occur since the urban areas did not offer better living conditions to rural masses. Due these reasons, there was no extensive migration in these years (ibid, p. 67).

Just then in Ankara, since the process of being capital city continues and in the mentioned three sector, i.e. construction, services and trade; the employment rate was increasing. However, for the population in Ankara, especially for low income officers, the rents were not quite affordable. In a nutshell, there was limited supply in housing settlements while there is increasing population in Ankara. This phenomenon pushed this population to illegal dwelling in the areas outside of the center. Another reason for illegal dwelling was the speculative land ownership and the unequal sharing of income lead not only low income groups to illegal housing but also other income groups. In sum, the period between 1930 and 1940 is the years within which illegal housing outside of the city center was spread and intensified. However, while low income groups developed squatting as a solution within the period between 1923 and 1930, the middle income groups in the period between 1930 and 1940 developed housing cooperative as the solution such as Bahçelievler cooperative housing society in 1935 as the first example of its kind (ibid, p. 67-69).

In between the years 1940 and 1950, the phenomenon discussed as "squatting" turns into a specific phenomenon called *"gecekondulaşma",* i.e. shanty-town urbanization. The most important political economic phenomenon affecting these years is the global crisis in 1929. During the crisis, public borrowings increased while state investments decreased (Karpat, 2012, p. 153-154). Within the scope of economic development model of these times called "industrialization led by the state", the state organized institutions like Sümerbank and Etibank in order to

control the industrialization and finance. The negative effects of 1939 was at the same time, left its negative mark on the economy. Agricultural production, at the same time, has not achieved to produce required surplus accumulation. In order to overcome the uneven development between the agriculture and industry, in 1945, land reform numbered 4753 has been planned but could not be implemented due to the negative responses in National Assembly. Adnan Menderes, a deputy at that time and became the leader of Democrat Party after, criticized this reform intensely by stating that the law conflicted with the principles of United Nations (ibid, p. 163-164). In 1946, Democrat Party (DP) led by Adnan Menderes, has been established and elected four years later which has finished the single-party period. In the period starting with 1950, the elected DP government has implemented new policies differently from the previous government. In other words, the development principles have been changed from "industrialization led by state" model to "industrialization led by private sector" model which depends on foreign investments and aiming at agricultural mechanization instead of industrialization (ibid, p. 170).

In several resources, the most remarkable event leading *gecekondulaşma* is Marshall Aid in 1945. Tansı Şenyapılı (1985) clearly states that Marshall Aids caused structural changes in agriculture sector and population masses migrated to urban areas with the impact of these changes. As a result of agricultural mechanization, agriculture labourers have become unemployed. Small farmers also could not compete with giants due to the increased land prices after mechanization. When they sold their lands, they created finance to migrate urban areas. Ultimately, in the second half of this period, "squatting" phenomenon turned to "*gecekondulaşma*" phenomenon having its own dynamics and specifity.

In Ankara, between the years 1940 and 1950, there were no remarkable changes have happened in the economic structure of Ankara, while, at the same time, public services and trade volume has increased (ibid, p. 75). Within the period, two different kinds of housing have emerged. The first one is cooperative housing

societies of middle class and the second is *gecekondu* houses of lower classes. Between the years 1935-1944, out of 50 cooperative housing societies, 22 of them were in Ankara (ibid, p. 77). The second kind of housing, i.e. in *gecekondu* neighbourhoods, between the years 1945 and 1950, were the essential shelters for the populations "pushed" from rural sides and "not pulled" by the urban sides.

In those years, "*gecekondu* problem" has been discussed frequently in National Assembly. In 1948, the government enacted the first directly related law with *gecekondu* houses: Law numbered 5218 and 5228.

It has been discussed that these laws did not solve the housing problem in urban areas. Since they do not have enough finance to own the houses, the newly migrated population could not benefit from these laws. However, as it is also mentioned in the previous section, in 1950, by the Law No. 5228, Yenimahalle has been constructed for solution of housing problem of middle classes. It could only help for middle classes since they had economic power to pay the instalments regularly. Moreover, since the houses were quite affordable when compared to their wages, some owned and started to rent. Therefore, squatting in the cities could not be stopped.

As the city was growing along the transportation axes, in neighbourhoods Atıf Bey, Yenidoğan, Altındağ, Gülveren and Topraklık; *gecekondu* houses have been built and migrants from nearby cities have started to come. In the areas near central areas of the city, *gecekondu* neighbourhoods have been established since they provided opportunities of employment. These areas were mostly the public lands which were excluded from zoning due to their topographical characteristics.

In addition to the public transportation whose service provided by the municipality, there are also minibuses called *dolmuş*. When the urbanization accelerated in Ankara city in 1950, the municipality decided to organize the public transportation, Ankara Electricity and Gas Operations Business and Municipality Bus Operations were united named as one institution, EGO. In this way, addressing public transportation

needs of newly developing capital has been planned. However, this did not meet need in practice. Instead, another small business called *dolmuş* was emerged (Tekeli, 1982, p. 71). *Dolmuş* was one of the most important figures of *gecekondu* settlements back then. Also represented in the cinema, dolmuş was identified with *gecekondu* settlements. To Şentepe also, there are several number of *dolmuş* lines transporting passengers from Şentepe to city center and vice versa.

In 1940-1950 period, Ankara city was not providing extensive opportunities. The most developed business lines were trade and bureaucratic services. Accordingly, the migrated population were employed in unqualified jobs like peddler, stallholder, cleaning jobs, portage and construction business. Not only men but also women and children have had to work due to tough living conditions in cities. In the following period, economic function of this population has changed and accordingly, their position in urban space and living conditions have changed. In this period, spread of *gecekondu* settlements towards the center of the cities has caused reactions among both the rulers and the public. In contrast to the Minister Şükrü Kaya's attitude in the previous period, *gecekondu* has started to be perceived as a negative phenomenon of the cities separately from the causing socio-economic factors. Accordingly, the solution was being searched merely at the level of urban space without developing an integrative approach on housing and land. In the example of Yenimahalle, affordable housing has been implemented. However, it was a solution that is limited to the groups that were able to afford paying the housing instalments regularly like civil servants and small business owners. Moreover, land speculation and gaining income from renting the houses also emerged due to affordable prices of these lands (Şenyapılı, 1985, p. 115-116).

3.1.2.2. Ankara in 1950-1960

The impacts of the structural changes in the previous period due to agricultural mechanization was remarkable. With the implementations of the newly elected Menderes government, the state led economic model has been replaced with the economic model promoting the private sector by foreign investments. In 1954, Law

on Foreign Investment Incentives has been enacted. With this law, limitations on profits and capital have been abolished and all the rights that the national businesses have in Turkey have also been entitled to the foreign businesses. However, policies promoting consumption rather than production in the domestic market have caused increase in prices and inflation. This deficit has tried to be supported by short term foreign money borrowed from United Stated and institutions of United Nations (Karpat, 2012, p. 170). As a result, in 1954, Turkey was not able to pay the foreign debt. At the point that all these dynamics created the need of a new regulations and establishment, 1960 military coup has been staged.

The socio-economic dynamics discussed previous paragraph put the cities in Turkey under a huge responsibility, despite the developments in the urban areas. In this period, urban economies developed due to two reasons: the investments on urban areas instead of rural and the migration of the rural population to urban area (Şenyapılı, 1985, p. 117). At the same time, since the migrated population was not qualified, they had to be employed in the market of less desired jobs by the middle class members of the society and this situation ultimately caused marginalization of this population.

In line with the new policies implemented, in Ankara city; the share of trade, services sector and manufacturing sector has increased while the share of agriculture and animal breeding has decreased. With all these economic changes, the economic and political attractiveness of Ankara city increased. Accordingly, rate of migration increased.

As Şenyapılı stated, the structural changes, such as legal regulations on property market, has provided an environment in which the ones inspecting the land market had the maximum profit despite some positive changes for the working classes. The population migrating to the cities found themselves in a completely unfamiliar environment. There were no organization that was responsible to solve the housing and employment problem of this population. For this reason, *gecekondu* can be named as a compulsory solution to precarious conditions. In other words, the

housing problem solved by building shanties by the rural population on the public lands in peripheries of the cities. Since there were no such organization to solve this problem, between the first comers to the gecekondu neighbourhoods and the new comers, there were solidarity networks based on *hemşehrilik*, i.e. being fellow countyman, on the basis of coming from the same village.

The *gecekondu* houses of this period have been built by using mud-bricks. When building their houses, the dwellers were not using the knowledge of urban constructions. The suitable and available (both economically and mechanically) substances around the environment were used in a similar way done in rural areas. Also, the construction structures of houses in Ankara show similarities with the ones in İstanbul. It means that *gecekondu* dwellers did not know the details of construction in the urban space. After 1953 to 1960, briquettes started to be used in the construction of *gecekondu* houses. This also points out increasing knowledge of dwellers on building houses. Accordingly, for the new comers, a network for construction of the houses started to be formed in Ankara. The ones who wanted to build house would talk to the contractors in coffee houses and the contractors would gain a share from this (ibid, p. 133).

Gecekondu houses were building by using mud-bricks, wooden pieces and plastic packing sheets, so at this stage migrated population could build their own *gecekondu*s. However, as it is reflected to the newspapers of that time, urban dwellers and rulers had a negative approach to these settlements depending on the argument that they "ruin" or "profane" the urban fabric. Correspondingly, *gecekondu* dwellers marginalized in the urban space.

Interestingly, in 1970s when the hippie and "return to nature movement" raised, Bernard Rudofsky with the book *Architecture without Architects,* have been published and in Turkey; and architectural investigations that focus on the spatial organizations of *gecekondu* neihgbourhoods and *gecekondu* houses were done. These studies are important in terms of researching sustainable living places by starting from solution strategies that *gecekondu* dwellers proposed. As one of them,

the study of Ayşegül Cankat presents the spatial organizations and specific architectural structures of *gecekondu* houses such as living-room/living-garden yard, collective places, landings in which the dwellers gather and chat. It is stated by Cankat that it is important to clearly point out what needs to "be protected" in *gecekondu* architectures rather than romanticizing the settlements. She states that the living culture needs to be protected rather than the exact physical structure (As cited in Adanalı, 2018, p. 37-52). It is due to the fact that *gecekondu* dwellers were able to produce practical collective ways of spatial orientation in their living spaces. Furthermore, apart from the physical conditions to be improved, it is also crucial to think on the fact *gecekondu* settlement are designed to fulfill the needs for shelter, i.e. designed according to use value; rather than designed to "make money" from land or housing speculations, i.e. rather than exchange value.

There is also another important point that needs to be stated. That is DP government used the voting potential of *gecekondu* settlements by bringing settlement permissions into the bargaining table. As a result, several *gecekondu* population in different neighbourhood of Ankara supported DP government.

As a result of such political relations, in this period, the few and scattered shanties started to turn to *gecekondu* neighbourhoods. The infrastructures have been done and the spatial qualities of the settlements were being enhanced while gecekondu phenomenon started to gain an unofficial permanent character (Şenyapılı, 1985, p. 128). From procurement of the construction materials to squatting on the lands, this process was organizing unofficially as the *gecekondu* neighbourhoods were being settled.

To conclude, from the establishment of the republic to the 1960s, in Ankara city, the reasons for gecekondu formation are: Economic model that could employ unqualified labour in urban area, the lower income level of these jobs, formation of a speculative land and house owning, lack of proper land and housing policy by the state, limitedness of housing zones that can be assigned to migrated population and few and scattered lands that are remained uncontrolled in the peripheries of the

cities. The solutions that the state proposed did not solved the economically marginalized population of *gecekondu*, while it solved the housing problem of middle classes that could pay their instalments regularly. As a result, state allowed the formation of *gecekondu* settlements within the frame of the new economic model of DP government since this model needs the cheap labour in the cities and the migrated population in *gecekondu* to feed this need. As also negatively corresponded by the urban dwellers with the argument that they "ruin" the urban fabric and economically marginalized by the state, *gecekondu* dwellers faced with challenges in Ankara city.

3.1.3. Urban Transformation and Changing Context of *Gecekondu*

After 1980 military coup especially at the beginnings of 1990, right wing in Turkey adopted Turkish-Islam synthesis model which was represented by Welfare Party (RP). Starting from the mid-2000s, after Justice and Development Party (AKP) has been elected and come to power alone, the moderate Islam model has been preferred. Followed by the neoliberal policies in economy, after Sunnification of the state in 1990s, this right wing party has been fed by the Sunni conservatism. Yet seeming more libertarian when first elected in the early 2000s, the political power posited itself at the opposite side of early Republics' modernist values and promoted such conservative means. Through the economic policies taken by the government, construction sector unconditionally promoted.

The global crisis in 2008 has affected almost all economies. It was due to this unconditional growth and the collapse of this uncontrolled growth. When Turkey has been studied, two different eras of growth in construction sector draws attention: After 1980 and after 2000 (Balaban, 2016, p. 23). These two periods represent two milestones of the transformation of *gecekondu* neighbourhoods. The first period has started in 1982 and continued to 1988 while the second has started in 2002 and continued to 2010 despite the downfall in 2008 (ibid). It has been stated that the state clearly supported the growth of construction sector after 1980. Housing Development Administration of Turkey (TOKİ) has been established in 1984,

within this period. Mega urban transformation projects of TOKİ have been implemented especially in the metropolitan cities of Turkey. *Gecekondu* neighbourhoods, in this era, were the objects of desire of these transformation projects, as the social places the construction sector desires to swallow, digest and turn into completely different place in line with the promoted life style by neoliberal capitalism covered with Sunni conservatism. With the promises of "cleaning" and providing "equal" living standards to such neighbourhoods, through this state institution, *gecekondu* neighbourhoods turned to "TOKİ houses neighbourhoods". In fact, urban transformation discourse in this era is constructed upon the modernist-elitist perspective of previous era. In other words, similar to Özal government has been done, the marginalized population of *gecekondu* has been promised to have a different life with clean, modern, shiny, full-fledged neighbourhoods as upper classes have.

Thus, after 2000s, having the roots in the neoliberal policies in 1980s, *gecekondu* started to be discussed in a different context, as the neighbourhoods that should be immediately "cleaned" and transformed.

3.1.4. Urban Space and Place

The modern experience of urban space and place and its relationship with the memory is at the center of this study. In order to analyse the changes in urban space and its relationship with memory, it is necessary to explain the theoretical approach to space in here. Thus, the main questions to be answered in this part is: "How this study conceptualizes urban space and place?".

To begin with, in Cartesian view, it is assumed that time and space, as given entities, crosscuts the daily experience. In other words, the space is an absolute realm that dominates all beings by containing them. There is an external truth independent from the existence of human beings which waits researcher to discover the "laws" of it. It also means that there was space before humans and there will be space after them. Similarly, in Kantian notion, space (and also time) is *a priori* which means it

precedes everything in human consciousness. Space like a decoration, exists in the manifold of consciousness of human beings. Whenever there is a human consciousness there is also space and time before it.

Henri Lefebvre, in his canonical view Production of Space (1991), criticizes the Cartesian view of space and sees space as product of human consciousness, not as an external independent reality. However, since it is pure intuition, before other things in human consciousness, there exists the space. The second implication of his premise is that every society has its own spaces. With its interdependent culture particular to the existing mode of production, every society has its own particular spaces. The third implication he talks about is a shift from "things in space" to "production of space". This emerges because of the fact that he does not view space as *a priori* as Kant. Since space is not something already exists in human consciousness, before talking to "things in space" we need to talk about "production of space", i.e. how the specific space is produced socially.

Here, it is important to talk about his "conceptual triad" as "spatial practice", "representation of space" and "representational spaces". He claims that the anthropologists are the students of "representational spaces". Those spaces are the expressions and forms of existence of dominant notions and ideologies. In those places, powerful ones use a system of symbols that are particular to different spaces. They are dealing with how those spaces are produced. It is highly fluid and dynamic. Thus, it is possible for researchers to read the codes and meanings of dominant ideology from those representational spaces.

In conclusion, after discussing the modern notions of space, Lefebvre urges to think social space as a social production specific to each mode of production and ideology. He also discusses the important implications of this premise in social space. The most important conclusion he made is seeing the social space as socially constructed by humans. Accordingly, it is possible for anthropologist to analyze the codes and meanings of dominant ideologies and notion from those constructed spaces.

3.2. Memory

After plotting the context of *gecekondu* as a specific form of space construction, in this section, memory conceptualization is viewed through previous studies in this area. Besides, it is required to discuss the relationship between memory and space since this study is all about recollections about a specific place.

The word memory in English has the abstract meanings of awareness, mindful, record, faculty of remembrance (Oxford Online Etymological Dictionary, n.d.). From the root –(s)mer, two different sets of words are derived. These derived words have meanings related with the concept itself. On the one hand, words like commemorate, commemoration, mourn, memo, memoir, memorable, memorandum, memorial, memorious, memorize, memory, remember; having the root meaning "to remember"; and on the other, words like demerit, emeritus, isomer, isomeric, meretricious, merism, meristem, merit merito, meritorious, mero-, monomer Moira, polymer turmeric; having the root meaning "to get share of something" (Oxford Online Etymological Dictionary, n.d.). As can be seen, etymological roots within the two branches address two main dimensions of memory: The consciousness and being aware, i.e. remembering; and secondly sharing, i.e. being a social phenomenon rather than being individual one; though it remains specific and unique to oneself.

When one looks at the Turkish translation of memory, "*hafıza*"; it has the origin "*hıfz*" from which the words like "*hafaza*" and "*muhafaza*" can be derived. It means storing and conserving (Nişanyan Sözlük, 2002-2019). When the synonym word used in Turkish is looked, "*bellek*", it has the root "*bellemek*" which means to learn, the competence for learning, to know, to mark or something marked. Thus, in Turkish, the word addresses conserving consciously (ibid).

More interestingly, the word meaning human in Turkish, "*insan*"; has the relationship with the word "*ünsiyet*" coming from the Arabic root "*uns*", meaning being tame (ibid). It is also known that the word has the relationship with the word

"*nisyan*". The word simply means forgetting (ibid). Thus, the word human, goes back and forth between the meanings being tame and forgetting (Sait, 2007, p. 160). There is also a Turkish proverb "*Hafıza-ı beşer nisyan ile malûldur.*" meaning that memory of the humanity is handicapped of forgetting. Thus, in this way, the word is used for forgetting has a negative attribution like betrayal and breach of trust (Bora, 2018) as well as referring to one of the main features of human kind.

3.2.1. Memory Studies

Within the scientific endeavour, the concept of memory is frequently discussed and studied not only in social sciences but also in natural sciences. In the very broad sense, memory studies work on individual and social remembering and forgetting processes (Neyzi, 2012). The variety of the subjective experiences have puzzled natural scientists since the organisms consist of the same biological building stones. In biological sciences, biologists and neuroscientists have conceptualized memory as a physical place in which remembering and forgetting occurred. This approach views the mind as an inseparable unit from the brain. As a result, it is stated within these disciplines that when a person remembers, the physical structure of the brain changes (Kandel, 2006, p. 267-272). In addition, it is also revealed in neuroscientific studies that remembering does not begin as an independent action by the individual; rather, recalling is initiated by external factors. Furthermore, remembering happens through the pathways that are previously constructed in the mind. These findings questioned the idea of free will (ibid, p. 389). Although it seems that memory has a completely different ground[4] in these studies, a more positivistic one; natural sciences also deal with a similar question: How can memory be specific to each individual while also there are patterns and mechanisms of remembering?

When it comes to social sciences, several disciplines like sociology, anthropology, cultural studies, psychology and literature; have constructed different approaches to

---

[4] Interestingly, in the referred book *In Search of Memory: The Emergence of New Science of Mind*, Eric Kandel starts with his own recollections as a Jewish child during Second World War in occupied Vienna by Nazis.

the concept. There are several readers (Olick at al 2011, Radstone and Schwartz 2010, Erll and Nünning 2008), a journal named *Memory Studies,* a book series named *Palgrave Macmillan Memory Studies* and several international and national networks. Thus, the study area in social sciences is quite broad and multidisciplinary.

Two different peak eras can be mentioned for memory studies within social sciences (Neyzi, 2012). The first era includes the studies of Holocaust after World War II which can be counted as one of the bold paths within literature. As the methodology, oral history was used to constitute the archives especially after 1960s. These studies served a model for social scientists in other countries all over the world which studies traumatic events like Holocaust. The second era called "memory boom" (Olick et. al., 2011) covers the studies especially after 1970s and is associated with the interest to identity politics (Neyzi, 2012). For Pierre Nora, this interest is identified with the post-modern experiences of subjects: loss of the traditional (As cited in Sancar, 2007, p. 64-65). Similarly, Jan Assmann explains this memory boom in 1990s from three aspects. The first is the existence of artificial memory having a huge potential of recording almost everything unlike human memory. This technological transformation, as a milestone for cultural change, is seen equivalent to the invention of writing and press. The second aspect, depending on the first one, was domination of the perspective that sees the culture of today as the subsequent culture of the past. Last but not least, he points out the death of the generation which witnessed the major crimes and crimes against humanity. Here, he states that after each forty years, a major change of social memory is on the verge of a period change due to the emerging problems of social remembering mechanisms (ibid, p. 62-63).

Though memory has a long history in human intellectual history, it was 19th and 20th century when a distinctive approach in social perspectives on memory was frequently mentioned (Olick and Robbins, 1998, p. 106). The first use of the term "collective memory" is by Hugo von Hofmannsthal in 1902 in the context of our relationship with past (ibid, p. 106). However, almost every contemporary study

starts with the reference to canonical pieces of Maurice Halbwachs, namely *Social Frameworks of Memory* and *Collective Memory*. Halbwachs is one of the most important names for memory studies due to his pioneering thoughts to sociologization of the term. By asking the question "What do societies do with memory?", he analyses the link between the social processes and remembering. Affected by Emile Durkheim's social theory and Henri Bergson's time conceptualization, Halbwachs stated that memory is a socially constructed, dynamic and present phenomenon (Coser, 1992, p. 7-8). By also contrasting history and memory as two different scales of narratives, he highlights the agency of social groups against official historical narrative.

Furthermore, Halbwachs, importantly talks about the social frameworks of memory. Though he has been affected by the Durkheimian school of thought, his theory on memory, through the term "collective memory", is far from taking memory as a crystallized body existing in the individuals' mind. He importantly states that memory refers to social frameworks rather than bodies of content. This very approach allows him to talk from within sociology discipline. Thus, it could be said that collective memory is a socially constructed phenomenon in Halbwachs's theory (ibid, p. 22).

In his piece *Social Frameworks of Memory,* he clearly puts that memory depends on social environment (Halbwachs, 1992, p. 37). Moreover, on the bond between individual and social groups he states that:

> One is rather astonished when reading psychological treatises that deal with memory to find that people are considered there as isolated beings. These make it appear that to understand our mental operations, we need to stick to individuals and first of all, to divide all the bonds which attach individuals to the society of their fellows. Yet it is in society that people normally acquire their memories. It is also in society that they recall, recognize, and localize their memories. If we enumerate the number of recollections during one day that we have evoked upon the occasion of our direct and indirect relations with other people, we will see that, most frequently, we appeal to our memory only in order to answer questions which others have asked us, or that we suppose they could have asked us. We note, moreover, that in order

to answer them, we place ourselves in their perspective and we consider ourselves as being part of the same group or groups as they.

(ibid, p. 38)

He points out the relation between memory and being a member of a social group. By being a member of a social group, the individual owns frameworks for memory. This argument is similar with to Durkheimian approach of society stating that society is more than mere and atomic collection of individuals. Accordingly, collective frameworks of memory are more than sum or combination of individual recollections of different members of the society (ibid, p. 39). There is a shared time in here and this time points out the sociality rather than mechanical sum of the individual times. Thus, the collective memory can exist in this sense, through social frameworks created by the social groups. Moreover, act of recollection of individual's mind can be possible through placing itself in these frameworks (ibid, p. 40).

He importantly puts that:

> Collective frameworks are, to the contrary, precisely the instruments used by the collective memory to reconstruct an image of the past which is in accord, in each epoch, with the predominant thoughts of the society.

(ibid)

Frameworks provide the margins on which individual memories are constructed. The act of construction is individual action while the ground and frame are provided by the social groups of which individuals are the members. Memory of each individual is subjective and unique though collective at the same time (ibid, 53). In other words, while sociality provides the basis for remembering and forgetting, the identity of the individual mediates the memory. In this way, chronological order of the events in the individual's mind gets the meaning through social mechanisms. Moreover, predominant meanings circulating in the community provide the main elements of the frameworks through which individual memory is constructed. By remembering, the individual reproduces the sense of belonging to the group. However, Halbwachs also importantly states the multiplicity of memories. Each

social group has its sociality and thus, has its mechanisms of remembering and forgetting. In other words, there are memories of social groups, rather than there is only one memory with "M".

Halbwachs also distinguishes autobiographical memory with the historical memory. He points out the impersonal characteristics of historical memory, while also stating that autobiographical memory reveals how the events internalized by the individuals. There is interrelation between individual's construction of events and how these events constructed by the narrative of history. In this way, memory concept points out the editing power of individuals and social groups as an alternative narrative to official narratives.

As Halbwachs stated by contrasting memory with history, memory refers to an individually internalized and adopted past narrative and representation as well as referring to the social frameworks. Accordingly, differently from history, memory concept allows to follow the relations that ordinary individuals construct in relation with the past and the present. In this way, memory is a dynamic, creative and open to individuals' edition. At the same time, since memory is constituted through social frameworks, it allows individual creation. However, this does not mean that individual is able to create purely "free" memory. Contradicting, official and opposite recollections are also constituted in memory. This makes memory a political ground on which complexly contextualized recollections are edited differently by individuals.

Following the German school, art historian Aby Warburg and used "social memory" concept to analyse artworks while Walter Benjamin (1968) studied the material world through perspective of accumulated history. Though he did not use the term, he contributed the memory literature in terms of commodity culture and historicity (Olick and Robbins, 1998, p. 106). In the same period, from the sociology discipline, Cooley (1918) and Mead (1932) theorized social frames of memory. The classical figures of sociology Emile Durkheim, Karl Marx and Max Weber provided very limited statements for memory, most of which are about time and temporality (ibid,

p. 106). Thus, in this early era of sociology, the theories stating the relationship between memory and present are discussed in a very limited context. However, in the era called *new memory studies* era, between the years 1970-1990 and especially after 1990s, the remarkable increase in the studies of memory was recorded.

Several thinkers associate this rise with the postmodern era and collapse of metanarratives. Barry Schwartz (1998, p. 65) discusses that the postmodernity corrodes the time frame of the society in two ways. Firstly, the collapse of metanarratives eroded the link of the individual between society and her past. Individuals require relating themselves to shared experiences. Secondly, he proposes that past seems as a series of unrelated events. In this way, the life line of individual ceases to be a sequence of meaningful events. Pierre Nora (1989) also associates the causes of rise in memory studies with collapse of meta-narratives through events like fall of Communism, multiculturalism, politics and sensitivity of Holocaust as well as other factors constituting post-modern era. With the endeavors of the thinkers like Michael Foucault (1977) with "archaeology", Philippe Aries (1974), Maurice Agulhon (1981) Patrick H. Hutton (1993) and Eric Hobsbawm (1972); history of the commemorative practices approached from the political perspective rather than historiographical perspectives.

In addition, from the perspective of agency, the shift called "post-modern turn", caused the destruction of meta-narratives and humanity disciplines raised a considerable critique of the "totalizing aspects of historical discourse" (As cited in Berliner, 2005, p. 199). Thus, memory in these contemporary studies started to refer to edited knowledge on the past from the present by individuals as social agents.

On the other hand, the contribution of anthropology to memory studies is considerable. Differently from historians, social anthropologists analyse practices, discourses and places in which the past is interpreted and and through which the past made sense of in the present. Besides, anthropologists study politically and ideologically "forgotten" agendas (Kidron, 2016). This account points out two statements. Firstly, rather than chronologically sequencing past events, social

anthropology accounts focus on interpretations and socially created meanings of communities and individuals. This statement also includes the sociological approach that memory is not a dead repertoire, rather, it is an "interplay of present and past in socio-cultural contexts" (As cited in Erll et al., 2008, p. 2). Obviously, the politics of this "interplay" is calculated in today's conditions. Secondly, the statement implies that memory is a political area. In other words, power asymmetries crosscut the ground of memory.

In the *new memory studies* era, in line with the theoretical shift in paradigms, methodologies have shifted from more positivist paradigm to a more interpretivist one. Oral history should be mentioned as an important methodology which initiated the memory boom in the world and in Turkey (Neyzi, 2009, p. 3-4). It has been widely used in the Holocaust studies as constitution of an audial and visual archive in order to witness the genocide and cure the impacts. Likewise, in Turkey, the methodology was widely used in the studies regarding the traumatic social changes such as the 1980 military coup and genocide of ethnic groups.

Within the anthropology discipline, the term "cultural memory" (Assmann, 2011) refers to community-specific memory which constitutes the identity of community, over time. With this term Jan Assmann contributed to memory studies by emphasizing institutional and artificial aspects of memory. Cultural memory is constituted and transferred by the symbolic images of the community. Paul Connerton (1989) is another important name from anthropology. He emphasizes the performative side of events in terms of remembering. He also points out the lost link between individual and producing meaningful stories in modern times. He is also one of the important names who stated that forgetting is not quite the opposite of memory. Rather, memory is also shaped by forgetting (Connerton, 2009). In line with the idea stating that memory is not a dead repertoire, forgetting is more about losing the link of that social framework, rather than deleting the recollections. In other words, forgetting points out the disconnectedness between the recollections and the today's frameworks. On top of that, Connerton (1989) discusses that

individual remembers so as to justify its present context. In addition, Barry Schwartz (1996), John Czaplicka (1995), Eviatar Zerubavel (1996) and Michael Schudson (1997) approached the memory of communities from socio-cultural perspectives by analysing the symbolic and repetitive actions of the society.

Thanks to contemporary studies, Joel Candau (1998), Jakob Climo and Maria Cattell (2002), Olick and Robbins (1998), it is stated that now, it is possible to talk about a sub-area called anthropology of memory (Berliner, 2005, p. 197). However, as an important criticism, Berliner points out "the danger of overextension" of the term. Memory started to lose its specific context which distinguishes it from similar concepts such as identity or discourse (ibid, p. 198). The contemporary difficulties to cope with the intense information flux causes "fetishizing memory" (ibid, p. 199). He criticizes the view of Olick and Robbins that memory is defined from its functional and instrumental aspect of maintaining the social reproduction.

He importantly states that:

> It seems to me that the concept of memory has become a scientific common sense in the anthropological discourse, constantly and unthinkingly deployed.

> (ibid, p. 206)

Thus, as the social studies on memory started to be diversified, it has been difficult to plot the framework of the term. Accordingly, Berliner warns about what counts as memory and at which analytical stage. For such reasons, it is important to plot the framework of the concept and difference of it from the similar concepts like culture, discourse or identity for analytical purposes.

For the area in Turkey, Leyla Neyzi argues that memory studies area is a relatively new one. (2009, p. 3) Especially the social changes after the 12 September 1980 military coup; with the impacts of globalization and other important political changes, the interest to the recent history of Turkey increased. (ibid, p. 4) Social and

political eras starting from transformation of Ottoman Empire to Republic of Turkey to minority policies, have taken part in these studies.

On the other hand, oral history studies in Turkey have enabled researchers to analyse individual narratives. Since the official narratives taught in the schools do not include several events happened in the recent history, oral history was widely used in the recent history studies of Turkey. Arzu Öztürkmen talks about "*söz patlaması*" for the oral history studies especially for the studies done after 1980. In 1992, Istanbul University Women Studies Center; in 1993, Turkey Social and Economic History Association; in 1994, Women Literature Library and Information Center Association started to conduct the first institutional oral history studies (Öztürkmen, 2001-2002, p. 118). Among these, the "pilot study" that Women Literature Library conducted should be mentioned. Differently from the study that History Association has conducted with Paul Thompson, this study started with the meeting of the researchers from different disciplines to constitute a discussion group. The aim was to specify the theoretical and methodological foundations for a long term study that focuses on the women's oral history**.** Though never published, the research process itself, especially the discussions of ethical dimensions of oral history was remarkable.

In the middle of 1990s, the researchers working for different oral history gathered to discuss and share the finding of the different oral history studies conducted in different contexts (ibid). With the initiatives of Arzu Öztürkmen in 2000, International Oral History Association (IOHA) was held which was very useful for oral history studies to be known in Turkey (Neyzi, 1999, p. 5). In addition, audio and visual documentary studies accelerated in 2000s. Documentary Film Producers Union conducted a workshop in 1-3 March 1998. In this way, oral history studies in Turkey contributed to memory studies.

In the context of Turkey, the sub-areas focused on are gender (Akal, 2003), generation of early republic (Akşit, 2005), minorities (Altınay and Çetin, 2009), state and violence (Özgen, 2003), social trauma (Neyzi, 2008), local history

(Öztürkmen, 2003), urbanization (Şenol Cantek, 2003), migration and class (Erdoğan, 2002) (ibid, 2012). In addition, researches, conferences and classes conducted by Meltem Ahıska (2004) contributed to the critical development of theoretical framework of the term memory in Turkey.

From anthropology discipline in the Turkish context, Esra Özyürek (2006) and Yael Navaro-Yashin (2002) have been influential. While Özyürek analyses uses of different Ottoman and Republican symbols by political movements, Navaro-Yashin investigated the place of Atatürk mythology within popular culture.

It could be said that as memory studies area has established itself as an interdisciplinary sub-area within social sciences, the theory of memory has shifted from taking the elements of cultures as crystallized, essential and dead symbols to taking them within the historical analysis as social processes. Accordingly, with the pioneering contributions of Halbwachs, the discussed problematics on memory have become transfer, conservation and change of the frames constituting memory processes. In other words, memory has started to be as an issue of present, rather than of the past. This point is the fundamental reason why this study takes the memory concept to explain urban transformation. This also shows the changing connections of humans with their past. From history to memory, approach to agency of the individuals also has changed. For this study, discussion of memories on *gecekondu* is the very floor on which current discourses regarding urban transformation are built. All related issues such as modernity and class mobility dissolved in *gecekondu* discussions embodied themselves on what is remembered and forgotten about *gecekondu*. Moreover, in this study, the personal narratives of ordinary people are analysed. Thus, a sort of agency on the edition of their own narratives is attributed to individuals and ordinary people for the issues regarding urban transformation. In other words, the study focuses on social construction of memory by individuals and context of it in the present daily life.

In sum, it could be said that within anthropology discipline, most of the approaches within social sciences are constructed upon the ground built by Halbwachs. In this

sense, with the assumption that there is no absolute memory independent from the communities' values, the minor memories are traced through individual narratives. Furthermore, within such framing, memory is social, multiply framed, actively and dynamically constructed process which reveals the values and meanings of the present, rather than past. Remembering and forgetting as the two parts of the memory, are far from being antagonistically operating processes. Instead, remembering a meaning body of memoirs could only be possible through forgetting some parts of what has happened. Together, they constitute the concept memory. As another important implication, memory is constructed from the present. It is far from referencing to a closed box of recorded past events. Rather, it is constructed through present, i.e. while looking with the glasses and positions of the present. Moreover, it is used to legitimize the present positions. All these dimensions of memory are crucial for this study and they constitute the convenience of the term. Furthermore, these dimensions distinguish memory from other similar terms in terms of especially being a social framework, rather than a content.

Since this study is about memory of a specific place, it is equivalently important to frame the memory-place relationship.

3.2.2. Memory-Place Relationship

This section is a connecting branch between the *gecekondu* phenomenon as a spatio-social phenomenon and memory as a socio-political concept. Together, they constitute the backbone of the theoretical framework. On the memory and place relationship, Halbwachs clearly stated that memory cannot be constructed without referring the spatial frameworks (1980, p. 139-140). In other words, one of the frameworks of memory is space and without spatial framework, it is not possible for a social community to constitute memory.

> The group not only transforms the space into which it has been inserted, but also yields and adapts to its physical surroundings. It becomes enclosed within the framework it has built.

> (ibid, p. 130)

In other words, the walls of city are not just bulk of the stones; they are, at the same time, recklessness and stable meanings of the social groups. Furthermore, he states that:

> When a group has lived a long time in a place adapted to its habits, its thoughts as well as its movements are in turn ordered by the succession of images from these external objects.

(ibid, p. 133).

Here, Halbwachs states that habits and meanings of a human community can "be read" from the place since these abstract beings manifests itself through physical images. As it has been stated previously, Halbwachs was curious about what holds communities and social groups together. Intensely affected by Durkheim, his investigation remains within formulizations of the functional theories which see societies as complementarily working organisms with all its parts.

> That we remember only by transporting ourselves outside space is therefore incorrect. Indeed, quite the contrary, it is the spatial image alone that, by reason of its stability, gives us an illusion of not having changed through time and of retrieving the past in the present. But that's how memory is defined. Space alone is stable enough to endure without growing old or losing any of its parts.

(ibid, p. 156)

In the paragraph above, one can see its formulation on space. He clearly states that we can remember with space, not outside of it. It is the spatial orientations themselves that creates the perception that everything in their "original" position. However, they are not original or natural, rather, they are the unchanging spaces that are created before. In this way, space represents the groups' values and meanings. It could be said that Halbwachs' approach on space is structural, i.e. it enables one to reveal the meanings of the groups through reasoning out dynamics constituting the specific spatial orientations. Furthermore, though it seems that memory can exist outside of the space, it is the unchanging space itself that creates this illusion.

This also means that when the space is changed, the memory is changed since the frame of what is remembered and forgotten would shift. The groups' meanings and

values would be transformed into another sphere of meanings and values with the transformation of the space. If urban transformation is considered as a change and transformation of space in a neighbourhood, the recollections will change dependently.

At this point, in order to plot a meaningful framework on space, it is also necessary to mention the time approach in Halbwachsian perspective. In addition to Durkheim, he is also affected by Bergson and his understanding of subjective time, he states that there is an individual flow of time for each person. On the other hand, he also criticizes Bergsonian subjectivism, he builds his theory as socially constructed space and time. This requires introducing a sense of sharedness for time. He denies purely individual and subjective perceptions of time and states that:

> But certain objects are a meeting place for the thoughts of individuals. In any case, we picture those we meet in voice and gesture as having a sensory existence in space. Thus sections are cut out in both my duration and theirs that tend to extend to the durations or consciousnesses of other individuals (even to all people). We can imagine some kind of empty time to unfold between these successive common moments that we are assumed to remember—a common casing for the lived duration of personal consciousness, as the psychologist might say. We find it convenient to measure time by periodic natural movements of heavenly bodies or by creating artificial regulators such as watches because we are unable to find in the sequence of conscious states enough definite points of reference valid for every consciousness.

(ibid, p. 91)

Individual durations meet other individual durations of the social groups when they meet in certain spaces. Again, the space is at the center of the sensing of time for individuals. Though time is perceived singularly by each individual, there is "common time" that cross cuts these individual perceptions and creating collective sense of time due to sociality of the group members. Accordingly, he states that recollections could only be contextualized when one puts them into the time period in which they belong to. Indeed, this very formulization makes memory a social framework. This means that the individual memoirs are remembered only when a

time context is constructed. Thus, individual representations of past exist within the frame of time.

When one comes from Halbwachs' functional approach to present theories, several theorists criticizing modernity, capitalism and national state contributed to memory studies within the area of space-memory relationship. To being with, Pierre Nora, through his concept *lieux de mémoire*, i.e. sites of memory, he states that space carries and transmits the meanings and ideologies of the present. Through the symbolic and representational orientation of space, evoking the feelings and emotions, and also witnessing the rituals and ceremonies; sites of memory construct the past in a monolithic way as the homogenous and single voice of the history raises. Accordingly, he points out that rapid increase in memory studies is due to disappearance of real environments of memory (Nora, 1989, p. 7).

As Halbwachs does, he contrasts memory with the history in terms of agency. In this way, memory has more "human" elements than the monolithic, natural, humanless, anonymous and even universal narrative of history. It is necessary to state that Nora's history points out the nationalist and heroic narrative of nation states. Ideologically, sites of memory are constituted as an answer to the ambiguity of meaning in the imagination of nation states (ibid, p. 9). Thus, here the space is the key element of evoking such emotions and thereby constituting and transferring this a single voice of history.

Obviously, considering *gecekondu* neighbourhoods as sites of memory would be incorrect. Sites of memory are more of the places that are ideologically constituted in order to make a social groups remember the past events in a certain way. *Gecekondu*, in this discussion is not inside the scope of the term of sites of memory but Nora's conceptualization of the relation between memory and place is remarkable for this study. That is, memory is a social frame constructed though the specific way of orientation of space, rather than a body of content, a continuum of strategies, and a phenomenon that has value with its functionality rather than its

existence (ibid, p. 10). In this respect, for this study, his theorization is illustrative to show that the space is central for the memory.

3.3. Nostalgia

At the first glance, the term nostalgia connotes yearning for a condition or a state of mind that could never be experienced again. This idea implies a kind of "golden age" or a "peak point" that will not be reached again.

It is true that nostalgia means yearning for the past. In fact, it refers to a specific period in the personally experienced past. In this way, the actor always looks for a home, an authentic origin or stable meaning (Tannock, 1995, p. 453). However, nostalgia is not merely looking back and yearning for "the golden age". This state of mind itself has a function in the society. Moreover, there is not only one type of nostalgia. On the contrary, there is "presence of multiple and different nostalgias among individuals and communities and social groups" (ibid, p. 454). Likewise, nostalgia is not pathological or regressive. It answers personal needs and political desires.

In order to elaborate the functions of the nostalgia for the individual and the society, under the following three titles, starting from history and early uses of the concept; the relation between social change and nostalgia and utopian aspect of nostalgia are plotted.

3.3.1. A Brief Discussion on History and Early Uses of the Concept

The word nostalgia consists of two Greek words: *Nostos* means return home and *algia* means a painful condition. Thus, the word literally means a painful yearning to return home (Davis, 1979, p. 414). However, Svetlana Boym (2001, p. 3) states that although the word nostalgia is composed of two Greek words, it did not originate in ancient Greek. In fact, the term is first used by Swiss doctor Johannes Hofer in a medical paper in 1688. In this context, the term was viewed as

"pathological homesickness among Swiss mercenaries who were fighting far from their homeland" (Rosaldo, 1989, p. 108).

In the seventeenth century, the term nostalgia was viewed as a physical and curable disease rather than a mental situation, used especially by the medical doctors. In such view, nostalgia was conceptualized as a disease disfunctioning the body and causes nausea, loss of appetite, pathological changes in lungs brain inflammation, cardiac arrests, high fever, marasmus and propensity for suicide. Thus, with such serious looking symptoms, the roots of the term are from area of medicine rather than poetry or literature.

As Boym (2001) further stated, in fact, though some of the symptoms of it were similar to melancholia, nostalgia was not an individual anxiety but a public condition that points out the contradictions of modernity. When the similar conditions like melancholia and hypochondria, the nostalgic has a utopian view of the world as the notion of a "lost paradise" implies. Thereby, they remember sensations, tastes, smells and sounds fascinatingly that the residents of homeland cannot do.

Furthermore, nostalgia is about a sense of lost that is romanticized to an extent, however, this does not mean that the nostalgic were properly remember and fully capable of where to look for the losses. Accordingly, doctors of eighteenth and nineteenth century looked for a single source for this disease. Then, nostalgia was started to be perceived as a "curable disease" than "incurable illness".

3.3.2. Social Change and the Theory of Nostalgia

Jean Starobinsky (1966, p. 89-90) defines nostalgia as "an emotional upheaval which is related to workings of memory." In this formulization, sense of nostalgia is associated with (most probably the positive) emotions evoked by the memories. The current context of nostalgia is being discussed in relation with the social changes. Starobinsky further states about the changing conceptualization for nostalgia as:

In psychiatry, several concepts have taken the place of nostalgia. They correspond, on the one hand, to a determined effort to analyze the behavior of nostalgic people. On the other hand, they have radically modified the very idea of the disease. The emphasis has changed. We no longer speak of disease but of reaction; we no longer underline the desire to return but, on the contrary, the failure of adaptation. When we speak of "depressive reactions of social maladjustment", the name given to the phenomenon has ceased to designate a place and a history, as in the case of nostalgia; we no longer follow the hypothesis that repatriation will result in a cure. We emphasize, rather, the lack of adaptation to the new society which the individual must live in. The theory of nostalgia put the accent on the original environment (on the Heim); the theory of inadaptation accentuates the paramount necessity of reintegration into an existing milieu. In many respects, this transformation of concept and terminology is indicative of the change which has taken places as a result of the process of urbanization. The theory of nostalgia was developed in Europe at the time of the rise of the great cities when greatly improved means of transportation made movements of the population much easier. But, at the same time, the social unit of the village, the particularities of the province, the local customs, the local dialects continued to exert all their influence. Between the village environment and the conditions encountered by an individual in the city or in the army, there was a great difference. The village environment, highly structured, constituted an important influence. The desire to return had a literal meaning; it was oriented toward a given geographical area, it concentrated on a given localized reality.

(ibid, p. 101-102)

As is stated in the paragraph above, the context in which nostalgia discussed within the scientific community changed in the direction of defining it as a reaction due to an inability to conform or resisting to the irrevocable changes. Also, this context implies the necessity of the adaptation to the new social environment which evolved against one's will. In this context, once the standarts of time was created, the act of looking back is defined as "disintegration" or "maladaptation". In this context, the adaptation refers to accepting the differentiation between time partitions as "the past", "the present" and "the future". They have definited with article "the" because they symbolize certain experienced moments. For *gecekondu* discussion here for example, "the past" refers to the previous daily life in *gecekondu* neighbourhood which shaped by the spatio-social reality: muddy, unhealthy living conditions, poverty etcetra. Accordingly, to construct "the future", i.e. the better conditions,

healthy environments to live, better life chances for children etcetra., the actions has been taken in "the present", i.e. demolishing *gecekondu* houses and constructing new building instead. However, subjective time is a whole, not a fragmented one and when the radical changes in one's spatio-social environment do not entirely close the so called previous chapter by forgetting, nostalgia emerges.

Starobinsky (1966) also importantly stated that the theoretical approaches to nostalgia have been developed in the times of great changes in Europe. This means that in the urban areas in which a great change happened, a pattern of nostalgia has likely to emerge. In the cases of migration, while the way of life in rural area has an influence on the individuals in urban area, in the cities there is a different life model according to which individuals have to orient themselves. Therefore, from such difference, "yearning to return to home" emerged.

The nostalgia experienced after modernity is about the loss of enchanted world due to distinct and strict borders and meanings, i.e. a more socially based phenomenon. Boym (2001) states that it may be a secular kind of expression for loss of the spiritual aspects of life. When the mechanical clocks started to state the time in equally measured divisions, a huge anxiety emerges to control and organize the future as it creates a sense of slipping by.

As it is stated at the beginning of the section 3.1, nostalgia refers to ideas of "golden age", "home", "prelapsarian period". Modern experience of time dislodged individual's attachment of a specific house, locality, land or a region. In today's conditions, differently from the pre-modern times, "*home* is no longer where the heart is." (Davis, 1979, p. 6). In fact, for this reason, the idea of place of birth or home desired to return frequently associated with the childhood memories and the influences of the parents. Accordingly, it could be said that the memories of childhood have a particular place in the narratives of nostalgia.

Further to this, the living spaces are ceaselessly changing and in most of the cases, the logic and mechanisms of these changes is determined by the external forces than

the actors at stake. This could be the state, the state institutions or the powerful actors of neo-liberal market rules. It does not mean that the individual does not have any role or agency. Moreover, the actors mostly find themselves in a game in which they deeply feel that the rules were not determined by them. However, especially for the urban transformation cases in Turkey, resisting against the changes which are declared as "mega projects" carries the risk of staying completely irrelevant to the one's neighbourhood. Also, while these projects are being designed, especially the ones prepared for the *gecekondu* neighbourhoods, the psychological and social dimensions are not being planned well. Since urban transformation does not merely change in the spatial dimension, when they are overlooked, other dimensions remains acontextual and people could not find themselves meanings to hold. This may create the action of continuously looking back and trying to find meanings, values and "customs" in the past which ultimately has a contribution to the nostalgic look.

It is necessary to keep in mind the memory conceptualization of Halbwachs since nostalgia can be considered as a specific form of memory. In the first place, similarly with the editing actor of the memory, for nostalgia, one can talk about the nostalgic actor who is looking to the past experiences nostalgically. Secondly, nostalgia and its context are constructed from today and today's conditions. This kind of conceptualization also challenges the modern conceptualization of time which divides the duration into equal, consecutive and measurable units as seconds, minutes, hours etcetra. As Halbwachs reminded (fed by Bergsonian conceptualization of duration), there is a subjective flow of time which is plotted inside the societies' meaning frameworks. In other words, it could be said that past is not passed. The subjective time is rather a continuous flow during which some factually happened events are forgotten and remembered with certain connotations. In the individual flow of time, "the past" is discussed, interpreted and reconstructed at the present and for the future by the actor. As as a result, in some occasions, "the past" is yearned for and this is about present and the future, more than "the past".

Nostalgia, is a specific form of memory and this exclusivity of the nostalgia comes from the fact that it indicates positively remembered events of "the past". People are not nostalgic about what they remember with negative connotations (Davis, 1979, p. 14). This is about what is "unfortunately" changed in their lives. The second special characteristic of nostalgia comes from the contrast between "before and "after". In such imagination, "before" points out a kind of "so good to be true" period. The moment of change is a "lapse" in which past started to be periodized. Therefore, nostalgic look to past is also a periodizing action (Tannock, 1995, p. 456-457). "Good" aspects of their experiences before the social changes are remembered in a nostalgic manner. In fact, the very "goodness" of these events comes from the negatively evaluated present (ibid).

Social change affects the individual perception of the self. For the individual, nostalgia has a function for pursuit of continuity for the personal identity (Davis, 1979, p. 31). Therefore, it is an attempt to salvage the self from chaotic and out-of-context past experience (ibid, p. 33). In this way, nostalgia a specific form of relating the personal past with the present. During the action of pursuit for continuation of identity, nostalgia magnifies some segments of personal past while simultaneously blurs other parts (ibid, p. 31). One of the aspects of prettifying the past is nostalgia's exclusion of the negative parts. While removing the painful and shameful parts, nostalgia serves for the plot of meaningful timeline of the identity. As a result, it could be said that people feel nostalgic most frequently in the times of transformation of their selves. Although potentially originated by discontinuities of the self, nostalgia created by both continuities and discontinuities of people's personal identities. Related with the discontinuity of the identity, nostalgia is an answer to the changes in social level. Davis (1979) states that in times of war, crisis or scandals; people are more likely to feel nostalgic about the past in which those events does not exist. He states that:

> The current nostalgia wave offers, as many social critic has noted, a retreat, a haven, an oasis, if you will, from the anxieties vast numbers felt (and continue to feel) about proposed alterations in mores and custom. And these

alterations were not merely proposed; often they were enacted aggressively with all due media publicity, by one and another aggrieved minority that had until then suffered and chafed under the established scheme of things.

(Davis, 1979, p. 107)

As it is clearly stated, nostalgia functions for holding onto the past meanings and contexts and bringing them into the scene again which were broken off by the current social changes. Therefore, it could be said that nostalgia is a response to the social change.

Nostalgia is also about human alienation to both natural and social worlds (Turner, 1987, p. 149-150). According to Turner, there are four dimensions of nostalgia. The first points out a historical decline and loss of "the home" which brings the idea of "golden age", a peak point that one will never reach again similar to the idea of "the fall of Adam" from heaven to the earth. The second dimension implies a moral discontinuity through the lines in which one's personal story was somehow broken down. It is a collapse of well-functioning human relations and social milieu. This dimension is also about the loss of spiritual values as a result of the changes in the direction of modern materialist world. The third is the loss of personal freedom and autonomy which implies the reification of the individual in front of the strict state bureaucracies. The last one is the loss of simplicity, personal authenticity and emotional spontaneity. The authentic way of life is replaced with the culture promoted by the new society for the sake of the continuity of the nation state.

Besides, Fritzsche reveals that:

> I argue that nostalgia is a fundamentally modern phenomenon because it depended on the notion of historical process as the continual production of the new.

(2001, p. 1589)

In the fragmented time notion as "the past", "the present" and "the future"; within the evolutionary model, everything is in its proper place in accordance with the present daily life. Within this idea of progress, both "retrograde aspects of past and

69

rational endeavours of the present" are able to provide legitimate ground for it. (ibid, p. 1590). Therefore, no temporal difference is implied. Rather, a homogenized forever-continuing present is presented.

He further discusses that:

> But, in contrast to the Christian worldview, modern time did not admit a final conclusion of judgment or rebirth but, rather, gave way to a growing recognition of the ceaseless iteration of loss, so much so that Richard Terdiman points to a far-reaching "memory crisis" at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The "massive disruption of traditional forms of memory" that was the result of the growing illegitimacy of tradition and the incongruity of experience after the French Revolution opened up new ways to approach and consume the past. Well-articulated despair over the disappearance of the past combined with growing insistence on the need to work at its recollection; while the past was no longer present, it was constantly, even obsessively, represented in reflection and mourning.

(ibid, p. 1591)

He relates the well-known discussion of "memory crisis" with the disconnection of "the past" with "the present", and states that it ends up with the emergence of nostalgic look to "the past". It could be said that when the individuals find themselves in an unceasing present to which they have limited power to transform it in the direction of their expectations, i.e. the modern hegemony on time by the modern subjectivity, this "painful yearning" becomes apparent.

The idea of adaptation approach opens a space to discuss the emerging patterns of the nostalgic reaction to a social change. In other words, the approach well underlines the relation between the social change and emerging nostalgic look to one's new life. However, it still implies a specific normative life style to which the subjects have to adapt. Accordingly, nostalgia implies a regression, a desire to stay and live in the previous conditions, sometimes a conservative approach. However, nostalgia may also play a role in social criticism and political protest (Turner, 1987, p. 154). This is due to its potential power to connect "the past" and "the present" with "the future".

3.3.3. Nostalgia and Utopia

Nostalgia is frequently associated with will to preserve, resistance to change and conservatism. While nostalgia has characteristics of keeping the customs belonging the past contexts and frames, utopia often related with the future imagination, expectations and fantasies. Similarly, in the language of daily politics, nostalgia is associated with rightest thoughts, while utopia with the leftist thoughts since leftist line of thoughts often includes change and revolution. In this thesis, this idea is problematized. Furthermore, it is claimed that a nostalgic look of the individuals to social changes may refer not only to their discomfort to present social life but also their future expectations, imaginations and dreams.

It is crucial to state that there are multiple kinds of nostalgia. Accordingly, these different nostalgias point out different experiences of individuals and different social frames and contexts (Tannock, 1995, p. 454). As it is stated at the beginning of this section nostalgia is far from being delusional or pathological. In fact, an emerging nostalgic pattern points out needs and imaginations both in individual and social level. Consequently, nostalgia has a political function in the society.

The idea is that, if one goes back and looks a period of time nostalgically, this shows that there is a will to look critically to one's present and also future since it may mean that one is looking for a framework that could be useful for the future. In this way, nostalgia looks for the past as a stable source of meaning and contexts (ibid, p. 455). A flux of change jumps into the middle of one's life conflicts with the desire for stability. Nostalgia emerges from these lines. This is the point that Davis plots as the desire of identity for the continuation. What Tannock further argues is that:

> Davis's suggestion provides a useful starting point for conceptualizing nostalgia, but it needs to be taken a step further: for discontinuity, far from being simply experienced by the nostalgic subject, and far from being simply the engendering condition of nostalgia, is also and always at the same time a discontinuity posited by the nostalgic subject.

(ibid, p. 456-457)

He discusses the fact that the very positionality of the discontinuity is determined by the actor itself. Therefore, the "prelapsarian" moment before "the lapse", i.e. the social change, may be a factual event whose existence cannot be denied. It could be a huge transformation moment in one's daily life. However, the individual at stake, as the social actor, states the malfunctioning parts of the present for itself. It points out an opponent look to the changed daily life.

Tannock (1995) states that nostalgia includes retreat and retrieval aspects at the same time. However, these two aspects of the nostalgia should not be regarded as firmly negative and positive poles of nostalgia (ibid, p. 459). Together with these two sides, nostalgia functions as brings past to present to construct the future. It could also be read as an effort to combine these artificially segregated part of the time which originated from the pursuit for continuation of the self.

He again raises a critique to Davis's idea of seeing nostalgia as a safety valve in the society and states that:

> Nostalgia, by sanctioning soothing and utopian images of the past, lets people adapt both to rapid social change and to changes in individual life histories - changes, in the latter case, that may well lead into social roles and positions (of adolescence, adulthood, old age) in which individual agency, sense of identity, and participation in community are severely restricted. Davis's analysis, insofar as it refers to institutionalized spaces for nostalgia, has to be taken seriously; but, if the nostalgic retreat always comprises both critique and alternative, then these officially sanctioned spaces may well, at certain points in history, provide sites, materials, and inspiration for meaningful social change.

(ibid, p. 459)

It is argued in the paragraph above that nostalgia is an answer to social change as Davis states, however, retreat side within nostalgia may include critique and alternative sides. Furthermore, in this way, nostalgia may show a more meaningful type of social change. When read in this manner, nostalgia highlights how these discontinuities are interpreted rather than the discontinuities themselves. Consequently, by taking how individual interpreted them into the center of the

discussion. An emerged nostalgic pattern may refer to malfunctioning parts of the social change at stake and may lead a more meaningful change.

> Similarly, by placing indigenous voices and cultural institutions in an ethnographic past, the ethnographer denies the fact that these voices represent alternative cultural futures, futures which are struggling to find a place within the structures and movements of the contemporary world system.

> (ibid, p. 460)

In this way, nostalgia may point the dissident voices to the existing imagination of the future. In fact, the idea of the "prelapsarian moment" itself implies that the moment in which the "lapse" happened came from the outside, i.e. performed by an external force. Taking "the lapse" itself points out that the actor did not internalized and takes the change as an unfortunate external event.

In the context of social criticism and political protest, Turner further argues that:

> In a similar fashion, we may suggest that while Marx himself rejected the village and peasant vulture as a vegetative life, Marxism has been a radical form of nostalgia, since, within a theological framework, it regards capitalism as a fall from the primitive communism of the dawn of the history. Within this Marxist nostalgic paradigm, communism represents a return to the Garden of Eden prior to the emergence of private property, the division of labour, and the cash nexus.

> (Turner, 1987, p. 154)

When the construction of Marxist theory as a meta-narrative and the Hegelian teleological history conceptualization are considered, the point that Turner shows is remarkable. However, neither social criticism nor Marxist theory consist only this point. There is another crucial idea in both Marxist theory and the theories of political protest keeps, which has a potential to change in the direction of a community's dreams, hopes and future expectations: the idea of utopia.

Having appreciated the political implications of nostalgia, it needs to be stated that it underlines the alternative experiences that may otherwise stay unnoticed. Within

the frame of dynamic relation of the memory with "the past", it is worth thinking the potentialities of nostalgia to shape "the future".

Meaning a place "too good to be real", the idea of utopia is highly related with the nostalgia. Through the term "sustainable nostalgia", Davies argues the role of nostalgia while construction of the future within the ecological criticism. He notes on the idea of sustainability as:

> Sustainability seeks to enable us to predict and determine the future. It subordinates change to itself, saturating the future with the present. It does not require pure repetition: it is not essential to a sustainable transport programme, for instance, that today we rely exclusively on a transport system that could be used indefinitely far into the future.

> (Davies, 2010, p. 263)

Merging the sustainable development idea of ecological movement with the idea of nostalgia, he states that physical endurance thought may be productive. In this way, what nostalgia may potentially say about "the future" is underlined. In this way, the nostalgia is conceptualized as:

> Nostalgia becomes a utopian environmental and social programme. *Nostos*, homecoming, describes the unlimited recuperation or layering of the present that will enable us to experience it as definitively our home; *algos*, suffering, describes the critical work and the material renunciation that are needed for that sustainable habitation to begin.

> (ibid, p. 264)

The utopian view of the new world is plotted along the two lines in which what is re-imagined and what is wished to be preserved. The opening space of nostalgia into the ecological criticism is a resource for argument rather than a specified mode of thought. This means thinking on how nostalgia can possibly reflect upon the ways in which led to a self-sustaining design of space.

In line of such conceptualization, Boym (2001) distinguishes two kinds of nostalgia as restorative and reflective nostalgia. In her theory, these two were used to define the tendencies of giving meaning to the passage of the time. While the first one fills

the "loss home" gap emerging from the mechanical separation of "past" and "present", the second type highlights the painful side of the yearning and the imperfection of the present experience. Although she specifically used the first type to define the nationalist movements, the idea of bringing some parts of "the past" to "the future" remains important to state. Reflective nostalgia on the other hand, spend time on the dysfunctional parts of "the past".

Though discussing the Boym's illustrative separation, Davies states that Susan Stewart's connection of nostalgia and utopia is more useful for sustainable growth concept of ecology since it underlines "the reunification of culture with biology". Therefore, the desire for nostalgia can be sceptical and critical. It can plot the potential expectations in the connection of the three imagined fragments of time. As long as hope and utopia can be included to the discussions of nostalgia, it can point out to imagination of an alternative way of living in which a resistance to cultural homogenization can emerge and an agency can be attributed to the powerless.

CHAPTER 4

ŞENTEPE IN MEMORIES

As socio-spatial phenomenon, *gecekondu* emerged in 1950s in Turkey, due to agricultural mechanization in rural areas. The city Ankara, as the capital of Turkey was at the heart of the nation building process of the new republic. In the direction of "renunciation of inheritance" from the Ottoman Empire, İstanbul, as former favourite, has been discarded (Cantek, 2003, p. 39). In short, having nothing special than the other Central Anatolian settlements of that time, Ankara has been selected to be a model for the remaining cities of the young republic.

Figure 1: A photo of Yenimahalle in 1950s

Yenimahalle, as a social housing settlement established in 1946-1949 in Ankara, was designed to provide houses to the low income groups, to especially the low income civil servants who were able to pay the housing instalments regularly. Yenimahalle designed as a modern housing settlement of the capital so as to reflect

the "new" face of the regime. To ensure this, not only housing zones but also public places, parks and places for cultural events like cinema have been constructed.

For the lower classes who did not afford to pay instalments for the housing, on the other hand, nothing has been foreseen. With the effects of the mechanization of agriculture in rural areas, in 1950s, when rural population started to migrate to urban areas due to financial difficulties; in the absence of a regulatory mechanism providing a housing for them, the migrated population constructed themselves houses in the nights especially on the public lands. These houses called *gecekondu*, meaning "built overnight". The name well explains the immediate need for shelter built in just one night as well as the aspect without legal permission due to constructed at the night, rather than day time.

As a neighbourhoods bounded to Yenimahalle district, Şentepe hill was one of the many *gecekondu* neighbourhoods hosted the migrated population since the beginnings of 1960s. Being a *gecekondu* settlement at the beginning, Şentepe, has had different social structures from 1960s to 2010s, depending on the changing social and political dynamics.

Şentepe is located approximately 12 km far from the city center, Kızılay. In Figure 2 the red dot is the location of Şentepe neighbourhood in Ankara city. Within borders of Yenimahalle district, Şentepe lies on the north-west development axis of Ankara and is surrounded by Karşıyaka Graveyard on the east; Keçiören district on the east; İvedik Organized Industrial Zone on the west and regularly parcelled settlements of neighbourhoods of Yenimahalle on the south (Özdemirli, 2012, p. 188). The hills of Şentepe have the altitude of 1,200 meters which is one of the highest altitudes of the hills in Ankara (ibid, p. 250).

Figure 2: Location of Şentepe in Ankara city, taken from Google maps

Figure 3: View from Yenimahalle, Miralay Nazım Bey Street to Vakıflar Hill, i.e.
Şentepe at the present

The urban areas on which *gecekondus* constructed were mostly the public lands which were excluded from zoning due to their topographical characteristics. Likewise, Şentepe was a mountainous vast land for when compared to the topographical characteristics of Yenimahalle and it was rather difficult to construct houses in there. (The border between Yenimahalle Şentepe which creates a daily language use such as "climbing up to Şentepe" and "walking down to Yenimahalle" is due to this very characteristic, in fact. As another consequence of this characteristic, Şentepe had -and still has- transportation difficulty while going to the city center.) Gradually establishing Yenimahalle and a sight from Yenimahalle to Vakıflar Hill, i.e. Şentepe at the present can be seen from Figure 3 above.

It is important to state that the evolution of Şentepe from 1950s to present day is in line with the general context presented for the evolution of *gecekondu* neighburhoods in Turkey in Chapter 3. Accordingly, the patterns in the evolution of Şentepe show several similarities with other *gecekondu* neighbourhoods in Turkey. On the other hand, it is equally important to discuss the particularity of Şentepe amongst the similar neighbourhoods in other cities of Turkey. Therefore, in this chapter, the aim is to present a picture regarding the history of Şentepe. This work is done here by following the memories of different residents regarding Şentepe.

Though the aim is to plot the history of Şentepe, there is no such "official history" for Şentepe since it took time for the neighbourhood to get a legal status. In same resources regarding Yenimahalle, which are discussed in detail in the following title, Şentepe often mentioned as "*gecekondu* district of Yenimahalle". For this reason, the individual memories in which the past experiences were told were provided and analzed together with the larger social transformations and dynamics.

Consequently, to be able to present a picture for past of Şentepe, my account here consists of layers. In the first one, the global and national dynamics affecting the place are discussed. In the second, specifically, relationality of the studied subject with those dynamics is mentioned, with the help of several resources and previously done studies on Şentepe. In the final layer, the data I gathered from the field is used

to contribute the available knowledge on Şentepe and its recent transformation. The data in the final layer consists of the information provided by interviewees on Şentepe and on their lives in Şentepe, together with my observations and background knowledge.

As it is discussed in Chapter 2, there are four relevant studies with this research done exactly on Şentepe neighbourhood (written in chronological order): Pınar Özcan (2005), Nermin İveynat (2008), Nilüfer Korkmaz Yaylagül (2008) and Yelda Özdemirli (2012). The studies of İveynat and Özdemirli have important details on urban transformation process of the neighbourhood while Yaylagül's thesis includes important points on social structure and formation of it. The useful knowledge from these resources were merged with the data I gathered from the field.

Yelda Özdemirli states that there are important historical moments regarding urban transformation in Şentepe (2012, p. 187). The first moment is the beginning of 1960s that is the emergence of first *gecekondu* houses appeared in there. The second one is after 1980, the period in which 1/5000 scale Master Plan, i.e. *"Şentepe Gecekondu Bölgesine Ait Nazım İmar Planı",* has been done. The plan has been prepared in 1984 and in between 1986-1989 when Mustafa Vuran, candidate of Motherland Party (ANAP) was the mayor of Yenimahalle Municipality. The last one is at the beginning of 2000s, in 2004 when Ahmet Duyar, candidate of Justice and Development Party (AKP) is the mayor of Yenimahalle Municipality. In fact, these two periods coincide with "two different eras of growth in construction" in the history of Turkey that Balaban has pointed out in section 3.1.3. The last transformation project has been done due to "inefficiency" of the first transformation in 1984 according to municipality's report. In the second transformation which was declared as project named "Şentepe Transformation Project", the municipality has also made some institutional changes in order to ease the transformation procedures for the developers (ibid, p. 187). These two moments for urban transformation are discussed in this chapter.

When the major transformations in Turkey is considered, Tarık Şengül divides urban experience into three distinct phases: the urbanisation of the state in the context of nation-state formation; the urbanisation of labour power in the context of rapid migration from rural areas; and finally the urbanisation of capital in the context of globalisation (2017, p. 408-409). The first period covers the years between 1923-1950 while the second covers 1950-1980 and the third covers 1980 and onwards.

For Şentepe, two radical moments for spatial transformation can be discussed. The first is the changes after 1980, namely, the legalization attempts of *gecekondus* with land certificates in 1984; and the transformation after 2000, which was declared as an "urban trasnformation project".

When the gathered data is considered in this study, it is appropriate to discuss the issues regarding "Şentepe in memories" under four sections in total. The first section discusses the historical border between Yenimahalle and Şentepe. This opening is necessary in order to address the approach that takes the researcher as a social category, namely, self-reflexivity. Accordingly, within three titles starting from establishment of Yenimahalle with the name "*Ucuz Arsa Evleri*" (Cheap Parcel Houses), the social border between these two districts is plotted. The period between 1960 and 1970 is remarkable not only for *gecekondu* formation in Ankara but also specifically in Şentepe since the neighbourhood witnessed an intense wave of migration from the nearby cities. Most of the people I talked in the field arrived in Şentepe in this period. Therefore, this period is discussed under a separate title. The period between 1970 and 1980 is discussed in a separate section due to the remarkable political dynamism in the neighbourhood within this period. Şentepe, back then, were named as "rescued region". At the end of this politically dynamic period, 12 September military coup has come and as also Şengül has stated; the structural transformations and changes in the economic, political and social dimensions are remarkable. Also in 1990s, different political issues emerged such as ethnic identities in the neighbourhood. Hence, as the fourth section, the period between the years 1980 and 2000 is discussed. The second urban transformation has

been done in 2004 and the changes within the scope of this transformation is remarkable for the neighbourhood which is discussed in the next chapter, Chapher 5, in order to be able to plot the nostalgic look by the residents more clearly.

4.1. Yenimahalle, Şentepe and the Border in between

To contextualize my position mediating the whole study, social border between Yenimahalle and Şentepe is discussed in this section through the following titles: (1) the establishment of Yenimahalle as a solution to housing problem at the second half of 1940s and the roots of remembering neighbourhood as "middle class utopia", (2) how local authorities view Şentepe in their narratives, and (3) the discussions on the border between Yenimahalle and Şentepe supported by the interviews in the 1st phase of this study.

4.1.1. Establishment of Yenimahalle: *"Ucuz Arsa Evleri"* (Cheap Parcel Houses)

The first residence places in Yenimahalle have been built between the years 1946-1949 with the purpose of providing residential area for low-income families (civil servants, small business owners) with the efforts of the 9th mayor of Ankara city, Dr. Ragıp Tüzün (Yenimahalle Belediyesi, n.d.). From the date 01.09.1957, Yenimahalle has become a town of Ankara city (ibid).

The first gecekondu houses were seen in 1930s in Ankara. The state has taken action after Second World War in response to housing problem. At the end of 1940s, the population residing in shanty houses has reached 100,000 which constitutes 34% of population in Ankara at that time. During 22 March 1948 dated meeting in the assembly, Mayor Ragıp Tüzün has stated that the area around İstanbul Caddesi at that time, was pointed out as "*amele mahallesi*" (worker neighbourhood). However, since this neighbourhood has not been parcelled and turned into housing zone, shanty settlement has arosen (As cited in Tokman, 1985, p. 13-14). In fact, the dwellers in this area consisted of not only workers of service sector but also civil

servants mostly coming outside of the city who saw shanty settlement as a solution to housing problem (ibid).

After the legal regulations and the infrastructure works was done, the lands have been parceled and sold to an affordable price. The initial name of Yenimahalle was "Cheap Parcel Houses" due to its affordable opportunities of housing (Ceylan, 2012, p. 13).

In order to have a house in Yenimahalle, as per the law number 5218, the candidates should have not owned any land or housing property in Ankara. The ones who buy land from Yenimahalle had to build a house themselves in a residence type that the municipality stated (Ceylan, 1986, p. 28). In Law number 5218 and 5228, *"mesken buhranı"* (the housing problem) was mentioned. In accordance with this law, for the housing in Yenimahalle, parceled lands have been sold in quite affordable prices. The people who bought lands were responsible for the construction of houses and for this, loans opportunities were provided (Tokman, 1985, p. 37). With such characteristics, Yenimahalle has been mentioned as a unique example of social housing in Ankara, target groups of which were mostly lower income middle class civil servants coming mostly from the nearby cities.

Mehmet Uğur, an officer from the municipality, in 1954, summarizes the reasons for constructing Yenimahalle as a new housing neighborhood into three: preventing unlicensed construction, regulating unplanned neighborhoods according to a master plan and finally easing and speeding up an affordable and healthy housing construction (As cited in Cantek, 2016, p. 44). The added phrase *"yeni"*, meaning new, to the name of neighborhood reflects the new face of the young republic which is modern but not ostentatious.

In line with such ideological background, planning of Ankara city after proclamation as capital had specific challenges. Tansı Şenyapılı states five of them in between the years 1923-1930: (1) Difficulty of establishing a functional urban fabric which reflects the modern, glorious and sustainability of the new regime, while zoning "old

town" for construction, (2) also planning the new area for housing for the new comers; (3) establishing an appropriate infrastructure for the future of the capital parallel to the city development, (4) placing superstructures as required by modern life in city and (5) establishing the organizational frame which provides solution for these developments (1985, p. 19-20).

Figure 4: Construction of one of the houses in Yenimahalle in 1950s

Thus, the capital city Ankara has been planned according to these needs of the new regime and government model. As a result, a similar distinction has been occurred between old town, i.e. the oldest settlement area around Ankara castle and the new center called Yenişehir around Kızılay. In Ankara, instead of traditional wooden and

adobe houses, concrete and single detached houses with garden has been built[5] (ibid, p. 44).

As Yıldız Tokman stated, while land distribution in Yenimahalle was being done, one point was emphasized: the candidates would respect to law and order which means they would not build shanty houses. For the governing elites, shanty towns were beyond being illegal settlements, in fact, their very existence was seen as irritating per se (Cantek, 2016, p. 46). In Yenimahalle, municipality aimed to create a new and entirely modern neighborhood, not only in terms of physical settlements but also in social and cultural aspects.

4.1.2. Şentepe as "*Gecekondu* Area in Yenimahalle"

Yenimahalle is mentioned as "a sort of laboratory" and "experience area" by Mustafa Ceylan, an officer from Yenimahalle municipality, since he stated that the district taught the local authorities a lot in terms of urban planning with all consequences, foreseen and unforeseen (1986, p. 32). In the book, Yenimahalle is mentioned with the values of the republic like the image of Atatürk, as "the eternal leader", through historical memoirs. Yenimahalle is also introduced as "industrial district" with the zones such as Ostim and other public and private institutions that make manufacturing such as ASELSAN (Military Electronics Industries) (ibid, p. 40-42). *Gecekondu* in this book is argued under the title of services of municipality in the context of unauthorized land owning. The directorate that "look for solutions to *gecekondu* issue" was mentioned as *Gecekondu* and Social Housing Directorate. The book also states that in 1984, the municipality has been certified 5,000 land registry. Furthermore, it announces that in Güventepe and Burç quarters, as the two quarters bounded to Şentepe, rehabilitation and zoning works has been done (ibid, p. 47-48).

In another printed booklet by Yenimahalle municipality targeted for children, *Ankara'nın Batıya Açılan Penceresi, İlçemizi Tanıyalım*, Şentepe is mentioned as

---

[5] These "old Yenimahalle houses" has a unique place in architectural literature of Ankara city.

"*gecekondu* areas of Yenimahalle" as such with example of Yahyalar district, while Demetevler and Karşıyaka are mentioned as "*çarpık kentleşme örnekleri*" (examples of irregular urbanization) (2003, p. 12). Also in this book, Yenimahalle is represented as "*modern yaşam şehri*" (town of modern life). It has also been argued that Yenimahalle municipality provides housing lands for affordable price to low income citizens in order to prevent squatting (ibid, p. 40).

Figure 5: An old photo of Pamuklar Farm, Şentepe in 1952

An interviewee residing in Yenimahalle, Mehmet, from the 1st phase of the study, stated that there were discussions on social media between residents of Yenimahalle and of Şentepe. In a private Facebook group consisted of present and old Yenimahalle residents and lovers, a discussion on whether residents of Şentepe are counted as "*Yenimahalleli*", a person from Yenimahalle, or not. He stated that one friend of him objected to such "elitism". He also explained that this friend of him studied at one of the oldest and rooted high schools and then moved to Şentepe. Accordingly, it is also unfair to call him as "not *Yenimahalleli*". I also observed that while talking with the residents of Yenimahalle, they welcomed me warmly and

even praised with me, after I stated that I was born and raised in Yenimahalle and as a student of Middle Eas Technical University (ODTÜ) where I am conducting a research. The phrase that they used was "*Yenimahalle'nin çocuğu*" (the child of Yenimahalle). I surmised that it was pleasant for them to encounter a young person who has been living in Yenimahalle for ages.

4.1.3. The Border in Between

The constructed houses in Yenimahalle had the capacity to host one-tenth of the population of Ankara in 1950s. In order to ensure this capacity, the houses have been designed in the form of attached buildings. This physical orientation affected the social and cultural life in Yenimahalle. The closer houses made people more into each other's life (Cantek, 2016, p. 48-49). This also stated by an interviwee, Mehmet, a retired civil servant living in Yenimahalle since childhood exactly, as "Places affect the people's attitudes.". He stated that "It is important not to approach this issue in an elitist way in the context of being *Yenimahalleli* or *Şentepeli,* i.e. people from Şentepe; but close pyhsical connections of the houses have led a unique structure of old Yenimahalle houses: "warmer and being in solidarity." Moreover, the distance of the neighbourhood to the center of the capital caused Yenimahalle to have had its own market place and social places[6].

Figure 6: Attached old buildings of Yenimahalle

---

[6] For example, Alemdar Sineması is one of the most frequently mentioned places for socialization in Yenimahalle by the old residents. When the fact that most of the long-established cinemas in Ankara are in around Kızılay and Ulus (the centers of Ankara city) is considered, in this respect, Yenimahalle had and still has social and cultural centers within the district.

As Cantek stated, by these aspects, Yenimahalle is now narrated as a physical representation "middle class utopia", embracing and surveiling at the same time (ibid, p. 50). As an illustrative part of this utopia, two male interviewees from 1st phase of study, Mehmet and Ali have stated that there was a notion "*mahallenin kızı*" (the girl from the neighbourhood) used for their female friends residing in the same neighbourhood. They told that they regard these friends as their relatives or sisters, not as girl friend or wife candidate. I observed that in their narratives, Yenimahalle, especially in the years that is firstly established, were homogenious, good old settlement. In this context, there is book written and published by a "*Yenimahalleli*" (a person from Yenimahalle), Ergin Taner, namely, *Bir Zamanlar Yenimahalle and Yenimahalleliler*. In this book, there are three chapters titled as "Old Yenimahalle", "Yenimahalle at the Present" and "Yenimahalle in the Future". In the first chapter, starting from the establishment of the settlement, daily life in the neighbourhood "back then" is narrated. Under the titles "Spring in Yenimahalle", "Summer in Yenimahalle", "Autumn in Yenimahalle" and "Winter in Yenimahalle" the way of life in four seasons is presented. In this presentation, the schools in Yenimahalle, cultural and sportive activities, the teachers, social places, children's plays, market places, the streets, friendships and romance stories, some families residing in Yenimahalle for many years and old houses are told with a rich photo repertoire. This "back then" part constitutes approximately three quarters of the book. In fact, the way of presentation in this chapter supports Cantek's argument of narrating the life in the past in Yenimahalle as "middle class utopia". In the second part, the projects of the new municipality, TOKİ buildings and urban transformation, new hospital, parks, rearrangement of some social places, new settlements like Batıkent and associations regarding Yenimahalle are presented. This chapter seems to be narrating the "present" in a developmentalistic logic by showing what have been done recently in the neighbourhood differently than before. In the last part, the future projects of the municipality are discussed. The illustrations in this chapter seem quite futuristic again within the scope of the developmentialist approach. For this time, the future is compared with the present and it is implied that the future

will be "better". For today and the future, there are quite few discussions which are limited with the context of the projects of the municipality while there are even poems on neighbourhood is presented in the "back then" chapter. The narrative mostly seems to be affected by the modern, secular meanings which are promoted by the state from the establishment of the neihgbourhood.

When I asked them about Şentepe, another interviewee, Ali, retired civil servant, told that "What does *varoş* means? *Varoş* means being backward. In these terms, Şentepe is a *varoş*." Mehmet, defined the social profile of Yenimahalle back then as "petit bourgeois":

> Everybody was able to pay their instalments without delay. Houses have been owned. The people were at small or medium level civil servants. There were several doctors, judges, prosecutors, soldiers. We were residing all together in the same neighbourhoods in Yenimahalle. The prejudgements of resident of Yenimahalle to Şentepe were mostly due to armed conflicts in there before 12 September military coup. There was also the perception that they were peasants. In fact, including the first settlers to Yenimahalle, we all have rural roots.

> (Male, 55, Retired civil servant)

According to him, there were people among residents of Yenimahalle who thought that they move upper places in the social stratification. According to him, coming from rural sides, when they owned a house and a place in the institutions of state, they supposed that they jumped into the level of upper class. This has been stated as a reason for prejudices. Residents of Şentepe on the other hand, were defined as "*daha mutaassıp*" (more conservative). These two settlements were encountered in public transports like minibuses. Women residing in Şentepe were told as "headscarfed women". He told an anectode[7] on one of such encounters:

> I was going to one of my friend's house on a regilious holiday, a bareheaded women got on to minibus. The driver grumbled that "On a religious feast day, she painted her lips, removed the headscarf from her head. She will go

---

[7] This anectode is from the year 1985, before 12 September military coup. After this, the lands in Şentepe have been opened to speculations and religious communities has started to be organized in neighbourhoods.

to sightseeing.". I felt quite angry and said "What kind of a man you are! Stop the car! I will get out!".

<div align="right">(Male, 55, Retired civil servant)</div>

He stated that such behaviour of the driver was unacceptable. Moreover, he was also irritated by the silence of the other passengers in the minibus who were mostly the residents of Şentepe. Another encounter was told by him as:

> I tried hard to rent my house. It was in Yenimahalle. One day, a man came with his headscarfed wife and his father-in-law. They were from my hometown. I looked at the man and said that if he did not come with his wife, I would not rent my house to them. I said that I see that you value your wife's opinions. I said this in order to motivate him and to express that I appriciate such behavior.

<div align="right">(Male, 55, Retired civil servant)</div>

After 1980, with the urban transformation, the social fabric changed. Some residents of Şentepe have moved out and new people move in. More importantly, the religious communities and sects started to be organized in the neighbourhood. As the neighbourhood was changing and becoming more conservative, Yenimahalle remained more or less the same. As a result of such transformation in the neighbourhood, in the public areas like public transport, the kind of conflicts that Mehmet narrated, started to emerge.

After 1990s, Şentepe, especially the district around television transmitters were known as the place where drugs were sold. The teenagers of Şentepe were also seen as "*taşkın*" (boisterous), "*bıçkın*" (ruffneck), "*lümpen davranışlı ergenler*" (teenagers with lumpen behaviours), "*kılıksız*" (shabby), "*saygın değil*" (not respectable), "*kendini kanıtlama ihtiyacında*" (in need of demonstrating themselves), "*maganda*" (lout), "*uyuşturucu bağımlısı/balici*" (drug addict). It has been stated that these teenagers cannot show such behaviours in their own neighbourhoods due to the conservative social structure of their neighbourhood. The solution was proposed as making them familiar with cultural events like dance, music and also sports. In fact, the residents of Yenimahalle, especially who have children, did not blame the teenagers for such behaviours. Conservative structure,

rural roots, increase of religious communities and sects after 1980s, social pressure and class differences were seen as the causes. About the teenagers Mehmet said that:

> Şentepe is like blood and thunder. Lout people… Well, when one has a Hacı Murat and the other has a Mercedes, what does the one with Hacı Murat feel? He definitely wants to demonstrate oneself. He wants to show that he arrived the city. He wants to say that he is also here. He wants to express his own existence through such behaviors. He states that he is a human being and this emerges as a result of being repressed. He cannot do this in his neighbourhood but he shows off by saying that he went to Yenimahalle and he did this and that.

<div align="right">(Male, 55, Retired civil servant)</div>

The bad reputation of Şentepe also affects the house prices. The house rents around Suadiye Caddesi were low when compared to the houses near to the central street Ragıp Tüzün Street. In addition to being old, these houses were near television transmitters and since once it has been named as "radiation hill" due to the radiation from the transmitters, the rents decreased. Moreover, Mehmet told about one of his friends wanted to sell his houses and he did not: "That place was not like Yenimahalle. Selling a house is more difficult." Nevertheless, there is a considerable population who migrated to Şentepe from nearby districts but he stated that due to the bad reputation of Şentepe among the residents of Yenimahalle (especially the old ones), that buying a house from Şentepe is still not recevied.

In fact, there is an unofficial physical border where center of Yenimahalle ends and Şentepe starts. This border is also plotted by the public transport vehicles, implying that the area excluded by the route of the line is "outside of Yenimahalle". Once the line of trolleybus, now of bus, 202 Yenimahalle-Kızılay line has still been going from this border to the center of Ankara (Kızılay). Around the border, there is last stop of this old bus line which exist from the establishment of Yenimahalle. There are minibuses "climbing" to Şentepe and newly built cable car which carries passengers from Şentepe to "down". The border of Yenimahalle has been narrated in a quite pastoral way by Mehmet, as:

When I was at primary school, the last border of Yenimahalle was around Esertepe. The trolleybus was climbing up from the street at the back of public bus line. This was the border of Yenimahalle. At the back of our house, there was a vacant land. There was nothing in there back then. Sheeps and lambs were bleating and there were wild flowers around. Sometimes foxes were stealing our chickens.

<div align="right">(Male, 55, Retired civil servant)</div>

This pastoral view narrated by Mehmet states the initial borders of Yenimahalle. He added that:

At those times, some was considering the place around Suadiye Street as Şentepe even. Like a place in between. Before 1965, opening this place for settlement has caused the place below the television transmitters to be occupied. Even our neighbourhoods discussed to squat on the lands there though they have houses in Yenimahalle. We did not find it appropriate. We already had a house! At that time, they were called drivers, they had horse-drawn vehicles. They occupied lands in there. Conflicts had happened between the squatters.

<div align="right">(Male, 55, Retired civil servant)</div>

Figure 7: Sattellite image of a district of Şentepe near Yenimahalle

In the Figure 7, Suadiye Street and Seval Street can be seen as well as Ragıp Tüzün Street on the south. Also the irregular organization of the apartments can be observed from Yenimahalle to Şentepe, i.e. from south to north. Esertepe is on the northeast part of this map.

It can be said that the Suadiye Street was the line of border separating the "official" residents of Yenimahalle and "unofficial" residents of Şentepe. Before 1980, being affected by popular leftist tendencies in the political atmosphere of Turkey, people residing in Yenimahalle were able to establish a bond and be in solidarity with the people who had to migrate from rural sides to the peripheries of urban places. He stated this as:

> I remember that when I was a child, at 3 am in morning, my father was smoking because he was paying bank debt. He was a worker. My mother was not working. He was having financial troubles. My father was having troubles and I was going to Şentepe for helping the construction of *gecekondu* houses? Was this rational? Yes, because we thought that they should have had equal rights with us, they would come and settle to the city. They would also benefit from the opportunities of the city like better paid jobs, schools, hospitals. They have also wanted to elevate their standards of living and these were fundamental human rights. We helped them to build these houses within this frame.

(Male, 55, Retired civil servant)

However, after 1980s, when *tapu tahsis belgeleri* (land registry certificates)[8] were given to the *gecekondu* residents, the houses began to be used apart from need for shelter in urban area. The owners began to profit from the lands by selling them or transforming them into new apartment buildings. After this, some migrated to the "better neighborhoods"[9] of Ankara. This fact made *gecekondu* a source of profit

---

[8] Land registry certificate is not a certificate of title. It is a special legal certificate for *gecekondus* enacted by Turgut Özal government after 1980. These documents are not counted within the frame of property rights However, it means that the state recognized the legitimacy of the *gecekondus*.

[9] Better neighborhoods are urban peripheries of Ankara to which the secular upper and upper middle class move in from the center of the city. This point was referred by several interviewees in a similar way.

rather than the urban poor's right to shelter in the eyes of residents' of Yenimahalle and eventually, distanced these two neighborhoods. Mehmet has expressed his disappointment as:

> The process continued with the distribution of land certificates by Özal government. Thereby, Özal transferred the funds from *gecekondu* dwellers. Then comes the urban transformations. At these times, when my friends were imprisoned and they bought flats in exchange for their lands, I was disappointed. We struggled for them and they struck it rich.

<div align="right">(Male, 55, Retired civil servant)</div>

12 September 1980 military coup "walked all over revolutionists" as Çiğdem (Female, 62, small enterprise manager) stated. Leftist organizations were quite organized in Yenimahalle and among the residents of Yenimahalle, there were several young people arrested and imprisoned after the coup. Before having been arrested, organized young people were helped the construction of *gecekondu* houses in Şentepe. Moreover, regardless of their class positions, they were literally living in the neighbourhood and were quite into the daily life in Şentepe. However, unlike Mehmet, the imprisoned young people of that time stated that they "understand" why the *gecekondu* population withdrawn their support from revolutionists. Çiğdem stated that *gecekondu* population were anxious about armed conflicts in the neighbourhood before 1980. According to her, especially the Alevi population in Şentepe supported revolutionists since they were disturbed by the constant fascist attacks of rightest groups. For example, there were murder of a baby in 1978 of an Alevi family by fascists (As cited in Canlı, 2014, p. 94). According to Çiğdem, being afraid by such attacks, Alevi population within *gecekondu* population allowed revolutionist young people into the neighbourhood before the coup and after the coup, since the state forces arrived and took action, the population expressed that there is no need for the revolutionists and they needed to go. After asking a couple of questions about how they feel about these responses and changes in the behaviours of the residents, she advised me not to be angry about the residents of Şentepe since after 1980, revolutionists do not have power to be organized as in

1970s. Therefore, it was stated that *gecekondu* population did not have other alternative since they chose to support the powerful side back then.

Kemal Karpat (1976, p. 157) states that unlike the attitude of ghetto dwellers, *gecekondu* dwellers have high level of expectations about future and optimism for the future. This makes a more mobile social structure possible for the dwellers. They believe that their children would have a better life in the future if they put "the necessary effort". Consequently, they do not see their rural background as an obstacle against their potential advancements in the future (ibid). Moreover, in the same resource, Karpat states that dwellers have a pragmatic look and "do not hesitate to use every opportunity to convert objective needs into political demands" (ibid, p. 43). For him, this is due to the tough conditions in which they have to survive. Accordingly, they have rapid organization skills and habits for taking collective action, sense of communal and civic responsibility within the frame of this "sophisticated pragmatic view of politics" (ibid, p. 44).

After 1980 coup, new elected government implemented neoliberal policies all over the country. Turgut Özal and the government led by him paved the way for the transformation of *gecekondus* to apartments on the basis of selling the previously squatted public lands. Therefore, *gecekondu* dwellers had the opportunity to own one or more than one apartment flats. Also, after the 1990s, Şentepe was known as the place for illegal businesses like drug dealing with the new population moved in the remaining *gecekondus*. Parents' and grandparents' were warning their children due to this reputation. In addition to minibuses, this public transport is also an important place in which people in Yenimahalle and Şentepe meet. Mehmet, staying near the border, stated that he confronts teenagers from Şentepe everytime he gets on the cable car. Mehmet and Ali (Male, 57, Retired inspector) also told me that they encountered "twisted" teenagers in the public transport. Some also called the attitudes of these teenagers as "lumpen" which mainly addresses swearing and behaving disrespectfully to each other. It is frequently discussed by the interviewees who were young and organized before 1980 coup that they also had "low-income

families" background, however, when they were young, they were taking political action, instead of the present behaviours existing among the young people in Şentepe. Frequently during the interviews, the organized generation of 78' have stated that they had a quite different kind of social and political daily life. For example, they said that after each school day, they meet and walk to *Halkevi*[10] in Yenimahalle by singing revolutionist anthems. The word "lumpen" points out the adjective "idle". In this case, "idle" refers to blaming context of the people who are poor and not taking action at the same time due to "lack of consciousness" or "laziness" regarding their class positions. As a result of this "idle" behaoviours it has been mentioned that they became drug addict or coordinating the illegal businesses. Though they appreciate that this pattern of young people in Şentepe is due to the transformations after 1980, they also blame the young people to some extent due to this "lack of consciousness".

Demet Lüküslü (2015, p. 125-126) states that money in itself has never been a source for getting high status in the Turkey's society. Starting from the Ottoman society, the way to get higher status in the society was serving the state. The officials in the service of the state have the highest status in the society. However, with the neoliberal transformations in 1980 and rise of private sector, owning money had been the new cultural code of the society. The terms emerged after 1980s like *yuppie* and *tiki* points out this cultural code. The word *tiki* was originated from an expensive model of pencil. As an indicator for prestige, these pencils were bought and accumulated by the young people. Therefore, *tiki*, refers to the young people who merely care about the appearance, keen on dressing specific brands and ultimately a passive propagator of the consumer society. Though the word *tiki* has the negative meaning among the young people, however, still, the new image of the youth after

---

[10] The word literally means "people's houses". They were common centres in which people can socialized. They were established by the People's Republican Party (CHP) as a project to new republic's ideology at the beginning from 1932 to 1951. Until 1980 from 1951 however, *Halkevleri* turned to places in which lesftist groups organized.

80s were being *tiki*. All these words point out the neoliberalism and consumption society and the importance of money which started to raise after 1980s in the society.

As a result of raising materialist desires instead of ideals to change the society among the young people, they were blamed by being "apolitical" and consciously avoiding mentioning the politics. This points out a disengagement from the previous generations who were ready to sacrifice their life to "save the country" (ibid, p. 167). As a result of changing cultural environment, a differentiation between the previous generation with the new generations happened. However, as Lüküslü (2015, p. 169) well stated, this is less related with the new generations being "selfish" nd "materialist". Rather, it arises from the anxiety of being broken by the new generations emerged from the changing codes of the society. Moreover, the new young generation after the radical transformations in 1980 has less publicly supported social, cultural and sportive opportunities. In line with the new spirit of the new era, these activities require money for them to participate (ibid, p. 169). Therefore, it could be said that if there is a problem with the cultural habis of the new generation, it is due to the codes of the new society which put the utmost importance on owning money.

They also said that after 1980s, religious movements began to be organized in Şentepe. While political tendencies of residents in Yenimahalle stayed as social democrat and distanced from religious movements on the basis of secularism, the residents in Şentepe, on the other hand, started to have right-wing tendencies. This does not address a concrete and consolidated ideology which reflects to local election. For example, the mayor of Yenimahalle Fethi Yaşar, as the candidate of Republican People's Party (CHP), a social democrat party, also receives considerable votes from Şentepe. Among the *Yenimahalleli*, it was frequently being discussed that residents of Şentepe "loves" Fethi Yaşar since the municipality "has allowed the unequal construction" (some houses are four-storey buildings and some are up to twenty storey) of the luxurious multi-storey buildings in there. Fethi Yaşar, as a local resident from Karşıyaka, is not a person who were nominated by the

central administration. In fact, such rumours points out that the sophisticated pragmatic political view of *gecekondu* residents. Şentepe is constantly negotiated by *Yenimahalleli*, the leaders of the dominant political party in Yenimahalle and by left-wingers. Each social group who have a contact with the dwellers have expectations by *gecekondu* dwellers.

It could be said that since 2010s to the present, transformations of shanty houses into new luxurious apartment buildings accelerated. In 2014, Ankara Metropolitan Municipality built a cable car which transports passengers from Yenimahalle subway station to Şentepe Burç neighborhood. There are four stations on this route. Instead of the second station, until this year, there was a little park called Yunus Emre Parkı which had domestic pine trees that were at least fifty years old. In the meantime, there was rumour (especially among Yenimahalle residents) that some of the people who have house in Şentepe want this cable car since they think that their houses would increase in value.

Though there were considerable number of people who migrated from Yenimahalle to Şentepe and Şentepe to Yenimahalle, the border still exists. Mehmet commented on the bad reputation of residing in Şentepe among the residents of Yenimahalle. He stated that despite being new and luxirous, buying a house from Şentepe is not welcomed and people even express their pity.

As it is discussed in section 2.2.2, the main methodological of this study requires to discuss my position in this study. As a person who residing in Yenimahalle, i.e. a *Yenimahalleli*, my identity also negiotiated in the field. In the eyes of Şentepe dweller, by all appearances, I was a *şehirli* (city-dweller), modern, young woman. I encountered that especially, being a *Yenimahalleli*, refers to being a "local" to modern city life. While there are habits regarding "village" on one hand like beating out the dust of the carpets from the balconies of huge apartment blocks or leaving the slippers in front of the door; on the other hand, there are habits associated with modern urban life like going a swimming pool or fitness center in the neighbourhood or being obliged to call neighbours before visiting them. These are couple of

examples that I encountered in the field. Therefore, my identity was negotiated on the basis of these images. To illustrate, when I first arrived to the neighbourhood and asked questions about the biggest problem of the neighbourhood, the mukhtar of Güventepe stated that their biggest problem is the dwellers who still could not integrated to the "apartment life" which points out the changing life style with the changing spatial reality. Another example is a single mother who were living with her family in Şentepe. We were talking with her and her mother in their house and after some time, her father arrived and started to sit with us. She was talking about an unfinished building foundation in which the women of the close neighbourhood were washing the carpets. She stated that the days in there were quite joyful though the houseworks were tough. While she was talking, her father tried to intervene to the flow of the narration by saying "Come on!". Probably, he thought that she was disgracing "his family" in front of a stranger coming from Yenimahalle. Another male interviewee who were in his fourties, while talking about how good was the *gecekondu* life, stated that ithe domestic work was tough but he claimed that if I asked to his mother, she would not remember this toughness of housework. Afterwards, he added that "*yeni nesil bayanlar*" (ladies of the new generation) are not like his mother now. These "kind" of ladies want to ease everything regarding domestic work. Therefore, according to his claim, they want "everything": new machines such as dish washers, vacuum cleaners and washing machines or even "assistant" for houseworks. This statement was carrying out a sort of complaint about modern and city-dweller young women who do not want to be so "self-sacrificing" like the previous generation symbolized by his mother. This was also a sarcasm to me with the assumption that I would also have demands from my husband in the similar direction.

Moreover, when I went to a fellow countrymen association's meeting to talk with the ones who stayed in *gecekondu* houses in Şentepe, the person who introduced me with the members was asking the others whether they stayed in shanty houses or not. Some said no and she made jokes about whether they belonged to "high society" in my presence. As another anectode, while visiting a transformed apartment, one

of interviewees from 3rd phase of the study, Sultan, said by pointing out the slippers in front of a neighbour's door that "*Gecekondulu* dweller is still *gecekondulu*! They do not change by moving in to the apartments. Look at that view!", though she is also a previous *gecekondu* dweller.

Also Kemal, who is construction subcontractor and closely acquainted with the transformation and also resident of Şentepe from 1960s, also stated the same point as:

> A person resided in Yenimahalle cannot reside in Şentepe afterwards. You know that there are customs and traditions in the villages. People in Şentepe still live according to them. For example, they intervene your clothes. Women gossip a lot. I am talking about the culture. The shoes are still in front of the doors. They stink.

<div align="right">(Male, 54, Construction subcontractor)</div>

As can be seen, the "the shoes in front of the door" is seen as "the culture" belongs to the *gecekondu* life. The "difference" that Kemal stated between Yenimahalle and Şentepe is that Yenimahalle is more integrated the "modern metropolitan life" whereas residents in Şentepe is still living with the "customs and traditions of villages" although he also resided in a *gecekondu* house in Şentepe and still living in there.

Therefore, it could be said that my *Yenimahalleli* identity in the field was negotiated through the components that I was a modern, city-dweller, young woman.

4.2. Şentepe in 1960-1970

In section 3.2.1, the period from the establishment of the republic to 1960s were discussed. As it is stated, liberal policies by the DP government were paved the way to internal migration from rural areas to urban areas. In the period between 1960 and 1970, the few and scattered shanties in cities like Ankara turned to shantytowns. In Şentepe, the first shanty houses emerged at the second half of 1950s, and accelerated towards the end of 1960s. The people I interviewed within the scope of this study

mostly arrived Şentepe in 1960s together with the one who migrated just after 1980 and in 1990s.

As an important milestone, on 27 May 1960, military coup has been staged. After the coup, previous liberal economic model has been abandoned and state-controlled economic model has been chosen. At the same time, the *gecekondu* population in the cities until this period were cheap labour force. In this period, differently, they have started to shoulder another role: being consumers.

In 1966, the first Gecekondu Law Number 775 has been enacted stating the problems of *gecekondu* neighbourhoods. Fully recognized by this law, municipalities were obliged to be responsible to take services to the areas differently from the previous period. However, although the services were defined within the responsibilities of municipalities, in practice, *gecekondu* dwellers were doing some services by raising money among each other and the municipalities were able to use bringing services to neighbourhoods as a trump or could demand votes in return.

There is also another important point that needs to be stated. That is DP government used the voting potential of *gecekondu* settlements by bringing settlement permissions into the bargaining table. As s result, *gecekondu* population supported DP government. The similar strategy has been followed by government in 1972 for Şentepe. Nilüfer Yaylagül also mentions this event as "seeing the gecekondu dwellers as the voting potential within the frame of populist approaches" (2008, p. 51-52). The political powers similarly have recieved positive feedbacks by the *gecekondu* population in this context. When Süleyman Demirel arrived at Şentepe in 1972, he listened the problems of the dwellers and in the direction of his instructions, a *gecekondu* settlement plan has been plotted. As a result, this brought a different characteristic to Şentepe differently from other *gecekondu* settlements. An interviewee, Kemal, was in Şentepe in this period and still living in Şentepe also remembers this event and he stated that "Even Demirel has come to Şentepe.". For this event, he added that:

When Demirel arrived Şentepe, I was a child. I barely remember. According to our elders told, in the 1970s, a water reservoir has been constructed in there by the orders of Demirel. Also he made an asphalt road done. Until then, there was nothing done in Şentepe. The municipality activities were not the same as today. Each district did not have a separate municipality back then. As far as I know, this is the first action for settlement in Şentepe. Our elders were frequently narrating this event. They pleased a lot. They were saying that there was knee-high mud before. Demirel was loved in Şentepe.

(Male, 54, Construction subcontractor)

The arrival of Demirel is remembered as the first event in the direction of urbanization and "bringing services" to *gecekondu* settlements. The municipality and the activities that they do are quite important in the eyes of the people residing in Şentepe. This is the main reason why they vote for Fethi Yaşar, the candidate of People's Republican Party although the tendency is to more conservative wing. This is a point which has been frequently stated by the different interviewees during the interviews.

With the effects of the crisis in 1970, a permanent solution has not been provided to *gecekondu* population. For the second generation of *gecekondu* houses, coming after the first comers, use of houses shifted from use value to exchange value. This means that the houses commercialized and started to be used as a source of profit. Şenyapılı also stated that for the period between 1950 and 1960 for the new comers to *gecekondu* neighbourhoods, the land speculations were already existing in there. For Şentepe also, between the years 1960-1970, the conflicts, discussions and networks about the lands were already existing in this period (Yaylagül, 2008, p. 64).

Şentepe consists of different districts the neighbourhoods existing from the first settlements are Pamuklar, Baristepe, Kayalar, Burç, Güventepe, Kaletepe, Avcilar and Çigdemtepe. The first settling area in Şentepe is Pamuklar district. Few and scattered shanties have seen in this area in 1951 while the first houses in Barıştepe have seen between the years 1963-1976. When compared to Pamuklar, Barıştepe is topographically smoother (As cited in Özdemirli, 2012, 203-204). The turning of the area from few and scattered shanties to gecekondu neighbourhood happened

mostly at the beginnings of 1960s, with the arrival of a massive population mostly from Central Anatolian region.

Mehmet said about the settlement preferences first incoming rural population to Şentepe as:

> Well, for example, people coming from Çankırı migrates to Hasköy. Why? Because while coming from Çankırı to Ankara, Hasköy is on the road. It is because the easiness to go to Çankırı. To Sincan, for example, people from Ayaş, Beypazarı, Nallıhan move in. Again, people from Koçhisar move in Akdere. In Şentepe, people coming from Yozgat and Kızılcahamam dominate the place. They also have plenty of *Hemşehri Dernekleri* (Fellow Countrymen Associations).

> (Male, 55, Retired civil servant)

About the district preferences of *gecekondu* dwellers, Tansı Şenyapılı states that houses were building in a small groups of clusters to the places that are near to main intercity roads and the places that were topographically most suitable. Then, these clusters increased in population and merged in the form of *gecekondu* neighbourhoods (Şenyapılı, 1985, p. 178).

These days were narrated by almost all of the interviewees in a nostalgic tone. While telling the physical and social difficulties, especially the old ones were also using almost a didactic tone which used to tell an unfamiliar situation to a younger one. The interviewees had the assumption that I, as a young woman and an urban dweller like their children now, cannot know the difficulties of these times in which even water was supplied through water tankers. One of the interviewees, Bahtiyar, stated the difficult conditions as:

> There was no electricity at the time that we arrived. There were few and far between houses. For the water, women were waiting their turn to get water from the water tanks. The big water bottles of the present time? They were unobtainable back then. We bought staff from grocery store with the paper bag. There were horse-driven water carriers. The carries were filling the tins. We have a big pot for water. My father bought four pots of water from the carriers and we drink it cold.

> (Male 55, Retired civil servant)

Another interviewee, Kemal, has told that:

> Acording to our elders, there has been knee-high mud in Şentepe although it is a rocky settlement. There was no refrigerator in the houses. Only an *Almancı*[11] neighbour had a television. There was real poverty. There was no market place for example. In fact, there was also no need to have a market place in the neighbourhood. People were farming their own vegetables in their gardens. Since they were peasants, they were prone to cultivate. They did know it. For example, in pour garden we had maydonoise, lettuce, peppergrass, cucumber. We also had fruit trees.

> (Male, 54, Construction subcontractor)

In one hand, the financial difficulties have been stated. On the other, the life in *gecekondu* that allows to produce on their own food free of charge has also been stated. They did not need to pay money and buy it from the market since they were able to farm in *gecekondu*.

Figure 8: A photo from 1970s in Şentepe from Mustafa Durmuş's archieve

---

[11] Turks migrated to Germany in 1970s.

Though not fully seen in the photograph in Figure 8, the vehicle is a tractor with which water is carried. Also the construction material and half-done houses can be seen in the background.

The first comers consist of four groups: The first groups of cities are Kızılcahamam, Güdül, Şereflikoçhisar, Beypazarı, Kazan, Bala; the second groups of cities are Yozgat, Kırşehir, Çankırı, Sivas, Niğde; the third groups of cities are Çorum and Bolu and the last group of the cities are Erzurum and Kars (Yaylagül, 2008, p. 53). Among these groups, the dwellers from Yozgat are the ones that are well known with their strong solidarity relationship, as it is commonly phrased "*birbirlerine çok tutkundular*". The dwellers coming from Kars arrived in Şentepe mostly in 1990s. It is well known fact that the people from same villages prefer the same neighbourhoods to settle in *gecekondu* neighbourhoods. In Şentepe also, the patterns are similar. In one of the interviews with him, mukhtar of Güventepe, Aydın Temeltaş, by pointing out the street named Karaballı Caddesi in front of the bench that we sit, told the fact that Karaballı is the name of a village in Yozgat and since people migrated from Yozgat are concentrated in this area, the street named accordingly. Another example, one of the interviewee told that when they first arrived to Şentepe, they resided in Demirdağ Caddesi in Kayalar district, the street in which people from Kars resides now. Demirdağ is also name of a village in Sivas, Divriği, known as Alevi village.

Mehmet stated, they were horse-drawn vehicles and their drivers, known as *arabacılar*, were residing in Şentepe at that time. One of them were the oldest interviewee I talked within the scope of this study. Cabbar has migrated from Güdül told that he was one of the first comers and owned land as squatting. He was quite old and when I asked questions about this squatting, he answered a bit nervous and on this issue, he frequently emphasized that he "worked hard". He stated that:

> We came from village ("*Topraklıktan geldik.*"). I was farmer. After I arrived here, I sold tometoes in the market. Then, we established this appliance store. When we first arrived, we resided in Demirdağ Street. Now, people from Kars are residing in there. They built houses and the name of the place

became Kayalar in 1975-1977. The cars could not climb here. This place was very mountaneous. We came up through the ranks (*"Biz sıfırdan geldik."*). Everybody squatted a land and I did also (*"Herkes bir arsa kapattı ben de kapattım"*). I spent my life working. I am working since I was in my mother's womb.

<div align="right">(Male, 72, Tradesman)</div>

Interestingly enough, towards the end, the interview became more didactical and he started to complain about the young people now and how they do take everything granted and how lazy they are.

In this period, due to the social dynamics forced rural population to migrate to cities, few *gecekondu* houses turned to *gecekondu* neighbourhoods. Also in this period, municipalities started to take the neighbourhoods seriously and take services to these settlements. As Erman stated, in this period, *gecekondu* dwellers also has been the consumers in the domestic market in the cities.

It is also important to state that the narratives with the nostalgic tone of the interviewees refers to these two period, i.e. the period between 1950-1960 and 1960-1970 and also beginnings of 1970s until 1977. The years 1978 and 1979 were not mentioned in such a nostalgic tone because it is stated that in these years there was violent environment in the neighbourhood.

4.3. Şentepe Just Before 1980 Military Coup: Between the Years 1970-1980

Menderes government was overthrown by the military coup in 1960. The liberal policies of DP period have been abandoned between the years 1960 and 1970. The new constitution of 1961 was a quite democratic constitution which is discussed as being constituted on more democratic principles. This characteristic of the constitution affected the student movements a lot in the years between 1960 and 1970. Also in the year 1968, the world has witnessed global and national rise of democratic youth and worker movements. However, in Turkey, this period was followed by another military coup in 1971. Three student leaders of leftist organization People's Liberal Army of Turkey (THKO), Deniz Gezmiş, Yusuf

Arslan and Hüseyin İnan; were sentenced to death in 1972. The following period witnessed the raise of leftist and also rightist student and youth movements and conflicts between them.

At the end of 1970s, the society was highly polarized and Ankara city was witnessing several armed conflicts between left and right groups and also between these groups and the security foces of the state. As a part of urban areas in which poor working classes have been concentrated, *gecekondu* neighbourhoods turned to the places in which such movements have highly organized since the leftist groups have chosen to be organized in these areas and raised the struggle on the equal rights for shelter for the poor populations. Several gecekondu neighbourhoods were named as "rescued regions" to which state officers like police forces could not enter.

Also in Şentepe, according to the interviewees, the neighbourhood was not polarized at the beginnings of 1970s. However, in the period starting from 1977 to military coup in 1980; there were many armed conflicts and events between right wing and left wing in the neighbourhood expressed as "*sağ sol davası*". The neighbourhood Kayalar that Cabbar narrated in the previous part was mentioned as "Ertuğrul Karakaya Neighbourhood" once. The neighbourhood was mentioned as "rescued region" in which police forces cannot enter in this period.

The name of the neighbourhood "Ertuğrul Karakaya" or "Karakaya" back then, was named in the memory of the student killed by the police forces in 1977 during the boycott mobilized by the Student Representative Board (ÖTK) in Middle East Technical University (ODTÜ). He was member of leftist organization *Devrimci Yol,* also known as *Dev-Yol* and the youth organization of it, *Devrimci Gençlik* also known as *Dev-Genç.*

During the interviews, this period was mostly mentioned with the expressions like "we could not go our houses from work" or "we cannot go outside in the evening" by the ones that stated that they were not participated in any of the political groups of this period. They were emphasized the violence in the neighbourhood. On the

other hand, there were also other interviewees who told this period differently. Also, there are published books mentioning Şentepe in which interviews have been done with the leaders of the leftist organizations of this time such as *O Çocuklar O Yapraklar: Zakir Koçak Kitabı* (2014) which includes the interviews with the important figures of this period, edited by Cemalettin Canlı.

In addition to Kayalar, as Nilüfer Yaylagül has stated, in Şentepe, Güventepe and Kaletepe were the two districts where leftist groups located (2008, p. 54). By the interviews I have done with muhktar, it has been stated that Güventepe has higher Alevi population from Yozgat. Among the others, namely *İlerici Gençlik Derneği* and *Halkın Kurtuluşu*; *Dev-Genç* was one of the strongest organizations to which mostly the Alevi youth has been participated. In fact, the leftist organizations were organized mostly in the *gecekondu* neighbourhoods where the Alevi population is higher.

According to Mustafa Kantaş (As cited in Canlı, 2014, p. 92); an important leader of *Dev-Yol* who came to Şentepe and had a role on the distribution of the lands to people, *Dev-Yol* "decided to live among the the people" ("*Halkın arasında yaşamak gerektiğine karar verdik*"). In mid-1970s, the dissident people who go to *Kültür Dernekleri* and *Halkevleri* seem as the ones who were at odds with the state. This degrades the image of them in the eyes of ordinary people. The students were helping the poor neighbourhoods in summer holidays. This created an impression in the eyes of the people as if these students were on their side temporarily, only during the holidays. At the end of such process, the organization decided to live in the poor neighbourhoods and they helped the land occupations in the several lands of Ankara. In 1977, they came to Kayalar neighbourhood in Şentepe. The organized students in there were consisted of the ones at the age range of 15-25 and most of them were university students.

According to Kantaş, there were also students of the 68 generation came before the 78 generation to Şentepe in order to squat and distribute the lands to the people. In

fact, the history of helping the squatting on the lands in Şentepe by leftist students, dates back to the end of 1960s (ibid).

In Kayalar neighbourhood, the lands belonged to a lawyer, Mürüvvet Aktopuk, who had a close relationship with the Ankara municipality. According to Zakir Koçak, an important "local" figure organized in *Dev-Yol* in Şentepe, who respected a lot in the leftist districts and unfortunately passed away in 2018, this lawyer detected the public lands in Ankara and bought the nearby lands to these public lands and then she bought the public lands also stage by stage (ibid, p. 65).

Kayalar was a quite rocky land. First, they parcelled this tough land by the help of city planners, architects and engineers from the organization. However, when they came to Kayalar, there were already a settlement in Şentepe. There were also an informal land and housing market. Kantaş mentions about an *imam* who were selling the public lands to the new comers. The people who came to the neighbourhood before 1977 had to buy the houses.

After the parcelling, with the help of democratic mass organizations, houses were built on the lands. At that time, the neighbourhood was quite like a self-governed commune. This model was called "resistance committees" ("*direniş komiteleri*") and Şentepe was the first place in which this model was implemented.

As it is stated, the people who were living in Kayalar at that time were mostly Alevi population came from the cities like Yozgat, Sivas and Kayseri. An interviewee Çiğdem, who among the organized students in Şentepe in the years between the years 1978-1980, states that:

> I came to the neighbourhood after the first arrival of organization there. There were mostly Alevi population in the neighbourhoods we went. They were excluded part of the society. The fascist attacks were happening in the neighbourhoods that they live in. They supported us for the security purposes and they expressed this clearly. They also loved us since we were taken care of the daily struggles of the neighbourhood. They were aware that we were university students and we could have live another life in the city center but we were there. However, after 12 September military coup, they scared.

> They told us that they are safe now, state intervened and our presence was not necessary anymore.
>
> (Female, 62, Small business enterprise manager)

Another interviewee, Yusuf, also gecekondu dweller in Siteler and among the organized youth, has told that in the neighbourhood, when the police has arrived to demolish the *gecekondus*, the people and organized youth struggled together for their houses. He told that the dwellers embraced them and rescued them from the police forces. However, when it comes to the end of 1970s, the struggles have become tougher and the neighbourhood turned to a more violent environment. In this violent environment, he stated that they started to keep watch in the neighbourhoods. He stated that "resistance comittees" emerged on this basis for "life safety".

The organized people lived in there, in commune were quite inside the life in the *gecekondus*. Çiğdem also stated that they were not going to neighbourhood in the morning and coming back to homes at night like "civil servant" which was stated as "*Memur gibi sabah gidip akşam gelmiyorduk.*". They were staying there and taken care of the daily contradictions and problems.

> We were taken care of everything in the neighbourhood. Problems of women, childcare, contradictions on land distributions… For example, the dwellers were conflicting due to the land shares. This private ownership mindset… A man had a house and a garden but he did not want to share any piece of land with the others. There were fights on this issue everyday. This bothered us a lot. We decided to design a theatre play on this issue. It was quite effective. It was a June night and we gathered 200-300 people from the neighbourhood and played. After the play, the people started to talk about this. They felt embarrassed about what they have done before. Besides, we were playing music at night in the neighbourhood. When there was a wedding, we were the first comers. We were completely living inside of the neighbourhood.
>
> (Female, 62, Small business enterprise manager)

In the organization of daily life in the neighbourhood, the organized youth were at the center. From the conflicts of marriages to land distributions, they were into the life in *gecekondu* despite the different backgrounds they have. She also stated that

she did not say that she was a university student in order not to differentiate herself from the dwellers. She further stated about Şentepe as:

> I do think that for a revolutionist, in order to become experienced, one should have seen Şentepe. The place was like mountain village. It was very far away and I felt quite independent and self-confident there. I was watching the region near Karşıyaka Graveyard at night and I did not fear at all. I was an alone woman but I was so self-confident that I never scared. On the other hand, Şentepe at that time was neither a village nor a city. The people had arrived there from their village. They have not seen the modern city center. The living conditions were worse than the village. In a village, at least there are natural resources. In Şentepe, it is more difficult than the other gecekondu settlements also. It was like Texas at that time. Yenimahalle was modern. It was a metropole. However, the people in Şentepe were living in the poorest conditions. They were living on a daily basis. They work today eat today but tomorrow he might not. There were no toilets in the houses and the water was carried from a common fountain from 500-600 meter below the ground. I remember that before going to the neighbourhood, I put my bag a toothbrush and a nightdress but I had chance to neither brush my teeth nor wear that dress. Back then, I was thinking that we were experiencing two different epochs.

> (Female, 62, Small business enterprise manager)

She further argues about their life in the neighbourhood as:

> We were wearing *şalvar* in the neighbourhood. Because we had to look like them. The shoes had the utmost importance because any time an attack could have happened. Besides, we were rushing around all the time in the neighbourhood. When I time to sit, I have realized that I was tired. Otherwise, there were a lot of problems to taken care of and we could not have rest.

> (Female, 62, Small business enterprise manager)

Yusuf told about the neighbourhood as a unit of analysis:

> Neighbourhood is the core of the society because the governors govern for them. I have never encountered a discourse from the politician saying that we will make the rich richer. All of them tried to take their support since they are the majority. If one could reach the neighbourhoods, he could reach the whole society. One can learn which food they eat in their houses by not going to their houses. There were grandmothers who knows everything about the neighbourhood. If you could meet with five or six of them, you could learn the most confidential information about the neigbourhood.

111

He stated the strenght of solidarity mechanisms in the neighbourhood. Neighbourhoods had the social environment in which different sides of the society live together at that time.

After this experience in Şentepe, a military coup has happened in 12 September 1980 which changed the neighbourhood completely in both socio-political and spatial terms.

4.4. Şentepe After 1980

During 1980s, both world and Turkey has witnessed several changes. Due to the fall of Soviet Union, the Cold War has ended with the victory of US. This made US the world's first power. Neoliberal policies have been adopted by the other countries. In Turkey, another military coup has staged in 12 September 1980. As it is discussed in section 4.1, after the military coup, neo-liberal policies started to be implemented by the newly elected government after the coup.

While whole world was changing, Turkey witnessed a specific neoliberal transformation after the military coup. The sense of community, publicity, democracy and citizenship has seen as the threats agains authoritative market model and they these values and symbol institutions of these values started to be cleaned. Since the domination logic mediated through the market logic, the transformations deserves to be named as "neoliberal transformations" (Özkazanç, 2011, p. 11-58). As a result of these transformations, the idea of "market society" has been raised. Consequently, the society started to be organized around "the market" which refers to the neoliberal capitalism. The actions taken to propagate this idea of "the market" caused the raise of individualism, "competition culture" in almost every area of daily life, privatization and commodification of everyday life. With the raising spirit of individualism, the collective actions and daily life practices turned to self-management and control of the individual on herself (ibid). Moreover, after 1980, domination, started to be functioned over not suppression but provocation

112

(Gürbilek, 2016, p. 41). Following Michael Foucult's History of Sexuality (1976), she refers to the new functioning mechanism of the power: Constructing, organizing, provocating and multiplication techniques of the power, rather than refusing, denying, inhibiting and prohibiting techniques. Therefore, the power lost its externality context and started to gain a self-operation logic.

In Turkey, the liberal line of thoughts within the new right after 1980 has taken two new models: "Entrepreneur individual" as the anti-thesis of bureaucratic state and "the nation" which has been put in front of the state through Islamic-conservative identiy (Özkazanç, 2011, p. 11-58).

Accordingly, 12 September military coup ended the political environment of the previous period in *gecekondu* neighbourhoods. In Şentepe also, the political environment of 1970s has completely changed after 1980 coup. The polarized left and right groups have disappeared. Most of the people participated left wing movements were put in prison, while some were exiled to abroad. The right wing, known as *ülkücüler* redefined after this date, they approached to the perspective supporting Turkish-Islamic synthesis.

Thereby, after the coup, the political environment in the neighbourhood changed from being dominated by the leftist organizations like *Dev-Genç* to Welfare Party (RP) which was a center-right party collected the majority of the votes after 1990 elections. With the continuing neo-liberal economic policies after 2000s, they have chosen moderate Islam ideology which was started to be represented by AKP in 2001 (Yaylagül, 2008, p. 54-56).

One of the interviewees, Bahtiyar, have stated the environment in Şentepe by comparing before and after military coup as:

> We have suffered a lot in 1978-1979. Not only us, but also the rest of the country as well. Look, here is Güventepe mukhtar building. I have been arrested as a suspect during the incident of shooting Güventepe mukhtar building. I have not participated in. This period was horrible. You got off *dolmuş* and you could not arrive your house. There were leftist and rightest groups polarized in the neighbourhood. There were a lot of people coming from outside of the neighbourhood. They were not among the dwellers of

gecekondu here. They were armed and even our state, our police were passive. Police has also been polarized as left and right in this period. Even the military was about to be polarized. In my opinion, some says that Kenan Evren was evil but I, myself was able to go to my own house easily after the coup. There is also this aspect.

(Male, 55, Retired civil servant)

The state, which is seen as the actor with utmost power, was narrated as "being passive". The coup, accordingly, was constructed as the actor gained its power back after the coup. According to Bahtiyar, the neighbourhood turned to "normal" after the coup. Another interviwee, Kemal, similarly put that:

People cannot go outside in this period. Şentepe was divided region by region. Leftist and rightist… Around Güventepe there were *Dev-Gençliler*, I know very well. Kayalar district was half rightest half leftist. My neighbourhood was rightest. But I did not know any people who abandon their neighbourhood. The people have tried to fit the neighbourhood that they live in. Compulsorily… The young people of that time have constituted the dominant political tendency of the neighbourhood. For example, I did not involve any of the sides but we were residing in a district in which *ülkücüler* were dominant. You could not go outside if you were not involved. They paint the walls, put up the posters until the morning. Half of the the Occupational School were leftist other half is rightest. Mustafa Kemal High School were completely leftist.

(Male, 54, Construction subcontractor)

The disappearance of highly polarized social environment has been expressed a number of interviewees during the research. Conflicts were ceased abruptly. The people who were not involved any of the poles said that they felt more confortable in their neighbourhood after the coup. After the highly polarized period, with the coup, a seemingly more stable period has come. They stated that at least the violence in the streets has terminated and also with the urban transformation, a new period in the neighbourhood started. However, neither migration nor conflicts have finished in the neighbourhood. After three years from the coup, the new government leaded by Turgut Özal, adopted neo-liberal policies on the contrary to the situation after the coup in 1960. As per the economic program that the new government implemented, the domestic market has been narrowed and the resources were transferred for the

outward oriented growth. In this new political formulation, both led the exclusion of the working classes and also providing the lower classes a high mobility than before. This caused widening the gap between rich and poor in the society since without a regulatory mechanism like the state, monopolization of resources in certain hands happened as a result of neo-liberal policies. For gecekondu settlements, several legal regulations on *gecekondu* have been done by the Özal government in this period. As one of them, land certificates have been given to the *gecekondu* dwellers. As the legitimacy basis of liberal policies, Özal government pledged to own more property to the poor populations of the cities. The hope for "striking it rich" was the *zeitgeist* of this period. By analysing from a Bourdieuan perspective, Yaylagül (2008, p. 76-77) states for this period that the main struggle between the social layers was on the basis of maximizing their economic capital. I asked to Kemal that I wonder why owners of *gecekondu* houses in Şentepe did not think to restore their *gecekondus* to another form of house with better physical conditions than selling them to the contractors for construction of the apartments and he told that:

> People in Şentepe do not think in this way. The reason is obviously the financial difficulties. For example, a man has fenced 300 m^2 land but the municipality did not give him all of it. They say that I gave you 180 m^2 from there. They take the remaining portion. The fencing at the beginning was illegal. Municipalities issued a share from these lands according to size of the lands for the public places like parks, schools, roads. Then the contractor calculates the value of your land. Then, they state the values of the flats. Upper flats are more expensive than the lower ones. If the man has two children, he wants two flats for each of them. According to the value of the flats, man could get two less valuable flats instead of one more valuable flat. Mostly, the people try to maximize the number of the flats that they can get. I myself did the same bargaining with the contractor and with the municipality also. I got one ground floor and one flat at the 5th floor at the rear front. By paying extra money, I owned two flats.

> (Male, 54, Construction subcontractor)

In this period, the former *gecekondu* dwellers have seen that the main stratification ground differentiating the classes was the material wealth. Likewise, the situation

stated by Çiğdem in the previous section, in Şentepe, in this period, the former *gecekondu* dwellers struggled for being able to own more flats in return to their lands for which they got land certificates but in a different context: This time the conflicts were not only among themselves, it was also with the state institutions. As a result of these struggles, some was able to make maximum profit, while some was not able and dissatisfied. Municipality has given another land to Kemal due to the planned park in return to his *gecekondu* places, which is less valuable in the new conditions. He told that:

> The municipality has shifted people's lands. Some parts from lands have been allocated for public places like roads, parks and schools. However, the municipality has given more valuable places to some certain people. For example, the stores in the main road are quite valuable. Seval Street is one of them. It is maybe one of the most expensive place in Ankara due to the shopping stores and the last station of cable car line. Some people gained unfair profit from there. I strived in person not to shift places of our lands. I tried to organize the people in the neighbourhood in order to get the equal-worth lands but I could not achieve. I did want to stay in the exact place where my land previously was but municipality has shifted my place to another place since they did want to build a park in a more apparent place. My land was at the edge of Burç neighbourhood where the valuable streets are located now. The municipality offered me to choose a vacant land wherever I want, but it should have been a vacant land. However, it is quite difficult to find such vacant lands here. I could not find and I had to go the place where municipality decided. Now there are two tall buildings near my house. Before I could go out to the balcony and watch the view of Ankara, now there are tall towers around.

> (Male, 54, Construction subcontractor)

Nermin İveynat also stated that main collector and distributor road such as Seval Street and Güventepe Avenues have given priority while the planning has been done (2008, p. 250). Here, Kemal also mentioned the name of Seval Street more than once and stated that the store owners there gained a lot as a result of the planning done during the second transformation.

Due to the changes in *gecekondu* neighbourhoods in several dimensions like physical, cultural, social and political; urbanization and transformation of the cities

116

in Turkey can be discussed into two periods as before and after 1980 (Işık&Pınarcıoğlu, 2001, p. 98). Before 1980, the main actor determining the economic relations between the different classes was the state. The economic model called "import substitution industrialization" was functioning until the mid-1970s. However, the economic crisis in the second haf of 1970 due to the increase in oil prices has affected Turkey in several dimensions economically, socially and politically. It could be said that, due to the regulatory role of the state until 1980s, urbanization in Turkey depends on a clear recoinciliation between the classes (ibid, p 121). This reconciliation had two different models: small businesses called "build-and-sell", known as *yap-satçı*, for middle classes and *gecekondu* for lower classes.

Promoted by media, another important characteristic of this period is to consume more and gain more. This was quite a differentiating character of this period since these activities were not sanctified in Turkey so intensely before. The "life styles" were differentiated through the different consuming habits. Services sector also has been promoted and the classes working in the service sector has obliged to live in the peripheries of the cities.

Furthermore, it could also be said that this period was the period in which the exchange value of the gecekondu houses was used instead of the use value in 1960s. The main characteristic of the structuring of the first generation *gecekondus* is to build according to the topography of the settlement. Furthermore, there was no systematic street grid. Also, the gardens were large and additional parts to the houses were made. These features shows that the neighbourhood at the beginning was designed as a neighbourhood for the need of shelter only (ibid, p. 119&353). However, it could also be said that the first generation of the gecekondu dwellers, with the Building Amnesty Law in 1984, have gained profits by selling their lands to the construction firms. In Şentepe also, there were people who sell their lands and move in to "better" neighbourhoods like Çankaya and Ümitköy.

In Şentepe, the model for construction was also mentioned by Kemal for Şentepe:

> There are two types of construction. The first one is "build-and-sell" and the other one is "sell-and-build". The first one requires bigger capital while the second consists of small capital owners. In Şentepe, there were mostly sell-and-build type constructors. They are selling the flats beforehand to cheaper prices since they do not have big capital to pay. The second group buy the materials on credit whereas the first group have the power to pay the money to material beforehand. In Şentepe I do not know that such big firms have done the construction. They contructed huge projects in the places like Çayyolu. The big firms. The sell-and-build model working firms done buildings in Şentepe and as a result they could not produce very qualified buildings. They used cheap materials.

(Male, 54, Construction subcontractor)

It can be seen that in Şentepe, mostly the small capital owners performed the transformation in this period. Kemal mentioned that there were a couple of big firms in Şentepe in the second transformation but most of them were small capital owner building contractors.

At the same time, in line with the *zeitgeist* of the period, the economic model has created new-rich. The most important characteristic of this "new rich" class is that their social position and the social context of this position. Differenly from the rich of the period before 1980, who knows that their position depends on a social recoinciliaiton due to the regulory role of the state, the richness of the "new rich" after 1980 depends on the tension between them and the lower classes. As a result, they have seen the other classes as a threat to their positions. This constructed to a wall between lower classes and new rich who are only open to cooperation with the people who had similar lives with them (ibid, p. 139-141). In this way, new policies created new "winners and losers" of this period.

As a former *gecekondu* resident in Şentepe, Halit, told me as a person who "has become millionaire" after 1980 coup. I reached him through his former "comrade" who told me that some of their friends have chosen "a different path". In short, he was on trial for the death penalty but was acquitted afterwards. Then, after a hard period of trying to find an occupation, he participated in construction tenders. He told me that he made a lot of money since he fulfilled the difficult tenders to be

118

achieved. As the cause he stated that he was going to die after being arrested, because of this, he did not fear any of the difficulties of the tenders and achieved.

The story that Halit told about his life is important to show the changing socio-economic structure and the class mobility of *gecekondu* dwellers after 1980.

He told his life after the coup as:

> I have completed military duty. I could not find a job due to my record. My wife told me that she read a vacancy on the newspaper. A firm in Rüzgârlı Sokak[12] was looking for a truck driver. I was transporting the construction materials. Then, they promoted me to salesman in 1983. I worked in there for one and a half year. Then my wife advised me to set up my own business. She gave me her gold chain and said "Sell this and start your own business.". I sold it for 20 liras and rented a store with my friends. The, we started to participate in bids with the case in our hands. From 1996 to 2000, I acquire the franchise of an automobile company. I made a lot of money but this money ruined my life.

(Male, 56, Small business owner)

Within the scope of Law Number 2981, enacted in 1984, transforming gecekondu neighbourhoods into apartments was targeted. It is planned for such neighbourhoods that the density would be at the level similar to the formal housing areas nearby. For Şentepe, first development plans have been prepared the years between 1986 and 1989, foreseen phase by phase (Özdemirli, 2012, p. 206).

However, as it is stated at the beginning of this chapter, this first transformation stage after 1980 has not achieved the planned development for the gecekondu settlement in Şentepe by the municipality. Özdemirli explains the reasons why the development plans were unsuccessful (ibid, p. 211-213). First of all, the developers who were willing to redevelop the areas were small capital house builders. The larger construction companies were attracted later by the building of luxurious housing designed to middle income groups in there. They involved in the second stage of the development after 2000s after the regulations that municipality have

---

[12] A Street in Ulus district known as the place where the construction materials are sold.

done. The reason is that the neighbourhoods in Şentepe did not have any important commercial or administrative attraction nodes that might cause a demand for houses. As a result, the small capital owners, some of which are already living in *gecekondu* settlements in Şentepe, decided to build new multi-storey apartments consisting of 75-85 m^2 building units. Even in some cases, the developer were the land owners themselves, their relatives or fellow countrymen who were new in the construction business. This was profitable for *gecekondu* owners since the surplus from the transformation would only be divided into two, that is shared between the developer and the land owner. Secondly, it has been stated that previous plans done by the municipality were foreseeing small plots making it hard to transform the area. For the big companies investing such small plots were not profitable enough as also the prestige of the neighbourhoods was law and could not create a demand by middle and upper income groups. In the end, the redevelopment project failed and majority of the *gecekondu* houses remained. The transformed houses by the small capital owners were in low physical quality since the small business owners had limitations by financial, technical and material aspects.

Yenimahalle Municipality, to which Şentepe is bounded, has been established in 1984 after Ankara Metropolitan Municipality has been established and Ankara city divided into five districts by the Law No. 3030. This gave the authority to municipalites on preparing and approving the urban development plans. This shows that a restructuring and decentralization has happened and the law empowered the local authorities for the urban development plans (ibid, p. 206).

About the municipality, I have observed during the interviews that the former *gecekondu* residents of Şentepe votes for People's Republican Party (CHP) which represents the social democracy in Turkey's political arena though they chose a more conservative life style. This is relevant with the opinion that the politicians visit the neighbourhood only just before the election times. For example, when I asked Cabbar about whether he is satisfied with the services of the municipality he exactly answered as "They only come here for just before the elections." On the

other hand, I had the impression that the residents are pleased with the implementations of the municipality at the present. For example, a single mother living together with her parents told about the sport facility that the major Fethi Yaşar from CHP, has done a lot for the residents, especially for women. In this context, the present major who has been elected for the third time, Fethi Yaşar, was praised for regularly "visiting to craftsman".

In Şentepe, as it is mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, there are two different moments for transformation from gecekondu houses to apartment buldings: The one in 1980s and the one in 2000s. It is also stated by Kemal as:

> As you know, Şentepe was a *gecekondu* neighbourhood. Then, first planning has been done. After the first one, the municipality behaved officiously and the second planning has been done. It was the change through urban transformation. The first one was after 1980. I guess it was around 1990s. The second one is after Ahmet Duyar has become mayor. This place seemed to politicians as a potential source for future votes. Because of this, they allowed the high building density. Then, Şentepe turned to such a crowded place. Most of the places have been specified after the second planning. There is almost no place in the neighbourhood now. In the second one, the municipality did not conduct the planning process by explaining it to the public. They shifted the people's lands. Some have taken more valuable locations than before.

> (Male, 54, Construction subcontractor)

Despite the fact that municipality considered the second planning necessary, which Özdemirli quotes and some dwellers see the second transformation as "officious" by the former dwellers. They believed that since the local authorities see the place as the potential source for votes and because of this.

About the transformation in 1980s in Şentepe, Kemal also has told that:

> Özal stated on television that Şentepe will be the second Çankaya but I do not think that this is the situation now. Özal said this to pull the votes. He came to Şentepe for propaganda.

> (Male, 54, Construction subcontractor)

121

During the urban transformation, owners of gecekondu wanted to make their settlements legal by protecting the exact m² area of their lands. However, in practice, this was not possible since master plans takes some lands of *gecekondus* for the construction of public areas like roads, schools and green areas (Yaylagül, 2008, p. 76). This has been stated by Kemal as:

> In my opinon, in Şentepe there were no huge profit gain. The ones had wider lands maybe had two flats. Everybody were in debt in order to pay for the flats they had now. Contractors also did not gain since they were small capital owners and bough the materials on credit. You know who gained? The state. The municipalities. Because they want money for everything. For asphalt, for construction permit, for waste water… State takes tax from everything.

<div align="right">(Male, 54, Construction subcontractor)</div>

As he stated, since the small firms constructed in Şentepe, the firms cannot gain huge profits. He also added that Şentepe is not a "special place like Balgat" in which the land values are higher than Şentepe. He said that Balgat was a previous *gecekondu* settlement also but in Şentepe on the other hand, due to this low speculation value, the contractors could not gain too much.

Here, in *gecekondu* ownership, the most advantaged group is the first comers who came and squat the lands in 1960s. The dwellers came afterwards in 1970s and 1980s had to buy the houses lands from them. With the land certificates and Amnesty Law in 1980s, the *gecekondu* dwellers moved slightly upwards while new comers arrived in Şentepe.

In fact, this phenomenon is expressed as "poverty in turns" by Oğuz Işık and Melih Pınarcıoğlu (2001). The new comers from South Eastern Anatolia Region have arrived to the metropololitan cities with almost no resources. Reluctantly migrated to the cities, this population had to live under the circumstances that the formers comers specified. Thus, another class hierarchy between the residents of *gecekondu* settlements emerged in this period.

At the beginnings of 1990s, there was another migration wave in which mostly Kurdish population from Kars has arrived in Şentepe. Differently from the Kurdish population settled mostly to the districts like Dikmen and Çiğdem, I did not encounter any narrative that they were coming due to village evacuations and conflicts in Kars.

I had a chance to enter[13] a coffee house in which Kurdish population migrated from Kars frequently spend time and talk with them. The people I interviewed have stated that they migrated from Kars, Kağızman; due to unemployment and tough living conditions in there. They told that they had schools and universities in there but they could not find the jobs that provide that proper living conditions. I asked them the question "Why did you decide to come to Ankara from Kars?" and one man answered as "We also did not want to come here but the struggle for earn a living…". I felt that he has taken offence and he assumed that I asked this in an irritating tone as if asking "What are you doing here?". In the following minutes of the interview, he complaint about that they cannot play Kurdish music during the weddings since their neighbors report this to the police.

The period in 1990s have a different place for identity politics. This also had an impact on the *gecekondu* neighbourhoods in which different identities inhabit. Regarding this, a woman interviewee, Habibe, migrated from Kars, Kağızman to Şentepe in 1992, have importantly told that before coming to Şentepe, she did not "know" that she was Kurdish. She stated that in the village, there were no such differentions and after they came to Şentepe, they "learnt" that they are Kurdish after the negative responses from Şentepe residents. As an important note, she and her family have rented Cabbar's house in a neighbourhood in which people migrated from Güdül in the 1960s. The men in the coffee house, similarly with Habibe told, were complaining about the negative responses coming from the dwellers of Şentepe

---

[13] I was able to enter this coffee house with the reference of a man whose sister I knew. It was a short conversation that I had chance to conduct with the men in the coffee house since the reference person felt uncomfortable after another group of men came from outside to see what I am doing in there.

when they play a song in Kurdish during the weddings. They insistently stated that they do not discriminate the people as Turk and Kurd. One of them said that "Now, everybody has money in Şentepe. They gave one land and had two flats instead.". This shows that they also see the first comers as "people with money" while this is not the situation for them.

Nilüfer Yaylagül has talked about a sense of neighbourhood among the residents of Şentepe around the "Şentepeli" identity despite the differences like being Sunni, Alevi, Turkish or Kurdish (2008, p. 54). However, as I observed, depending on the current conflicts in the country, these relations between the residents of neighbourhood changing as in the example of complaints and rumours about Kurdish people from Kars. The coffee house also was the one in which Kurdish people come and chat. They were also Kurds who support People's Democratic Party (HDP). They also made jokes about my interviews with them, by referring to the government's Kurdish initiative, known as "*Kürt açılımı*", using the word *açılım*, and said that "this lady came here and asks questions about Şentepe so be quite, we try do *açılım* here.".

It is discussed in the previous studies of Özdemirli and Yaylagül that in Şentepe, after the urban transformation projects, gentrification has not taken place since the former residents mostly were not forced to abandon the neighbourhood. Most of the gecekondu dwellers have taken the land certificates and sold their land to contractors and got flats in return. Most of the interviewees that I talked were residing in the apartments buildings in which previous *gecekondu* houses were standing once. However, most of them were the first comers in 1960 or the ones who bought the houses or the land from the first comers. The "not gentrified" argument may be true for them since they did not have to migrate, however, it may not be true for the late comers. The people migrated from Kars stated that they have taken housing loans and they be paying these loans for the upcoming ten years. For example, one family among them was paying the instalments to one of their relatives since the both of the parents were working in informal sector and could not officially apply for the

loan. It seems good but there is a guarantee that they will be able to pay the instalments in the future also since they are working precariously. Thus, in this "poverty in turns" structure in Şentepe, though it seems that the gentrification has not happened, there is no action that the local authorities have taken to support the undermost groups in the surviving pyramid. Accordingly, the tenants of *gecekondus* who cannot afford to take the house loans had to move out to the places they can afford. As the new poor in the peripheries of the cities in 2010s, Syrian refugees can also be mentioned as the groups in the undermost position in the surviving pyramid, in the light of the concept "poverty in turns".

As a result of the changes after 1980s, urbanization in Turkey has moved from integrative urbanization to exclusivist urbanization (Işık&Pınarcıoğlu, 2001, p. 127-128). Different actors adopted different strategies depending on the changing conditions. Gaining income due to the land speculations has become the much-devated topic in order to survive in the cities. The distribution mechanisms in this period were aggressive and exclusivist mechanisms when compared to the previous periods.

To conclude, in this chapter, the evolution of *gecekondu* in Şentepe has been viewed from the moment in which the first gecekondu houses have been seen in the settlement to 2000s. In this way, the specific character of Şentepe in relation with the socio-economic changes in these periods has been discussed. The 2000s and "the present" of the neighbourhood will be discussed in the following chapter in order to be able to compare and contrast the present situation with the memories on Şentepe.

CHAPTER 5

ŞENTEPE AT THE PRESENT AND NOSTALGIC LOOK TO PAST

When the historical context of Şentepe is thought, two "lapse" moments can be discussed. The first moment is the transformations started after 1980 and the second is "transformation project" after 2000s. It could be said that the nostalgic look of the dwellers who arrived and stayed in *gecekondus* before 1980 refers to the daily life in the neighbourhood in 1960s and 1970s. On the other hand, for the dwellers who came in 1990, "prelapsarian period" is before 2000s.

In the previous chapter the "lapse" moment in 1980 has been discussed through the memories of the dwellers. In this chapter, the second "lapse" moment is discussed by starting with the present conditions together with the changes in order to emphasize what was approached nostalgically is highly related with the current conditions. Afterwards, five different patterns emerged within the nostalgic look of the dwellers are argued. In the following section, the meaning of the patterns has been discussed in relation with the research question.

5.1. Şentepe at the Present: 2000-2010

From the establishment of the republic to the 2000s, as it could be followed in this text, gecekondu formation in the peripheries of Ankara city has its own specific social and political dynamics differently from other metropolitan cities of Turkey though certain factors affected the other cities in the similar way. In this last section, before discussing the patterns in the narratives on gecekondu, it is important to understand the current situation of the tranformations in the neighbourhood to be able to explain the meaning of this nostalgic look.

In the beginnings of 2000s, after 2001 crisis, studies on urban poverty have increased accordingly. After AKP came to power, neo-liberal policies have

accumulated and capital monopolization has peaked. In this period, the state has also been included the process as the developer through the institution Housing Development Administration of Turkey (TOKİ). This intervention mechanism was different from the state that is searching solution for the housing problem of the lower income groups in 1950s.

Transformation in Şentepe is different from these projects though the neighbourhoods changed in a similar way with the gentrified places in terms of emergence of shopping malls, coffee shops, fitness and wellness centers. As it is discussed in previous chapter, a textbook kind of gentrification was not happened in Şentepe. Differently from the gentrification projects based on ethnicity or identity, in Şentepe, the land owners (i.e. the ones that have got land certificates after 1980) were able to move in to the new flats though some had to pay after selling their lands while the poor who rented the *gecekondus* and could not afford to live in new flats had to move out to other remaining *gecekondu* neighbourhoods in Ankara. Thus, for the poorest of the neighbourhoods, the urban transformation has never been the solution to the housing problem. On the contrary, it means being forced to go other peripheries. Thus, it is hard to say that gentrification had
not happened in Şentepe at all.

The photo in Figure 9 clearly shows the gecekondus and buildings under construction together with the finished aparment blocks.

As it has been stated at the very beginning of the previous chapter, one last period which is important for the neighbourhood in terms of urban transformation is after 2000s, with the plans developed in 2004. Since the urban development project did not reach the desired results in the previous period in 1980s, at the beginnings of 2000s, in Şentepe, there were still considerable number of shanty houses with a limited number of apartment buildings concentrated in the main districts. For the transformation after 2000s, the municipality started with researching the potential reasons why the first phase has been failed (Özdemirli, 2012, p. 224).

Figure 9: A photo of Şentepe at the present[14]

Depending on the municipality reports, Özdemirli further explains the reasons for failure as:

> However, according to the established figures of the Municipality of Yenimahalle in which the neighbourhood of Sentepe is located, only 10-15% of the building stock had been transformed in the neighbourhood according to these improvement plans, and the rest remained still as squatter housing (Municipality of Yenimahalle Explanation Report, 2004). Then in 2004, the municipality came up with a new plan in which a new approach was brought into the agenda. By considering the reasons of the inefficacy of the former improvement plans and also considering the recent changes in the spatial and economic structures and the property market in both local and national levels, the municipality proposed a new project. The municipality of Yenimahalle has also made some institutional changes in order to ease the procedures for developers.

(ibid, p. 187)

There were several reasons for the transformation stated by the municipality: Increasing population in the neighbourhood, pyhsical and socio-cultural need of this population. These needs include public places like green areas, playgrounds, trade centers and transportation facilities like roads and public transportation systems.

---

[14] This photo was taken by me in 2016.

These deficiencies and the expectations of the residents urged the municipality to develop a new plan to make the settlement more "attractive" one (İveynat, 2008, 100-101). As a result, second phase of transformation has been launched in 2004 with the name "Şentepe Transformation Project". While the municipality reports the situation in this way, Kemal also stated that:

> In the second development plan after 2000s, the storey heights of 17-18 even 20 have been allowed in Şentepe in order to pull the votes and to please the people. The municipality allowed the building density up to 2.14 which is quite high. Here, three or two flats were constructed in 200 m² while only one flat can be built other settlements such as Yenimahalle. There was huge profit in Şentepe.
>
> (Male, 54, Construction subcontractor)

He called this allowance for 17 storey height buildings "unfair" since they hinder the other apartments just like his apartment.

Figure 10: Gecekondus and apartment blocks in Şentepe[15]

---

[15] The photo was taken by me in 2016.

Differently from the first phase of transformation in the 1980s, the second phase of transformation, municipality followed number of strategies to attract the developers with big capital. Four of them are stated by Özdemirli (2012, p. 226-227). First of all, this transformation was announced as a "Transformation Project". While also talking with the interviewees I encountered several times that they call the transformation after 2000s as "urban transformation" while calling the one after 1980 as "the first development", stated as "*ilk imar*". As Kemal stated, the interviewees believe that there is "high profit" in the second one especially due to this profitability image. Secondly, large urban parks have been decided to be built on the lands of former *gecekondus* in order to change the image in a positive way. For example, Habibe, when we went to Şentepe together, the first location that she wanted to show to me, to a person who is researching Şentepe, was Kayalar Public Park, one of the largest parks in Şentepe. In fact, this park is not a protected green zone. It is rather a constructed green patch with some artificial objects. One can see the artificial objects in Figure 12: a plow, a tent and goats, as the ornoments of the park seeming as the park of romantic pastoral past of a village; with the accompanying tall apartment blocks standing just behind. Furthermore, the reason why Kemal told the process as "they shifted the people's lands" may be due to the fact that some lands had to change during the construction of the public places like this park. Thirdly, in the new plan the social infrastructure like education, recreation and social facilities were developed which are not taking part in the first plan. Finally, the municipality eased some of he paperworks for the new investors and developers.

According to the institutional analysis of Özdemirli, there are several actors in addition to municipality and dwellers in the process of the second transformation: mukhtars and contractor firms. While municipality's role is obvious, before discussing the role of mukhtars and contractors, it is important to add one point about the role of dwellers. In addition to selling their lands to the contracting firms, the claims of the residents from municipality on the development of the settlement is obvious. As it has been stated previously, dwellers' perception of desirable

municipality is the one which "bringing the services" to the neighbourhood. As in the example of remembering Demirel's visit and establishment of water reservoir on the neighbourhood, the present major Fethi Yaşar is appreciated with his visits to store owners and construction of the facilities to the neighbourhood. Yaylagül points out this claim and states that claiming urban services or expressing needs in this direction is an indicator for urban integration (ibid, p. 107).

Figure 11: Kayalar Public Park[16]

Also the voting preferences shaped in this direction. The role of mukhtars as Özdemirli stated, the dwellers report the problems to the local authorities at the first step (ibid, p. 230). Thus, mukhtars functions as communication, mediation and negotiation channels.

During the research, when I asked "Is there any place in which you discuss your problems?", Bahtiyar has answered that "When a problem emerges, we report it to our mukhtars.". Therefore, the buildings of local authorities are the places that the problems are informed.

---

[16] The photo was taken from a web site of estate agency. Retrieved from: http://asiller-emlak.blogspot.com/2014/04/sentepe-kayalar-sakl-vadide-satlk.html

Figure 12: Artificial constructions in Kayalar Park and the apartment blocks
behind

The contracting firms, on the other hand, are the mediators performing the transformation. As Kemal told, they are also the ones with whom the land owners bargained the conditions and ownerships after the transformation. However, as Özdemirli stated and I also encountered, the interviewees think that the new comers to the neighbourhoods are the ones who cannot afford to buy a new house from the "better" districts of Ankara like Çayyolu and Ümitköy, therefore they have seen as the ones who "obliged to buy house in Şentepe".

As a result of the transformation project, depending on the spatial changes, social structure of the neighbourhood changed entirely. Mehmet told about the changing fabric of Şentepe with the recent urban tranformation as:

> In the period that Murat Karayalçın was major, after 1989 elections, there were buses which transport the workers in Ostim. It was because the workers of Ostim mostly came from Şentepe. After apartments were built, different people came to the neighbourhood and the previous homogenous structure changed. In Yenimahalle for example, the apartment could be maximum four storey apartments which correnponds 30%. However, in Şentepe when the blocks of 15-20 storey were built, only around 15-20% of previous population in Şentepe has remained. I do not know whether I exaggerate or

not but I see the blocks while going with cable car. Huge buildings… Other apartments and *gecekondus* are quite few.

<div align="right">(Male, 55, Retired civil servant)</div>

Mehmet also added about changing consumption habits of the neighbourhood as:

> Lately, the shopping stores, especially the furniture shops increased. For example, new shops like İpek Mobilya, Bellona… It is because that the people buy the flat for 300 thousand liras. They are opening these shops since now they can find to pay people in previously higher prices. In addition, banks started to open branches in there such as Garanti Bank, Ziraat Bank before five or six years ago. They were opened suddenly, did not exist in Şentepe before, there were only *gecekondu* houses. As the shops, there were only grocery stores and small markets.

<div align="right">(Male, 55, Retired civil servant)</div>

However, there are also some problems of the transformation like insuffient green zones and parks. İveynat indicated these as smallness of the parcels, they are too small for buildings; insufficiency of the green areas and lack of social/cultural properties and public spaces (2012, p. 115). During the interviews, smallness of parcels has been expressed several times. Mukhtar of Güventepe also stated the problems of infrastructure in Şentepe. Moreover, the mountainous characteristics of the place makes difficult for cars to reach to the place. Insufficiency of green areas were indicated as "our children are in more difficult conditions than ours". This is due to the fact that unlike their childhood, the children of the present have no green areas or garden to play in. It has been stated by the interviewees that their feet cannot meet with the soil. For the last problem, i.e. lack of social and cultural opportunities that are provided by municipality, it can be said that there is a progress. According to Hacer, they have even swimming pool in Şentepe. She also talked about the club for ladies, "*Hanımlar Lokali*", and owing to this service, she is able to have a social environment. She also appreciated the municipality's initiatives within this frame.

The role of the former *gecekondu* dwellers on selling the lands to the contractor firms, an interviewee told that after 2000s, the idea of staying in the flats started to

circulate among the dwellers "the people felt stuck and compulsorily started to sell their lands to the contractor firms".

Besides, Şentepe has a transportation problem due to its mountainous topography, distance to city center and the increasing population in there; despite the new cable car line that has been built in 2014. In fact, in summer, cable car is used for sightseeing rather than public transport. It is frequently happening that people who wait for get on cabins to reach their home sometimes cannot find a place to get on due to the crowd touring around. *Dolmuş* are still running between Şentepe and Kızılay-Sıhhiye line but differently from the situation before, they now have to run according to time schedule. Kemal told that before, people have come and form a long queue in order to make minibuses move in difficult seasonal conditions. It was stated as a huge transportation problem. It was expressed that it is better at the present.

The changing profile of the current residents of Şentepe also affected the new design of the houses. Kemal stated that 4+1, 5+1 and 6+1 flats emerged as a result of changing needs of the families. Differently from the *gecekondus*, now children are staying separate rooms. Therefore, for the families who have two and more children, these form of flats designed in the newly built apartments. This points out a differentiation in the living spaces between the children and parents (Tarhan, 2006, p. 133).

5.2. The Life in the New Apartments and Nostalgic Look to the *Gecekondu*

When I asked about their opinion about urban transformation, the interviewees answered that "in terms of image", "urban transformation is good". Here, it can be said that the dwellers adopted negative image and bad reputation of *gecekondu* neighbourhoods that they lived in. They stated that "the neighbourhood was improved", "the illegal businesses were cleaned" and "lands and houses raised in value". The image of the "modern urban space" has a positive value in the eyes of the dwellers. There were a couple of people who complaint about the "unchanging

behaviour of *gecekondu* dwellers even in the apartments". As an example, the slippers in front of the doors and cleaning carpets from the balconies. Moreover, they also appreciated the social and cultural activities brought by the municipality. In reality, they also tried hard to own house(s) in the neighbourhood. On the other hand, they also talked about the negative aspects of the transformation. The first and foremost is the absence of solidarity and strong social relationships between the neighbours. Also, the physical qualities and difficulties of the *gecekondus* were discussed. However, they discussed in such a context that these difficulties were being solved together with the inhabitants of the *gecekondu* back then. The second is security. Since there is a considerable new population coming to the neighbourhood, they stated that they do not feel secure now. It has also been stated that the thieveries have been increased. Thirdly, the decreasing green areas were discussed despite the "urban parks" constructed after the transformation. While each *gecekondu* had a garden before, now there are a couple of parks which are quite inadequate when compared to the amount of population in Şentepe. In addition to green areas, the gardens were resources of food for *gecekondu* dwellers. It decreased the expenses of *gecekondu* dwellers and also reduced their dependence on the consumption markets.

The memories mentioned in a nostalgic tone coincides with the mentioned negative aspects of the new life in the neighbourhood. In the following section under five titles, the themes and the contexts of *gecekondu* in the memories of interviewees and are discussed.

5.3. Patterns of the Interviewees' Narratives on *Gecekondu* in Şentepe

When I asked "Could you talk about the life in *gecekondu* in Şentepe?", the memories having both positive and negative connotatitions were mentioned. Especially the period between 1978 and 1979 was narrated as violent with negative connotations due to the armed conflicts. The memories having the positive connotations on the other hand, as Davis (1979) states, are the ones that were told in a nostalgic tone. As he further puts, people do not feel nostalgic with the

memories having negative connotations though they are remembered and narrated in some cases. The nostalgic ones about the life in *gecekondu* mostly includes context of solidarity and commonality practices. They were also the ones about living together with the people living alternative lives in the neighbourhood. In other words, the interviewees expressed that they miss the coexistence of marginalized parts of society together in *gecekondu* neighbourhoods in Şentepe. The nostalgic narratives refer mostly the period from 1960, i.e. the first establishment of the neighbourhood; to the second half of 1970s, i.e. before the changes in 1980.

In this section, under five titles, the data from the interviews are classified. The narratives in this part were consist of 3rd phase of the study mostly. All of the data gathered from the 3rd phase was used together with some of the data provided from the 1st phase by Habibe, men from Kars in the coffee house and from the 2nd phase, Bahtiyar and Murat. Together the data discussed in this part consists of twentyseven interviewees who resided in *gecekondus* and now living in apartments.

5.3.1. *Komşuluk*

Komşuluk, literally means being next door neighbours, is the most frequently discussed nostalgic context. In fact, *komşuluk* does not merely refer to "being next door neighbours" since they also have neighbours in the apartments now and the neighbours are even more crowded than before. Here, *komşuluk* includes practices of solidarity, sense of community, and coexistence. In this context, some clearly stated that "the taste of the life in *gecekondu* was different" ("*Gecekondunun tadı farklıydı*."). It was "different" since there are more neighbours in numbers inside the apartments blocks seemingly living together now but they do not sit and chat for hours in the houses or gardens, they cannot shoulder the difficulties together, do the housework together and they have to call the neighbours before visiting to the new flats to ask whether they are available or not.

The first problem about the loss of solidarity is about the new physical orientation of the houses. With the differentiation of the living spaces as in the example of the

construction of 6+1 houses, the spatial borders are plotted more boldly on the basis of purchasing power. On the contrary, *gecekondus* are the houses in which the dwellers live more in contact with each other. Besides, *gecekondus* were not "stable" houses. There could be additional rooms and structure constructed after the *gecekondu* has been built. Moreover, in *gecekondu*, it is not quite possible to keep what is happening as a secret. In flats however, privacy has a priority. The women have stated that they could visit their neighbours without calling and asking whether they are available or not in *gecekondu* but the life in flats is different. Fast-breaking meals in the Ramadan month and the visits lasting until the morning were also told in a nostalgic tone. Besides, for the working mothers, the children were looked after by the neighbours. The keys of the houses could easily be given to the neighbours. In such context, they trust each other. The elderly also mentioned that there is nobody who cares from the neighbourhood when they feel sick. A male interviewee ain his seventies told that "before, the people were embracing each other, now, nobody open door when you are sick".

"Sharing bread" in both literally and methaporically mentioned as a sharing practice. One interviewee stated that if one needs any food, one could even shout in the garden for neighbours bring it. It has been stated that one has to "save oneself" in the apartments.

An interviewee Hıdır, who has been born and raised in Şentepe stated that:

> I am sure that everybody states this in the similar way: The life in *gecekondu* was quite different. Now, I am staying in a 300,000 liras-worth flat but if you ask me, *gecekondu* was more valuable than this flat. In terms of kindness, having good relationships with the neighbours… We were sitting in the garden of the houses. In the evening, the women were bringing the different foods they cooked. We were eating together. If there is a patient somebody form neighbourhood has taken care of. The neighbours were closer than the relatives. Everything was known. If one had debt, it was known. If there was a patient in the houses, it was known also. If there would be a wedding, everybody was helping. Now, I am staying in this building but I do not know any neighbour. I do not even know where he is from.

> (Male, 42, Small business owner)

When I asked about the milestones in their life in Şentepe, Hıdır defined the urban transformation phase in 2000s as a milestone. It was again discussed on the context of weakening connections between the neighbours of *gecekondus*. Throughout this process, people whom he knows moved in other districts in Ankara until their houses completed in Şentepe. He sees this as a milestone, a starting point for "the end of the lovely times in the neighbourhood".

A similar context was stated a young man as "we are able to continue our lives with the lessons learnt from the gecekondu life". The solidarity is mentioned in this context. For instance, he mentioned that when family had a car in the neighbourhood, this family would have carried the patients or elderly to the required places like hospital etcetra.

All in all, *komşuluk* constitutes one of the main themes of the nostalgic look to life in *gecekondu* past. Within the context of previous solidarity and commoning practices, dwellers yearns for previous daily life which they could not find in the present life in their living space.

5.3.2. Toughness of *Gecekondu* and Comfort of Flats

Şentepe was one of the poorest neighbourhoods in Ankara in 1970s. Despite this, interestingly, former dwellers narrated these times in a nostalgic tone. However, the dwellers did not mention nostalgically as such. Rather, they told these times were the times of poverty but they were not hopeless, on the contrary, they were happier than now. The frame of narratives in this theme also includes the solidarity and "shouldering together" context to some extent. On top of that, it points out the commodification and commercialization of everyday life and also refers to the attaching more importance to money with the transformations after 1980 as Demet Lüküslü (2014) has stated in previous chapter. Moreover, increase of individualism in social relations also has a place in those narratives. In contast to the solidarity of *gecekondu* neighbourhood, after the transformations, now, there are comfort zones bought with money. Accordingly, public places and common areas turned into

individual property. Within this context, play grounds for children which were the whole streets before, became restricted parks or parking areas.

The times in which "there were even no nylon bags", were told as the "best times" of their life. The changes after 1980 was stated by a male interviewee as "It was easy to share the poverty. When we had flats and everthing, then it became hard to share the wealth." The changes in the direction of a more individualistic organization in space caused the comfort zones for which a price was paid instead of communal places naturally emerged in neighbourhood before. Also about the financial difficulties, an interviewee told that "We were even buying bread on credit. An evalution happened from these times to now.".

While it was stated that some people tried hard to sell and agree upon the construction of the apartments with the contractor firms, they also told that they now have everthing they need free for the taking, however, especially the children now are not satisfied with this wealth. One female interviewee has told that her grandson does not like what he cooked for him. She compared her childhood with him and stated that he is "sassy" while she was humble and due to the poverty, they had to eat whatever presented on the table. Another female interviewee told that they hang each other's door breads when one of them was going to bakery. Especially in the presence of tough material conditions, the dwellers of gecekondu were aware of each other's conditions while also they were sharing necessary works in the absence of the services by bigger actor like municipality back then. It was also stated that these changes point out a sort of "loss of spiritual side of the community" ("*maneviyat kaybı*") while the material conditions were improving.

Moreover, from the groceries, it was possible to take basic needs on credit. However, now, it is nearly impossible to take anything from the markets without paying down. This point highlighted during the narratives.

It has also been mentioned that there was poverty, the amount of the food that could be bought was lesser compared to now but "the taste of the food was better". One

male interviewee stated that "Now, I buy a kilo of mandarin, the half of it goes to waste. The half is rotten.". In this way, they pointed out the efficiency of the consumption back then. "The children of today" were also evaluated in this context: "they have everything but they cannot enjoy the things we were dreaming about to have". Another male interviewee, a father, told that "the dissatisfaction" were because of the parents including himself. The tough conditions that they experienced caused them to raise their children in a way that they provide "everything", stated as "*Biz çektik siz çekmeyin diye çocuklarımızı rahat yetiştirdik.*". The bicycle was the frequently discussed object of desire by the male interviewees. Also the children of today were criticized by not appreciating the toys like bicycle that they have. As Kemal Karpat (1976) stated, *gecekondu* dwellers had a positive attitude towards the future. It was the common sense among the dwellers that if they work hard, in the future, their children would have better conditions than once they had. However, now, in better conditions, their children do not appreciate this wealth.

Hıdır has told that:

> Of course, there were tough conditions in gecekondu. In winter, it was hard to the heat the house. It was difficult to clean the stove. The water was freezing. I have been staying in the flat relatively new. Throughout 28 years, I stayed in *gecekondu*. I forgot the difficulties. These remained as the sweet memoirs. I do not know but I think, if you ask 100 people, 95 of them would say *gecekondu* was better.

> (Male, 44, Small business owner)

Another male interviewee, Kahraman has told that:

> When man bargains for more than he needs, for example two flats rather than one, he forgets his previous world ("*Adam bir yerine iki tane daire istediğinde ne oluyor biliyor musun, eski dünyasını unutuyor.*"). During the bargains for new flats, people may face off against their own brother. In this way, the familial relationships may break down due to the material benefits. In the Turkey today, there is no place in which material benefit are not being calculated.

> (Male, 46, Worker in private sector)

Here, the narratives point out the missing "brotherhood" and sharing practices with the raising materialism and individualism. "Previous world" that Kahraman told refers to the previous life style in the neighbourhood. On the process of transformation while people tried to own more, the sharing practices lost its timeliness.

All in all, the contrast between toughness of the life in *gecekondu* and comfort of the flats in the narratives of interviewees points out the "lapse" moment, i.e. changes after 1980, in which the daily life started to be commodified and social relations were mediated by the material means. As a result of this, the life turned to "show" how much the individuals own and how comfortable they are in the places that paid for, rather than shouldering the poverty together and looking to the future with a hope. The faith that they will be happier in the future also decreased after the changes. This also points out the sharp change in the trust to the fairness among the society which completely changed after the "lapse" moment.

5.3.3. Security

On the contrary to the *gecekondu* population in the neighbourhood, with the construction of new apartments, a considerable new population have moved in. Therefore, the central places like the last station of Yenimahalle-Şentepe cable car line became more crowded. A male interviewee stated by pointing out the tall buildings that "hundreds of people stay in these concretes". It is true that there are more people residing in the neighbourhood but there is less social contact. Therefore, despite the fact that the people know each other and being next door neighbor for years, the social and political structure and context in which the residents have more contact disappeared. Despite the fact that flats have more secure doors when compared to the *gecekondus*, intervewees told that the thieveries increased in the neighbourhood. Therefore, people feel less secure in the new structure. A male interviewee told that they cannot trust on the strangers in the streets, therefore they cannot send their children out. However, in gecekondu, as

141

also another male interviewee told, the children were playing in the streets confidently.

This "knowing each other" is not just being familiar with the names or faces. It also points out sharing same values in the daily life in neighbourhood. They were able to trust and give the keys of the houses since they were sure about nothing negative would happen. In this context, they "know" each other. In the absence of this familiarity, parents do fear about visiting each other in the apartments. It has also been stated that "there was no fear back then".

The parents stated that they refrain from letting their children to go to the parks due to the security reasons stated as "these times are really bad times". In the limited public places in which children are able to play then become functionless. The drunk people in the parks were showed as an example. As a result, the children have to play at home.

All in all, within the frame of sharing similar values in the daily life, the familiar and secure environment of the *gecekondu* were told nostalgically. Their statements are quite the contrary to the perception of "dangerous *gecekondu* neighbourhood" (Erman, 2017, p. 122). The former dwellers clearly narrated through looking to the gecekondu past nostalgically that the environment in which they live now are less secure than "dangerous *gecekondu* neighbourhood" before. Again, there is prelapsarian moment narration and romantization here. It is for sure that there were times in which they feel insecure in *gecekondu* past in different contexts. However, here, with the radically changing values in a negative direction after 1980, they yearn for the times in which they let their children play in the streets and did not feel any hesitation for that.

5.3.4. The Garden

Image of "the garden" were one of the main themes and background in the narratives of the interviewees. In several times, interviewees started to tell what kind of vegetables and fruit that they cultivated in their garden. They told the garden of the

gecekondus and the previous condition of the neighbourhood in a nostalgic tone. *Gecekondu* was an integrative but an in-between form of housing. The houses were very much like village houses. However, their context and all relations (material, social, political) around the houses were organized and mediated by the dynamics belonged to the urban. The nostalgic look to the garden of the *gecekondus* and pastoral narration of the garden again points out the "lapse" moment in which a house form, though being in-between, changed. As Raymond Williams (1973) stated for the yearning of rural past in UK with the industrialization and migration to urban areas from the rural areas, the dwellers told the garden nostalgically. Their reality which has been plucked from "the nature" from *gecekondu* past to apartment buildings present.

The gardens were not only green places but they were the source of food which had the utmost importance for the life in *gecekondu*. One male interviewee told that they had all they need as food in the garden. In this context, he told that there was no need for market since the dwellers were peasants, they do know how to grow vegatables and in a cheaper way, they could produce food from the garden on the contrary to the present life in which they had to "pay for everyting".

Moreover, the fruit trees had an importance while mentioning about the recollections. For example, a female interviewee started to tell a memoir by asking the others that "Do you remember the apricot tree on the corner?". On the contrary to the public parks having limited green area, there were trees almost in every garden in the *gecekondu*. The women were sitting and chatting around the apricot tree separately from the men though there is no obligation for this. Moreover, the dinners, drinking tea in the garden and other activities in the garden were told as the joyful activities. The flats and apartments, on the other hand, were told as "concrete graves" and "half-opened prison" in which they do not feel as happy as in the *gecekondus* having the garden.

For the childhood memories, it has been stated as several times that "everywhere in the neighbourhood was a playground.", on the contrary to the strictly plotted

playgrounds inside the parks in the new organization of the neighbourhood. It has been stated that there was no need for the places for socializations since they can sit and be socialized in everywhere in the neighbourhood. The children were playing mostly in the gardens "with the soil" to which they were able to enter. In the context of the garden as place to sit in front of the houses, it has also been stated that they were able to sit everywhere in the neighbourhood, on the contrary to the present conditions in the neighbourhood. The independence of the *gecekondus* was also discussed when compared to the rules of the cities. A female interviewee gave the example that if one wants to make barbecue, she has to go to the public parks in which there are specified places for it. The places were told as irritating since they are very crowded nowadays.

All in all, within the frame of a "lapse" moment in which their reality was plucked from more contact with the nature the dwellers yearn for the past and told the gecekondu past in a pastorally and romantically told nostalgic tone. Morevoer, on the basis of prodiving food for free dwellers' nostalgic tone points out the commodified daily life in which they have to pay for everything including the basic foodstuff they cultivated in their garden for free previously.

5.3.5 Gendered Narratives

When I asked the female interviewees about the memories on gecekondu, mostly they told about the domestic works such as cleaning, cooking, growing vegatables in the garden, looking after children and elderly and maintenance of houses. The same point, i.e. shouldering the difficulties together, were underlined here. One single mother told an unfinished and abandoned building foundation, as "*bir temelimiz vardı*" in which they together wash the carpets. While they were washing the carpets, they were also having fun. During the narration of recollections, these funny moments shared and narrated together among women. Some of them also complained about the strict rules of the apartments like in the case of it is forbidden to shake tablecloth out from the balcony or difficulties of hanging up the laundry in relatively small spaces of flats than garden of *gecekondu*. However, in the

background there were always women who are cooking, cleaning, looking after the ones in need of care. There were only one female interviewe who were working outside of the neighbourhood and she also told that their children were sometimes taken care of the neighbours when needed.

The domestic work was told in nostalgic tone due to the shouldering the difficulties about the work together. Although they told that it is easier for them to handle with domestic work today, it was better in *gecekondu* due to this sense of unity and solidarity. Some even stated that it was easier to clean gecekondu since the area was smaller. The garden also told in this context. The common cooking places in the gardens also mentioned. As it was also stated in Yaylagül's study, garden and the place in front of the door were not only the spaces for leisure time but also the extension of the places in which the women handle the domestic works (2008, p. 139). However, in the new flats, the space is more strictly organized.

For the socialization places of the women, also the gardens and houses were mentioned. The places which municipalities built like *Hanımlar Lokali,* were mentioned as the places that "became modern afterwards".

One female interviewee stated that she feels herself lucky for "being a person who tasted the life in gecekondu". The reason is stated as there is no "culture for playing together among children" since they had to "stucked inside the flats". This young woman was a mother also and she further stated that:

> Now, each child has a tablet computer in their hands. They are stuck inside the flats. There is nothing other than television and computer. I take my child to the parks but there are a lot of people who do not. They think that the children grow in a more elit way but I do not agree. I think that the child raised in *gecekondu* will be more successful in life since the child knows the life outside. He knows what could possibly come from where. Also we knew the harmless games. But especially the boys have a tendency to play violently since they see this in the TV series.

> (Male, 44, Small business owner)

As it previously stated, Hıdır has told that "new generation ladies" would say that *gecekondu* was worse, the domestic work in the *gecekondu* was hard to handle. By comparing with her mother at the age of 67, he claimed that if I had a chance to ask her, we would say the tough aspects of life in *gecekondu* were nothing.

5.4. The Meaning of the Patterns in the Narratives

Collected under four different themes, the life in *gecekondu* were told in a nostalgic tone by former dwellers. Looking to these themes it could be said that dwellers were nostalgic about what they cannot find in the social environment of the neighbourhood at the present. Secondly, the memories told in "before and after" manner point out that they the changes after 1980 were a "lapse" before which "the golden age" were experienced.

If I go back to the research question emerged at the end of the pilot study, I asked that for what possible reasons could the former dwellers of *gecekondu* were narrating the life in gecekondu in a nostalgic tone through the formulated question "why former residents of *gecekondu* yearn for the practices of daily life in *gecekondu* in the neighbourhood despite the fact that they sell their lands to the contractor firms during the transformation project?". In the light of the finding I discussed in previous two chapters, I am able to say that there is no rational reason for this. Therefore, the research question itself needs to be discussed.

First of all, though having contribution to the transformations in the neighbourhood, the options are limited. Especially for the era starting with 1980, there is whole country changing radically in one hand. They would decide collectively not to sell their lands to the contractor firms collectively and such action would its stamp on the history and definitely would create a change, but this would not be so rational given the circumstances. Therefore, it could be said that there is no direct relation with the selling their lands and change of the neighbourhood.

Secondly, people may feel nostalgic about the circumstances that they changed consciously. *Gecekondu* dwellers migrated from the rural area and they yearn for the pastoral elements of life in rural in the urban area.

The points above do not mean that the emerged nostalgic pattern is meaningless and acontextual. This result rather shows that it is more meaningful to discuss the context and frame of positive connotation rather than assuming that this nostalgic look is merely paradoxical. Therefore, the research question may be modified as "What the nostalgic look of the residents in Şentepe to *gecekondu* past may possibly tell us about the reality of their life at the present?". Here, the most important point is to state that memory and nostalgia are more than being ways of looking to the "passed" past. They have functions at the present.

Moreover, as the main claim of this study, they have also functions for the future. The nostalgic themes that I found as a result of this study is similar with the study of Tahire Erman (2017). However, she concludes that as long as more radical changes happen in the neihgbourhood, the nostalgic look will increase and the romanticizing past will continue. This may be correct. However, on top of that, as the contribution of this study, it is crucial to state that the nostalgic look to *gecekondu* past states the future expectations of the dwellers. Since what people feel nostalgic about have the positive connonatition, these themes plots the frame and context of what kind of neighbourhood that they want to live in the future. In this discussion, the important point is not the *gecekondu* houses and their tough physical conditions as such but the meaning and contexts that they find valuable in the *gecekondu* past. Accordingly, the prominent point is which point that they define as "lapse" and how they define "prelapsarian period".

The nostalgically told themes point out what needs to be protected from the daily life in *gecekondu* rather than *gecekondu* houses themselves and tough living conditions back then. According to their narratives, what they value is the sharing difficulties together and the communal activities naturally emerged in daily life in *gecekondu*. This may form a basis for alternative approaches to the urban

transformation with the taking into consideration of the expectations of the dwellers. This participant approach may also provide the basis for an alternative approach to looking to *gecekondu* dwellers as "inferior others" as Erman pointed.

Moreover, though the discussions on *gecekondu* seem to be vanished due to the urban transformation projects recently, in fact, their discussion and also the legitimacy ground were built on how *gecekondu* is remembered. Memory is a social and political phenomenon. Therefore, it is also crucial to ask whose memory is this on which the legitimacy ground of the transformation project is built (Erman, 2017, p. 123). Although the former dwellers wanted to live in better conditions rightfully and accordingly they sold their lands to the contractor firms, they also remember the common activities in the daily life of *gecekondu* in a nostalgic way since as a result of the differentiation of the living spaces in neighbourhoods after 1980, "the *gecekondu* neighbourhood" started to loose its reference frame in the present daily life (Etöz, 2006, p. 11-12). The natural encounters within the dwellers sharing the same living space became lesser and category of the neighbourhood turned nothing but administrative units by loosing its reference frame of solidarity.

As an interesting closing anectode pointing the role of nostalgia in contructing the potential living spaces in the future, an interviewee, Hıdır told that the members of the village association, *Çamlıdere Osmansin Köyü Kültür ve Yardımlaşma Derneği*; the ones "who miss the days of *gecekondu* life are building the houses in the village." He stated that the newly built houses in the village have the same models with *gecekondus*. Another female interviewee also told about similar context. She stated that "now people build summer houses in several places to be engaged with the soil and agriculture since there is nothing left in the flats. We are like enprisoned here." She also stated that her elder brother built a house in their hometown since he was felt stucked in the flats in the cities. It is known that *gecekondu* itself was the model of houses in village. However, the context in which he told *gecekondu* houses in relation with the houses in the rural area would also be the arguing points for the issues of remigration.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS

In this study, my main aim is to analyze the memories on Şentepe and nostalgic look to life in gecekondu. It is also my endeavor to look at what they can possibly say for today's living spaces in urban area. In this scope, Şentepe, as a former *gecekondu* settlement has been discussed from its establishment in the beginnings of 1960s to the present. In the first phase of the research, the "bad reputation" of Şentepe were researched in a historical context. As the research question emerged from the second phase of the study, i.e. from the pilot study, the nostalgic look to the *gecekondu* past of the neighbourhood by the former dwellers is argued. The puzzle was why the former dwellers were talking about the *gecekondu* past in a nostalgic way while at the same time they were the ones who sold their lands to the contractor firms for the transformation led invocable changes in the neighbourhood.

In this context, the details of the design of the research are mentioned in Chapter 2 after an introduction about my interest on the place as a research field and the emergence of this study in Chapter 1. Within the scope of Chapter 2, the details on methodology of the research were discussed. The details on research with phases and demographic information of the interviewees were discussed in the first section of this chapter. In the second section, "the field" and my position as the researcher in the field were discussed as the relationalities of the research within the methodological frame of taking the researcher as another social category rather than an acontextual voice-over.

In Chapter 3, the conceptual tools as context of *gecekondu* in Turkey, the concept memory and nostalgia are discussed in order to plot the theoretical ground of the study. The phenomenon of *gecekondu* and the studies on *gecekondu* are discussed in terms of the frame in which politics of knowledge on *gecekondu* by Tahire Erman.

In this context, the academic look to the *gecekondu* dwellers as "inferior others" is discussed. For the concept memory, it has been stated that it is a social frame rather than a bulk of memoirs condemned to discussed in "the past". Rather a more dynamic and presentist approach to the memory is argued. For the nostalgia concept, in order to be able to analyze the narratives of interviewees, the utopian context of the term is discussed. This context enables one to approach the nostalgic representations of "the past" as the future expectations of the subjects.

In Chapter 4, the Şentepe is viewed in a historical context through the memories of the dwellers. Here, the memories on *gecekondu* past were analyzed. In this scope, Şentepe and the socio-political dynamics creating changes in the place are discussed within the periods as "Şentepe in 1960-1970", "Şentepe just before 1980 military coup: Between the years 1970-1980", "Şentepe after 1980"; together with the introductory section at the beginning discussing the historical roots of the border between Yenimahalle and Şentepe.

In Chapter 5, depending mostly on the data of the 3rd phase of the study including also some relevant data from the 1st and 2nd phases, the themes of nostalgic look to the *gecekondu* past were discussed under five titles. In order to be able to analyze the memories in relation with the present contidions, the transformations after 2000s are presented as a separated section under this chapter. At the end, the meanings of the nostalgically told memories are discussed together with the contribution of this study to the literature.

In conclusion; *komşuluk*, the tough conditions when compared to relatively comfortable conditions in the flats, the garden of gecekondu and the security were the main themes of the nostalgic look to *gecekondu* past of Şentepe. Together, these all points out the lost common life practices of the recent life in neighbourhood. When the thesis problematic revisited, it has been seen that the former dwellers wanted to live better material conditions than *gecekondus*, on this basis, they sold their lands to the contractor firms during the transformation process. Though appreciating the better material conditions, they also yearn for the solidarity

practices in the daily life in *gecekondu*. In fact, it is considered that the nostalgically told narratives were the ones remembered with their positive connotations, the solidarity practices maintains their positive connotations. Also when the utopian side of the nostalgia is considered, the nostalgically told aspects of the life in *gecekondu* reflects the future expectations of the former dwellers. In other words, revealing the nostalgic patterns emerged in their memories when the previous life in *gecekondu* was asked, this study tries to underline the dreams and the future expectations of the former dwellers for their neighbourhood at the present.

In fact, the transformation in the urban areas is inevitable. People will continue to produce the space according to dominant values of the society which are being driven mostly by the market rules of neo-liberal capitalism. However, here, there are points worth reconsidering according to the narratives of the interviewees. The conclusions may constitute the introductory ideas of an alternative space productions for further designs which is not a modernist "top to bottom" approach.

Tahire Erman states that the current "modernization project" by the political power caused nothing but the accumulation of wealth in certain hands by the handover of the lands on which *gecekondus* built (2017, p. 22). Also, this "top to bottom" modernization model is quite problematic. It is crucial to design urban spaces which respect the people's identities and their way of life. It is also critical for the marginalized parts like urban poor. For these parts of the society, Erman emphasizes the importance of living spaces designed through a participant way. This "bottom to top" model produced failures and conflicts in the urban space. When viewed though the term memory, the emerging nostalgic pattern points about an alternative world which the dwellers may be live in the future and in this way, more democratic approaches in the process of the transformation may be constituted for the future designs.

REFERENCES

(s)mer- n.d. In etymonline.com. Retrieved February 2, 2019, from https://www.etymonline.com/word/(s)mer-#etymonline_v_53458.

Adanalı, Y. (eds). (2018). *Gecekondu Sohbetleri: Arşiv, Bellek, İmge, Mekan, Mimari.* İstanbul: GSAPP Books.

Agulhon, M. (1981). *Marianne into Battle. Republican Imagery and Symbolism in France, 1789-1880.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ahıska, M. & Yenal, Z. (eds). (2004). *Hikâyemi Dinler misin? Tanıklıklarla Türkiye'de İnsan Hakları ve Sivil Toplum*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı.

Akal, E. (2003). *Kızıl Feministler: Bir Sözlü Tarih Çalışması*. İstanbul: TUSTAV Yayınları.

Akşit, E. E. (2005*). Kızların Sessizliği: Kız Enstitülerinin Uzun Tarihi*. İstanbul: İletişim.

Alpkaya, F. & Duru B. (eds.) (2012). *1920'den Günümüze Türkiye'de Toplumsal Yapı ve Değişim.* Ankara: Phoenix.

Altınay, A. G. & Çetin F. (2009). *Torunlar*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Argın, Ş. (1996). Nostalji ile Ütopya Arasında. *Birikim Dergisi, Sayı 82*. Retrieved from: http://www.birikimdergisi.com/birikim-yazi/5016/nostalji-ile-utopya-arasinda#.XVQEtegzbIU.

Aries, P. (1974). *Western Attitudes Toward Deathfrom the Middle Ages to the Present*. Marryland Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Assmann J. and Czaplicka J. (1995). Collective Memory and Cultural Identity. *New German Critique 65*, 125- 133.

Assmann, A. (2006). In R. E. Goodin & C. Tilly (eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis* (pp. 210-224). New York: Oxford University Press.

Assmann, J. (2011). *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Balaban, O. (2016). İnşaat Sektörü Neyin Lokomotifi?. In T. Bora (eds), *İnşaat Ya Resulullah*. (p. 17-32). İstanbul: İletişim.

bellek. (2002-2019). In nisanyansozluk.com. Retrieved February 2, 2019, from https://www.nisanyansozluk.com/?k=bellek.

Benjamin, W., Arendt, H., & Zohn, H. (1968). *Illuminations*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Berliner, D. C. (2005). The Abuses of Memory: Reflections on the Memory Boom in Anthropology. *Anthropological Quarterly, 78*(1), 197–211.

Birkalan-Gedik, H. (2011). Anthropological Writings on Urban Turkey: A Historical Overview. *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development*, *40* (2), 1-66.

Bora, T. (April 11, 2018) Hafıza Emeği. *Hafıza Emeği.* Retrieved from: http://www.birikimdergisi.com/haftalik/8841/hafiza-emegi#.XFXVI1UzbIU

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. , & Wacquant, L. J. D. (1992). *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. New York: Polity Press.

Boym, S. (2001). *The Future of Nostalgia*. New York: Basic Books.

Bozdoğan, S. (2012). *Modernizm ve Ulusun İnşası: Erken Cumhuriyet Türkiyesi'nde Mimari Kültür.* İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Candau, J. (1998). *Mémoire et identité*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Canlı, C. (2014). *O Çocuklar O Yapraklar: Bir Zakir Koçak Kitabı*. Ankara: Notabene.

Cantek, F. (eds.) (2012). *İcat Edilmiş Şehir: Ankara.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Çeşmecioğlu, K. (eds.). (2015). *Ateşe Uçan Pervaneler: Devrimci Yolcu Kadınlar Anlatıyor*. Kalkedon: İstanbul.

Ceylan, M. A. (1986). *Her Yönüyle Yenimahalle*. Ankara: İşkur Matbaa

Ceylan, M. A. (2012). *İlçemiz Yenimahalle*. Ankara: İşkur Matbaa.

Chedgzoy, K., Graham, E., Hodgkin, K., & Wray, R. (2018). Researching memory in early modern studies. *Memory Studies*, *11*(1), 5–20.

Climo, J. & Cattell, M. (2002). *Social Memory and History. Anthropological Perspectives*. Walnut Creek: Altamira Press.

Confino, A. (1997). "Collective Memory and Cultural History: Problems of Method", *The American Historical Review*, *102* (5), 1386- 1403.

Connerton, P. (1989). *How Societies Remember*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Connerton, P. (2008) "Seven Types of Forgetting", *Memory Studies*, *1* (1), 59-71.

Connerton, P. (2009). *How Modernity Forgets*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cooley C. H. (1918). *Social Process*. New York: Scribner's.

Coser, L. A., Halbwachs, M. (1992). *Maurice Halbwachs: On Collective Memory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Davies, J. (2010). Sustainable nostalgia. *Memory Studies 3*(3), 262-268.

Davis, F. (1977). Nostalgia, Identity and the Current Nostalgia Wave. *The Journal of Popular Culture, 11*(2), 414-424.

Davis, F. (1979). *Yearning for Yesterday: A sociology of Nostalgia*. New York: McMillan.

Dündar, Ö. (2004). Models of Urban Transformation Informal Housing in Ankara. *Cities 18*(6): 391.

Eğilmez, E. (Producer), & Eğilmez, E. (Director). (1973). *Canım Kardeşim*. [Motion Picture]. Turkey: Arzu Film.

Eğilmez, E. (Producer), & Tibet, K. (Director). (1978). *Sultan* [Motion Picture]. Turkey: Arzu Film.

Erder, S. (2006). *İstanbul'a Bir Kent Kondu*. İstanbul: İletişim.

Erdoğan, N. (eds). (2002). *Yoksulluk Halleri: Türkiye'de Yoksulluğun Toplumsal Görünümleri.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Erll, A., Nünning, A., & Young, S. B. (2008). *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Erman, T. & Özaloğlu S. (Eds). (2017). *Bir Varmış Bir Yokmuş: Toplumsal Bellek, Mekân ve Kimlik Üzerine Araştırmalar*. İstanbul: Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Erman, T. (1998). Becoming "Urban" or Staying "Rural": The Views of Turkish Rural-to-Urban Migrants on the "Integration" Question. *International Journal of Middle East Studies 30*(4): 541.

Erman, T. (2001). The politics of squatter (Gecekondu) studies in Turkey: The changing representations of rural migrants in the academic discourse. *Urban Studies, 38,* 983-1002.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Language, Counter Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Fritzsche, P. (2001). Specters of History: On Nostalgia, Exile, and Modernity. *The American Historical Review, 106* (5), 1587.

Güneş-Ayata, A. (1990). Gecekondularda Kimlik Sorunu, Dayanışma Örüntüleri ve Hemşehrilik. *Toplum ve Bilim* 51-52, 89-101.

Gupta, A., Ferguson, J., & Neve, G. (1997). *Discipline and practice: "The field" as site, method, and location in anthropology.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gür, Ş. (Producer), & Ökten, Z. (Director). (1988). *Düttürü Dünya*. [Motion Picture]. Turkey: Şeref Film.

Gürbilek, N. (2016). *Vitrinde Yaşamak: 1980'lerin Kültürel İklimi*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

hafıza. (2002-2019). In nisanyansozluk.com. Retrieved February 2, 2019, from https://www.nisanyansozluk.com/?k=haf%C4%B1za.

Halbwachs, M. (1980). *The Collective Memory*. New York: Harper & Row.

Halbwachs, M. (1992). *On Collective Memory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hobsbawm, E. (1972). The social function of the past: some questions. *Past Present* 55, 3-17.

Hutton, P. (1993). *History as an Art of Memory*. Hanover: University Press New England.

insan. (2002-2019). In nisanyansozluk.com. Retrieved February 2, 2019, from https://www.nisanyansozluk.com/?k=insan

Işık, O. & Pınarcıoğlu, M. M. (2001). *Nöbetleşe Yoksulluk: Gecekondulaşma ve Kent Yoksulları: Sultanbeyli Örneği*. İstanbul: İletişim.

İveynat, N. (2008). "Urban Transformation Projects in Squatter Settlements: The Case of Ankara, Şentepe Urban Transformation Project". (Unpublished Master's Thesis). The Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences of Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Kandel, E. R. (2006) *In Search of Memory: The Emergence of a New Science of Mind.* New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Karpat, K. H. (2012). *Kısa Türkiye Tarihi 1800-2012*. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları.

Karpat, K.H. (1976). *The Gecekondu: Rural Migration and Urbanization*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Karpat, Kemal H. (2004), "The Genesis of the Gecekondu: Rural Migration and Urbanization (1976)", European Journal of Turkish Studies, Thematic Issue No: 1 - Gecekondu, URL: http://www.ejts.org/document54.html.

Kidron, C. A. (2016). Memory. *Oxford Bibliographies*. Retrieved from: https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199766567/obo-9780199766567-0155.xml.

Kıray, M. (1964). *Ereğli, Ağır Sanayiden Önce Bir Sahil Kasabası*. Ankara: İletişim.

Koçak, D Ö. & Koçak, O. K. (eds). (2016). *İstanbul Kimin Şehri?: Kültür, Tasarım, Seyirlik ve Sermaye*. İstannbul: Metis Yayınları.

Kongar, E. (1973). Altındağ 'da Kentle Bütünleşme. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi 6*, 58-84.

Lefebvre, H. (1971). *Everyday Life in the Modern World*. Harper Torchbooks: New York.

Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lüküslü, D. (2015). *Türkiye'de "Gençlik Miti": 1980 Sonrası Türkiye Gençliği*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Mead G. H. (1959). [1932]. *The Philosophy of the Present*. La Salle, IL: Open Cour.

memory. n.d. In etymonline.com. Retrieved February 2, 2019, Retrieved from: https://www.etymonline.com/word/memory#etymonline_v_12571.

Merton, R. K. (July 01, 1972). Insiders and Outsiders: A Chapter in the Sociology of Knowledge. *American Journal of Sociology, 78*(1), 9-47.

Misztal, B. (2003). *Theories of Social Remembering*. Berkshire: Open University Press.

Mızıkacı, E. A. (1993). "Şentepe Gecekondu Bölgesinde 0-60 Aylık Çocuklarda Malnütrisyon Prevalansı ve İnsidansı". (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü Halk Sağlığı Ana Bilim Dalı, Ankara.

Navaro-Yashin, Y. (2002). *Faces of the State: Secularism and Public Life in Turkey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Neyzi, L. (1999). *İstanbul'da hatırlamak ve unutmak: Birey, bellek ve aidiyet*. İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı.

Neyzi, L. (2009). *Nasıl Hatırlıyoruz?: Türkiye'de Bellek Çalışmaları*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Neyzi, L. (2012, March 7) Türkiye'de Hafıza Çalışmaları. Retrieved from: https://hakikatadalethafiza.org/turkiyede-hafiza-calismalari-leyla-neyzi/

Nişanyan Sözlük. Retrieved from: https://nisanyansozluk.com/.

nisyan. (2002-2019). In nisanyansozluk.com. Retrieved February 2, 2019, from https://www.nisanyansozluk.com/?k=nisyan.

Nora, P. (1989). Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire Author(s): Pierre Nora. *Representations,* No. 26, Special Issue: Memory and Counter-Memory (Spring, 1989), pp. 7-24.

Nora, P. (2006). *Hafıza Mekanları*. Ankara: Dost.

Olick, J. K. (1999). "Collective Memory: The Two Cultures", *Sociological Theory 17* (3), 333-348.

Olick, J. K., Vinitzky-Seroussi, V., & Levy, D. (2011). *The collective memory reader*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Olick, J., & Robbins, J. (1998). Social Memory Studies: From "Collective Memory" to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices. *Annual Review of Sociology, 24*, 105-140. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/223476.

Orhon, G. (2014). "Alan Araştırması Deneyimini Tartışmaya Açmak: İçeriden ya da Dışarıdan Olmak, Çoğul Kimlikler ve Toplumsal Cinsiyet," *Fe Dergi 6* (1), 54-67.

Oxford Etymological Dictionary. Retrieved from: https://www.etymonline.com/.

Özcan, P. (2005). "A Critique of Housing Classes Approach: The Case of Şentepe-Ankara". (Unpublished Master's Thesis). The Graduate School of Social Science of Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Özçelik, D. S. (2010). "Yetişkinlerin Kentlileşme ve Eğitim İhtiyaçlarına İlişkin Görüşleri (Ankara Şentepe örneği)". (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü Yaşam Boyu Öğrenme ve Yetişkin Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, Ankara.

Özdemirli, Y. (2012). "An Institutional Analysis of the Transformation of Informal Housing Settlements in Turkey: A case study in the Şentepe Neighbourhood of Ankara". (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). The Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences of Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Özgen, H. N. (2003). *Van-Özalp ve 33 Kurşun Olayı: Toplumsal Hafızanın Hatırlama ve Unutma biçimleri*. İstanbul: Türkiye Sosyal Tarih Araştırma Vakfı.

Özkazanç, A. (2011). *Neo-Liberal Tezahürler: Vatandaşlık, Suç, Eğitim*. Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları.

Öztürk, M. (2004). Türk Sinemasında Gecekondular. *European Journal of Turkish Studies*, Thematic Issue 1 - Gecekondu, URL: http://www.ejts.org/document94.html.

Öztürkmen, A. (2001-2002). Sözlü tarih: Yeni bir disiplinin cazibesi. *Toplum ve Bilim 91*, 115-121.

Özyürek, E. (2001). *Hatırladıklarıyla Unuttuklarıyla Türkiye'nin Toplumsal Hafızası*. İstanbul: İletişim.

Özyürek, E. (2001). *Hatırladıklarıyla ve unuttuklarıyla Türkiye'nin toplumsal hafızası*. İstanbul: İletişim.

Özyürek, E. (2006). *Nostalgia for the Modern: State Secularism and Everyday Life Politics in Turkey.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Parmaksız, P. M. Y. (Der.) (2012) *Neye Yarar Hatıralar? Bellek ve Siyaset Çalışmaları.* İstanbul: Phoenix Yayınları.

Radstone, S., & Schwarz, B. (2010). *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Roediger III, H. L. and Wertsch J. V. (2008). "Creating a new Discipline of Memory Studies", *Memory Studies 1* (1), 9-22.

Rosaldo, R. (1989). "Imperialist Nostalgia". *Representations 26*. 107-122.

Sait, A. (2007). Varlık, Benlik, Hatırlayış ve Unutuş Üzerine. *Cogito Bellek: Öncesiz Sonrasız Özel Sayısı 50*, 158-169.

Sancar, M. (2007). *Geçmişle hesaplaşma: Unutma kültüründen hatırlama kültürüne*. İstanbul: İletişim.

Sargın, G. A. (2002). *Ankara'nın Kamusal Yüzleri: Başkent Üzerine Mekân Politik Tezler.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Saygın, G. (2003). "Gecekonduda Ana Sağlığına Etkide Bulunan Sosyal Faktörler: Ankara Şentepe ve Aktepe Gecekondu Bölgelerinde Bir Uygulama". (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyoloji Anabilim Dalı, Ankara.

Schieder, T. (1978). The Role of Historical Consciousness in Political Action. *History and Theory, 17*(4), 1-18.

Schudson, M. (1997). Lives, laws, and language: Commemorative versus non-commemorative forms of effective public memory. *The Communication Review, 2* (1), 3-17.

Schwartz, B. (1998). Postmodernity and Historical Reputation: Abraham Lincoln in Late Twentieth-Century American Memory. *Social Forces, 77*(1), 63-103.

Schwarz, B. (2010). Memory, Temporality, Modernity: Les lieux de mémoire. In Radstone S. & Schwarz B. (Eds.), *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates* (pp. 41-58). NEW YORK: Fordham University.

Şengül, H, T. (2003). "On the Trajectory of Urbanisation in Turkey: An attempt at Periodisation". *International Development Planning Review 25* (2).

Şenol-Cantek, F. (2003). *Yaban'lar ve Yerliler: Başkent Olma Sürecinde Ankara.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Şenol-Cantek, F. (2006). *Sanki Viran Ankara.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Şenol-Cantek, F. (2014). *Kenarın Kitabı: "Ara" da Kalmak, Çeperde Yaşamak.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Şentürk, B. (2015). *Bu Çamuru Beraber Çiğnedik: Bir Gecekondu Mahallesi Hikâyesi.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Şenyapılı T. (1985). Ankara Kentinde Gecekondu Gelişimi 1923-1960. Ankara: Kent-Koop Batıkent Konut Üretim Yapı Kooperatifleri Birliği.

Şenyapılı T. (eds). (2006). *Cumhuriyet'in Ankarası*. Ankara: ODTÜ Yayınları.

Şenyapılı, T. (1981). Gecekondu: Çevre İşçilerin Mekanı. Ankara: ODTÜ Mimarlık Fakültesi Basım İşliği.

seylap. (2002-2019). In nisanyansozluk.com. Retrieved February 2, 2019 from: https://nisanyansozluk.com/?k=seylap&lnk=1.

Shahzad, F. (2011). "Collective Memories: A Complex Construction", *Memory Studies*, 5 (4), 378-391.

Starobinski, J., & Kemp, W. S. (June 01, 1966). The Idea of Nostalgia. *Diogenes*, *14*(54), 81-103.

Süreya C. (2012). *Sevda Sözleri*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Taner, E. (2015). *Bir Zamanlar Yenimahalle ve Yenimahalleliler, Anılar ve Fotoğraflarla*. Ankara: İşkur Matbaa.

Tannock, S. (1995). "Nostalgia Critique". *Cultural Studies 9*(3), 453-464.

Tekeli, İ. (1982). *Türkiye'de Kentleşme Yazıları.* Ankara: Turhan Kitabevi.

Tekeli, İ. (1991). *Kent Planlama Konuşmaları*. Ankara: TMMOB Mimarlar Odası.

Temelkuran, E. (2015). *Devir*. İstanbul: Can Yayınları.

Tokman, Y. (1985). *Konut Politikaları Uygulamalarında Özel Bir Örnek: Yenimahalle*. Ankara: Kent-Koop. Batıkent Konut Üretim Yapı Kooperatifleri Birliği.

Turner, B. S. (1987). A Note on Nostalgia. *Theory, Culture & Society 4*(1), 147-156

Wawrzyniak, J. & Pakier, M. (2013). Memory Studies in Eastern Europe: Key Issues and Future Perspectives. *Polish Sociological Review,* (183), 257-279.

Yasa, İ. (1966). *Ankara'da gecekondu aileleri*. Ankara: Akın Matbaası.

Yasa, İ. (1970) "Gecekondu ailesi: geçiş halinde bir aile tipolojisi". *The AÜSBF Journal 25*, 9–18.

Yasa, İ. (1973). "Gecekondu ailesi mozayiği". *Amme İdaresi Dergisi 6*, 41– 46.

Yaylagül, N. (2008). "Gecekondudan Apartmana Geçiş Sürecinde Kültürel Dönüşüm: Ankara Şentepe ve Birlik Mahallesi Örneğinin Bourdieucü bir Çözümleme Denemesi". (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Antropoloji Anabilim Dalı, Ankara.

Yelsalı-Parmaksız, P. M. (2014). Ars Memoria'dan Postmnemonik Topluma: Levent-Gültepe'de Kayıp Zamanın İzinde. *Moment Dergi* 1 (2).Retrieved from: http://www.momentdergi.org/index.php/momentdergi/article/view/60.

Yenimahalle Belediyesi. (2003). *Ankara'nın Batıya Açılan Penceresi, İlçemizi Tanıyalım*. Ankara: Yenimahalle Belediyesi Basın Yayın ve Halkla İlişkiler Müdürlüğü.

Yenimahalle Belediyesi. (2012). *Kent Rehberi*. Ankara: Yenimahalle Belediyesi Basın Yayın ve Halkla İlişkiler Müdürlüğü.

Yenimahalle Kaymakamlığı. (n.d.) *İlçemiz*. Retrieved from: http://yenimahalle.gov.tr/ilcemiz.

Yenimahalle Kent Rehberi. (2012). Ankara: Yenimahalle Belediyesi.

Yılgür, E. (2012). *Nişantaşı Teneke Mahallesi: Teneke Mahalle Yoksulluğundan Orta Sınıf Yerleşimine*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Yörükhan, T. (1968). *Gecekondular ve Gecekondu Bölgelerinin Sosyo-kültürel Özellikleri.* Ankara: Ministry of Development and Resettlement Publications.

Yürekli, Y. (2016). *"Küçük Moskova" Tuzluçayır*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Zerubavel E. (1996). Social memories: Steps to a Sociology of the Past. *Qual. Sociology* 19(3), 283-300.

APPENDICES

A. INTERVIEW STRUCTURE

Görüşmecilere dair temel bilgiler

- Cinsiyet

- Yaş

- Doğum yeri

- Eğitim durumu

- Medeni durum (Temel ailevi bilgiler, çocuğunuz var mı?)

- Hane ile ilgili bilgiler (Kimlerle yaşıyorlar? Büyükanne büyükbaba var mı evde?)

- Sosyo-ekonomik durum (Aile geliri, alternatif geçim kaynakları, mülkiyet, sigorta, tüketim ile ilgili bilgi)

Göç

- Aslen nerelisiniz?

- Ne zamandır Ankara'da (Şentepe'de) yaşıyorsunuz?

- (Doğum yeri Ankara'dan farklı ise) Ankara'ya (Şentepe'ye) göç etme temel nedeniniz neydi?

- Nasıl göç ettiniz/kimlerle göç ettiniz?

- Ankara'ya (Şentepe'ye) ilk geldiğinizde ne yaptınız? (barınma, iş)

- Memleket ile ilişki devam ediyor mu, nasıl?

- Memleketinize geri dönmeyi ister misiniz?

Gecekondu-Ev-Mülkiyet

- Gecekonduda yaşadınız mı, ne kadar süre yaşadınız? Evin inşa sürecinde katkınız var mı? Mülkiyet size mi aitti (tapu tahsis belgesi) yoksa kirada mı kalıyordunuz?

- Yaşamadıysanız o zamanki gecekondularda yaşayanlarla aranızda nasıl bir ilişki vardı? Aralarında görüştüğünüz, komşunuz, arkadaşınız olan insanlar var mıydı?

- Şu anda hala gecekonduda mı oturuyorsunuz?

- Yeni ev aldıysanız bunun ödeme planı nasıl?

- Gecekonduda yaşamaktan biraz bahsedebilir misiniz?/Gecekonduda hayat nasıldı?

Şentepe-Şentepelilik-Mahalle

- Mahallenizden bahseder misiniz? Başka mahallede değil de özellikle bu mahallede yaşamak sizin için bir şey ifade ediyor mu? Ediyorsa ne ifade ediyor?

- Mahalleniz nereden başlayıp ve nerede bitiyor? Tarif eder misiniz?

- Mahalle sakinleri ile ilişkileriniz nasıl?

- Çalışmadığınız zamanlarda evin dışında neler yapıyorsunuz/ nerelerde vakit geçiriyorsunuz?

- Gün içinde kimlerle görüşüyorsunuz?

- Ulaşım için hangi araçları kullanıyorsunuz? Toplu taşıma kullanıyorsanız hangilerini kullanıyorsunuz?

- Buraya göç ettikten sonra yaşadığınız zorluklar var mıydı, varsa nelerdi?

- Hala yaşadığınız zorluklar veya mahallede problem olarak gördüğünüz durumlar var mı?

- Mahallede sosyal problemlerin konuşulduğu bir yer var mı?

Zaman-Bellek-Bellek Aktarımı

- İlk geldiğiniz zamanlar mahallede hayat nasıldı? (Sosyal, fiziki, siyasi, ailevi)

- Hayatınızda dönüm noktası olarak tanımlayabileceğiniz olaylar var mı? Nelerdir? Bunların mahalleyle/mahalledeki mekânlarla bir ilişkisi var mı?

- 1980 darbesi mahalleyi nasıl etkiledi?

- O zamanlara öncesine ve sonrasına dair neler hatırlıyorsunuz?

- Sizce o zamanların en önemli olayları nelerdi?

- 1990'lar ve 2000'ler ve son olarak da şimdi mahallenin içinde bulunduğu durumu nasıl değerlendiriyorsunuz?

- Mahallenin "eski" haline dair özlemini çektiğiniz bir şey var mı?

- Mahallenin geçmişini/çocukluğunuzu/gençliğinizi düşününce neler hissediyorsunuz?

- Mahallede sizin için o zamanlardan kalma hatırlanmaya dair mekânlar var mı? Bu mekânlar neden hatırlanmaya dair? Bu mekânların şimdiki durumu nasıl? Bu mekânlarda sizden daha genç insanların (çocuklarınızın) deneyimleri nasıl? Farklı mı? Farklıysa hangi yönlerden farklı?

- Mahallede değişen/dönüşen şeyler var mı? (Her açıdan) Varsa neler?

Kentsel Dönüşüm

- Şu an mahallenin içinde bulunduğu durumu nasıl değerlendiriyorsunuz? Sizce mahallede son beş yılda dikkat çekici bir değişiklik oldu mu?

- Etrafınızda sizi etkileyen (iyi/kötü) değişimler var mı? Varsa neler?

- Mahallenin içinde bulunduğu durum açısından "eski"/"yeni" karşılaştırması yapmanız mümkün mü? ("Eski" ve "yeni" den ne kast ediliyor?)

B. HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE PERMISSION

**ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY**

DUMLUPINAR BULVARI 06800
ÇANKAYA ANKARA/TURKEY
T: +90 312 210 22 91
F: +90 312 210 79 59
Sayı: 28620816 / 508
www.ueam.metu.edu.tr

10 EKİM 2017

Konu: Değerlendirme Sonucu

Gönderen: ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu (İAEK)

İlgi: İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başvurusu

Sayın Yrd.Doç.Dr. Besim Can ZIRH ;

Danışmanlığını yaptığınız yüksek lisans öğrencisi Gözde ARIK'ın **"Kentsel Dönüşüm Çağında Türkiye'de Bellek ve Kentsel Mekan: Şentepe Mahallesi Örneği"** başlıklı araştırmanız İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu tarafından uygun görülerek gerekli onay **2017-SOS-159** protokol numarası ile   **10.10.2017 – 30.12.2017** tarihleri arasında geçerli olmak üzere verilmiştir.

Bilgilerinize saygılarımla sunarım.

Prof. Dr. Ş. Halil TURAN

Başkan V

Prof. Dr. Ayhan SOL

Üye

BULUNAMADI

Doç. Dr. Yaşar KONDAKÇI

Üye

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Pınar KAYGAN

Üye

Prof. Dr. Ayhan Gürbüz DEMİR

Üye

Doç. Dr. Zana ÇITAK

Üye

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Emre SELÇUK

Üye

C. TURKISH SUMMARY/TÜRKÇE ÖZET

Türkiye akademisinde sıkça tartışılmış bir konu olmasına rağmen, gecekondu olgusu, günümüzde, gecekonduların kentsel dönüşüm projeleri ile hızla yıkılması sebebiyle güncelliğini yitirmiş gibi görünebilir. Ancak, değişikliklere bütünsel olarak bakıldığında görülebilecektir ki, gecekondu ve gecekondu ile ilgili anılar, sakinlerin yaşamını etkilemeye devam etmektedir. Özellikle son yıllarda, Türkiye'nin çeşitli kentlerinde apartmanların hızla çoğalmasına yol açan kentsel dönüşüm projelerinin meşruiyeti, gecekondu mahallelerinde önceki yaşamın nasıl hatırlandığı üzerine kurulmaktadır. Bu nedenle, gecekondu olgusunun kentsel mekân ve dönüşümleri ile bağlantısının devam ettiği söylenebilir. Söz konusu hatıraların nasıl kontrol edildiği ve hangi toplumsal ve siyasal mekanizmalar tarafından dolayımlandığı, bu meşruiyet zeminini anlayabilmek için önemlidir. Dahası, gecekondu hatıralarına bakmak, söz konusu kentsel dönüşüm projelerinin dönüşen mahallelerin sakinleri üzerindeki etkilerini de gözlemleyebilmeye imkân tanır.

Bahsedildiği gibi, günümüz koşullarında gecekonduların fiziksel varlığı kaybolduğundan, söz konusu gerçeklik bellek kavramı ile analiz edilmeye ihtiyaç duymaktadır. Bu çalışmada, Ankara'da dönüşüm altında olan eski bir gecekondu mahallesi olan Şentepe mahallesi incelenmiştir. Sonuç itibarıyla, sakinlerin anlatılarında, eski gecekondu mahallesindeki dayanışma ve kolektif pratiklere olumlu bir atıf taşıyan nostaljik bir ton bulunmuştur. Çalışma boyunca bu nostaljik anlatım örüntüsünün anlamları tarihsel bir bağlam içinde incelenmiştir.

Daha iyi konut koşulları için, gecekondu evlerinin, hükümet ve belediyelerin de kalkınmacı bir bakış açısıyla desteklediği, neo-liberal piyasa mekanizmaları aracılığıyla dönüştürülmesi gerektiğini belirten yaklaşımı sorgulayan bu çalışma; kendileri için üretilen politikalardan ziyade; konut sakinlerinin alternatif görüşlerini, özlemlerini, çelişkilerini, kaygılarını ve yaşam alanları olan mahalle ile ilişkilerini

takip eder. Elbette, bu yaklaşım, sakinlerin hatıralarının kendiliğinden tamamen alternatif olduklarını ve toplumda dolaşan baskın fikirlerden etkilenmediklerini varsaymaz. Nostaljik örüntünün kendisinden çok, bu nostaljik örüntünün sebepleri, anlamı ve fonksiyonu bu araştırmanın temel problematiğini oluşturur. Araştırma sorusu ise, kısaca, eski gecekondu sakinlerinin, dönüşüm projesi sırasında arazilerini müteahhit firmalara satmaya razı olmalarına rağmen, neden gecekondu mahallesindeki yaşama özlem duydukları sorusu etrafında dönmektedir.

Literatürde Şentepe üzerine yapılmış yedi adet tez bulunmaktadır. Söz konusu tezleri bu çalışmanın alanına ve bağlamına yakınlık derecesi açısından iki farklı grupta toplamak mümkündür. İlk grup bu çalışmanın alanına ve bağlamına daha az yakın olup sağlık ve eğitim alanındadır. Bu çalışmalarda, bir alan olarak Şentepe, şehrin çeperinde yer alan ve kent yaşamına uyum sağlayamamış bir "yarı kentsel bir yer" veya "getto" olarak ele alınmıştır. İkinci tez grubu ise bu çalışmanın alanına ve bağlamına daha yakındır. Bu grupta, kentsel alanda sınıfsal tabakalaşma, kentsel dönüşüm ve sosyo-kültürel değişimler ile ilgili konular tartışılmaktadır. Söz konusu olguların araştırılması için de dönüşüm altındaki bir yer olan Şentepe saha olarak seçilmiştir. İkinci gruptaki çalışmalar, kentsel mekân ve mekânın sosyo-politik tartışmaları hakkında daha fazla şey içermektedir.

İkinci gruptaki çalışmalardan üçü Yelda Özdemirli (2012), Nermin İveynat (2008) ve Pınar Özcan (2005) tarafından şehir ve bölge planlama alanında yapılmıştır. Özdemirli'nin ve İveynat'ın eserleri Şentepe'deki kentsel dönüşümleri değerlendirmiştir. Bu iki çalışma, Şentepe'de uygulanan kentsel dönüşüm projelerinin "başarısını" gözden geçirmektedir. Bu bakış açısı, mevcut pazarın dönüşüm mekanizmalarını sorgulamazken, dönüşümün başarısını mahalledeki gecekondu evlerinin apartman dairelerine dönüşüm oranı üzerinden tartışmaktadır. Bu çerçevede, kurumsal aktörler arasındaki ilişkiler analiz edilmiştir. Sosyo-kültürel dönüşümler ve bölge sakinlerinin bu dönüşümlere karşı verdiği yanıtlar açısından çok ayrıntılı olmamasına rağmen, bu çalışmalar, Şentepe'deki kentsel dönüşüm projelerinin uygulama aşamaları hakkında somut ve ayrıntılı bilgiler vermektedir.

Öte yandan Özcan'ın eseri, "konut sınıfları yaklaşımının" Şentepe'deki dönüşüm üzerine uygulanabilirliğini araştırmaktadır. Kökleri Weberyan sosyal tabakalaşma modeline dayanan ve konut sorununu yalnızca bir dağıtım meselesine indirgeyen bu yaklaşımı sorgulayarak, Özcan "konut sınıfları yaklaşımının" üretim ilişkilerini göz ardı ettiği için eksik olduğunu belirtmektedir. Şentepe'yi alan olarak seçerek, konut sınıfları yaklaşımının Şentepe'de geçerli olmadığı sonucuna varmıştır.

İkinci çalışma grubunun daha çok Şentepe'deki dönüşümlere yoğunlaştığı söylenebilir. Her ne kadar Şentepe'deki dönüşüm projelerinin ekonomi politiğine dair önemli çıkarımlar içerse ve bu çalışmayı önemli ölçüde beslese de, ilk iki çalışma Şentepe'yi mevcut piyasa mekanizmalarında dönüştürülmesi gereken ikinci derece bir kentsel alan olarak değerlendirmektedir.

Şentepe'de yapılan ve bu çalışmanın amaçlarına ve alanına en yakın çalışma antropoloji disiplinden Nilüfer Korkmaz Yaylagül'ün (2008) çalışmasıdır. Yaylagül, mahallede gecekondudan apartmanda yaşamına geçişteki kültürel değişimler üzerine Bourdieu'nün işaret ettiği sermaye türleri üzerinden geniş kapsamlı bir analiz yapmıştır. Çalışma, saha olarak Şentepe ile sınırlı kalmayıp, yanı sıra Ankara'nın bir başka mahallesi olan Birlik Mahallesi'ni de karşılaştırmalı bir analiz içinde ele almıştır. Bu çalışmanın amacı, apartmana geçiş ile yeni kazanılan ekonomik sermayenin başka sermaye biçimlerine aktarılıp aktarılmadığını ve sakinlerin gündelik alışkanlıklarındaki dönüşümü nasıl tecrübe ettiklerini araştırmaktır. Bu çalışmanın dönüşüme yalnızca mekânsal bir bakış açısıyla değil, aynı zamanda sosyo-kültürel bir bakış açısıyla yaklaştığı söylenebilir. Ayrıca, derinlemesine görüşmeler ve gözlemler yoluyla, yerleşik arasındaki sosyal ilişkiler ayrıntılı bir şekilde analiz edilmiş ve tartışılmıştır.

Literatürdeki çalışmalara bakarak, Şentepe'deki mekânsal değişimleri sosyo-kültürel açıdan değerlendiren sınırlı sayıda çalışma olduğu söylenebilir. Yaylagül'ün çalışması dışında; diğer çalışmalar dönüşüm planlarına, kurumların stratejilerine ve aralarındaki ilişkilere odaklanmaktadır. Şehir sakinlerinin bir dereceye kadar görüşlerini sunsalar da, kentsel dönüşüm projelerine "başarılı

olma/olmama" ekseninden yaklaştıkları söylenebilir. Sosyal yönleri dikkate alan çalışmalar arasında kentsel dönüşüm projeleri için kalkınmacı yaklaşımı sorunsallaştıran bir çalışma için bir boşluk bulunmaktadır. Kentsel dönüşüme salt yeni bina ve tesislerin inşası değil, aynı zamanda çok boyutlu bir değişim ve sakinlerin hayatındaki bir dizi değişiklik olarak bakmak daha doğru olacaktır. Nitekim mekânsal boyuttaki değişimlere bağlı olarak, mahalledeki günlük yaşamın sosyal, politik, kültürel boyutları da bu projelerin uygulanmasından sonra tamamen değişmektedir. Yaylagül'ün çalışması bu boyutları tartışsa da, gecekondu evlerinden apartman dairelerine geçiş dönemine odaklanmaktadır. Bölgedeki mevcut durum göz önüne alındığında, gecekondu evlerinde yaşayan tek tük birkaç ailenin kaldığı söylenebilir. İnsanlar bir süre evlerde yaşamaya başladıkça, gecekondu evlerinde yaşam, kaybolmuş mekânsal gerçeklik nedeniyle "geçmiş" veya "hatıralarda kalan" bağlamıyla tartışılan bir olguya dönmüştür. Söz konusu durum, kentsel dönüşüm toplumsal etkilerini değerlendirmek için belleği kavramsal bir araç olarak kullanan bir analizi gerekli kılmaktadır. Böyle bir araştırma, geçmişe bugünün hangi sosyo-politik mekanizmaları ile nasıl aracılık edildiğini sorgulamayı mümkün kılar ve konut sakinlerinin kentsel dönüşüm projeleri yoluyla dayatılan yaşam biçimlerine karşı alternatif sayılabilecek tepkilerini ortaya çıkarır. Buna bağlı olarak bu çalışmada bellek, değişen mekânsal gerçekliğe rağmen, kristalleşmiş bir geçmişten ziyade bugünün bağlamı içinde kurulan bir çerçeve olarak ele alınmıştır.

Şentepe literatürüne ek olarak, tezin bağlamı ile en ilgili ve güncel çalışma olarak, Bir Varmış Bir Yokmuş: Toplumsal Bellek, Mekân ve Kimlik Üzerine Araştırmalar (Erman ve Özaloğlu der., 2017) isimli derleme eserden bahsetmek gereklidir. Türkiye'nin bağlamı ile ilgili belli başlı konuları tartışan sekiz temadan oluşmuş bu kitap, hatırlama ve unutma arasında diyalektik bir ilişki kurarak bellekteki ekonomik, sosyal, kültürel ve siyasi değişikliklerin izdüşümlerini incelemektedir. Bellek ile ilgili diğer çalışmalardan farklı olarak eser, bellek ile mekân ilişkisini odağına almaktadır. Aynı eser içinde, Tahire Erman (2017), Belleklerdeki Gecekondu adlı makalesinde, Karacaören TOKİ (Türkiye Toplu Konut İdaresi) kentsel dönüşüm projesi üzerine yaptığı çalışmayı tartışmıştır. Erman, önceden

gecekonduda oturan ve sonrasında yıkılan gecekonduların yerine yapılan TOKİ apartmanlarına taşınmış kişilerle gecekondu hatıraları üzerine görüşmüştür. Böylece Erman, şehirlerde günümüzün daha bireysel ve yalıtılmış bir günlük yaşamında yok olmaya başlayan gecekondudaki yaşamın kolektif pratiklerini vurgulamaktadır.

Erman'ın ele aldığı vakadaki dönüşüm projesindeki sonuçlar benzer olarak dönüştürülen diğer mahalleler ile paralellik gösterse de; Şentepe'deki dönüşüm bir TOKİ projesi olmadığından ve mülk sahipleri müteahhit firmalarla ayrı anlaşmalar yaparak evlerini değiştirdiklerinden Şentepe'nin dönüşüm dinamikleri Karacaören TOKİ örneğinden farklıdır. Bu nedenle, mahallede ilan panoları ile bakanlıklar ve belediye gibi aktörler tarafından yapılan tanıtım ve söylemlerle karşılaşmak zordur. Öte yandan, görüşülen kişilerin önceki mahalle hakkındaki anlatılarındaki nostaljik ton ve ortaya çıkan başlıca temalar, bu çalışmanın sonuçlarıyla benzerlik göstermektedir. Nostaljik bir bagaj ile anlatılan anılarda; komşuluk, gecekondu bahçesi, güvenlik, yeni evlerin satın alınmış konfor alına kıyasla gecekondulardaki kolektif günlük yaşam gibi temalar bu çalışmanın bulgularıyla benzerlik göstermektedir. Sonuç olarak Erman, radikal ve hızlı mekânsal dönüşümlerin genç nesiller için, gecekonduyu eski, romantik ve tüm veçheleriyle aşılması gereken bir olgu olarak görmesinin önünü açtığını söylemektedir.

Bir yandan, gecekondu yerleşimlerinin yaşanabilir bir yer haline gelmesi için dairelere dönüştürülmesi gerektiğini belirten gelişimci yaklaşımı sorunsallaştıran bu çalışma, Erman'ın vardığı sonuçtan biraz farklı olarak, sakinlerin bellek ve nostalji kavramları aracılığıyla gecekondudaki yaşamda "korumak" istediklerini ortaya koymaya çalışır. Nostalji kavramının ütopya ile bağlantısını kurarak, bu nostaljik örüntünün geçmişte kalmaya mahkum bir bakış olmanın ötesinde eski sakinlerin gelecek beklentilerini ve hayallerini yansıtabileceğini vurgulamaktadır. Sakinlerin daha iyi fiziksel şartlara sahip evlerde yaşamayı hak ettiği muhakkaktır. Ancak, sakinlerin hatıralarına ilişkin anlatılarında ortaya çıkan nostaljik örüntü, bu gecekondu mahallelerindeki dönüşümlerin sakinlerin yararına olanların zorunlu

olarak Şentepe ve benzeri örneklerinin tecrübe ettiği şekilde olmayabileceğine işaret ediyor.

Buna ek olarak, klasik antropoloji çalışmalarından farklı şekilde ben, araştırmacı olarak alana tamamen yabancı değildim. Bu bağlamda bu çalışma, antropoloji disiplininin niteliksel metodolojik tartışmalarına da katkıda bulunmayı amaçlamaktadır. İçeriden bilgi sahibi olmak ve araştırma konusunda arka plan bilgisine sahip olmak, bu çalışmanın hem katkısını hem zorlu tarafını oluşturuyor. Bu pozisyon, arka plan bilgisine meydan okuyarak, kimi zaman onu parçalayarak bunun yerine alternatif bir bilgi oluşturmayı gerektirmektedir.

Bellek kavramı ile gecekondu evlerinin kentsel dönüşümüne bakmak iki açıdan faydalı görünüyor. Birincisi, gecekondu ve gecekondu ile ilgili çalışmalar, kentsel dönüşüm projeleri sebebiyle az sayıda gecekondu mahallesi kaldığından alaka düzeyini kaybetmiş gibi görünse de, bu projelerin çoğunun meşruiyet alanı, hatıralar ve gecekondu mahallelere ilişkin önceki algılara dayanıyor. Gecekondu mahallelerinin "yoksulluk yuvası" ve sakinlerinin "yasadışı işlerle uğraşan insanlar" olarak kötü bir üne sahip olmaları, neo-liberal pazar mekanizmaları aracılığıyla yapılan dönüşümleri meşrulaştırıyor. Bu mekanizmalar, gecekondu evlerini bu meşruiyet zemininde yutarken, kentsel alandaki eşitsizlikleri yeniden üretiyor. Ev sahibi olanların mahallede kaldığı, satın alma gücü olmayanların ise şehirlerin diğer semtlerinde yaşamaya zorlandıkları görülüyor. İkinci olarak, bellek kavramı eski gecekondu sakinlerinin anlatılarını analiz edebilmek için bir tür fâilliği önceler. Çünkü hatıraların bağlamı ve derlemesi görüşmeciler tarafından yapılmaktadır. Bu, hatırlamanın tamamen bağımsız bir edim olduğunu söylemek ile aynı değildir. Bellek, yalnızca öznel bir içerikten ziyade toplumsal olarak inşa edilmiş bir çerçeve olduğundan, yaşayanların hatıralarının baskın ideolojilerden etkilendiği muhakkaktır. Ancak, bu çalışmada ortaya çıkan ana örüntünün de işaret ettiği gibi, konut sakinleri bu kentsel dönüşüm projelerinde neyin "çalışmadığını" da ortaya koymaktadır. Bu nedenle, Şentepe'deki kentsel dönüşüm projesinin bir sonucu olarak toplumsal değişimlere bellek kavramı aracılığı ile bakmak, sakinlerin

dönüşüm projelerine ilişkin alternatif görüşlerine yer verebilmek açısında önemli görünmektedir.

2017-2019 yılları arasında yapılmış saha çalışmasını tartışan bu metin toplamda altı bölümden oluşmaktadır. İlk bölüm ile çalışmanın amacı ve araştırma sorusuna ortaya konduktan sonra, bir sonraki bölümde, çalışmanın saha kısmının ve metodolojik meselelerini detayları üzerinde durulur. Araştırmanın aşamaları, görüşülen kişilerin demografik verileri, "alanın" kavramsallaştırılması ve benim araştırmacı olarak bu çalışmadaki yerim bu bölümde tartışılmaktadır.

Bölüm 2'de ortaya konmuş olan bu çalışmanın alan deneyimi üç temel aşamadan oluşmaktadır. Önceden kesin olarak planlanmadıklarından, aksine, araştırmanın ilerleyişi içerisinde bu şekilde evrildiğinden, söz konusu aşamaları metin boyunca çalışmanın fazları olarak nitelendirdim.

İlk faz araştırmacı olarak benim konumumla ilgilidir. Bu fazda, çalışma konusu olarak Şentepe'yi seçtikten sonra, odak noktası, araştırmacı olarak benim de bir yere sahip olduğum Yenimahalle ve Şentepe sakinleri arasındaki çok yönlü sınırdır. Bu fazda toplam altı kişiyle dört görüşme yapılmıştır. İkinci fazda Şentepe'nin çalışma konusu olarak seçilmesine karar verilmiş ve araştırma sorusunu oluşturmak için geçici bir görüşme çatısı hazırlanmıştır. İlk kısımda, göç, gecekondu evleri / ev / toprak mülkiyeti, Şentepe / Şentepe'den / mahalleli olmak, zaman / bellek / bellek transferi ve kentsel dönüşüm gibi temalar oluşturulmuştur Bu aşamada, bir çeşit pilot çalışma olarak tasarlanmış olup toplamda üç görüşme yapılmıştır. Bunlar, Şentepe'deki mahallelerinin muhtarları tarafından rastgele seçilen üç kişiydi ve hepsi Şentepe ile ilgili anılarını nostaljik bir tonla anlattılar. Bu fazın sonunda ise araştırma sorusu formüle edilmiştir.

Üçüncü ve son aşamada, araştırma sorusu uyarınca, daha önce Şentepe'de gecekondu evlerinde oturmuş ve sonrasında yine aynı yerde apartman dairelerine taşınmış görüşmecilerle konuşulmuştur. Eski gecekondu sakinleri ile görüşmek, eski gecekondu evlerinin yerine inşa edilen yeni apartman dairelerinde

yaşadıklarından, mahalledeki günlük yaşamı "öncesi ve sonrası" olarak karşılaştırabilmeleri açısından önemliydi. 1970'lerin sonunda örgütlü olan ve Şentepe'deki gecekondu evlerinin inşa edilmesine yardım eden iki erkek, bir kadın hariç, bu aşamada toplam yirmi kişiyle görüştüm. Bu aşamadaki yirmi kişinin dokuzu kadın, on bir tanesi ise erkekti. Onlara Yenimahalle'de tanıdığım insanlar kanalıyla ulaştım. Daha sonraki görüşmeler için kartopu örneklemesini takip ettim.

Görüşülen kişilere sorulan sorular, "Şentepe bir gecekondu mahallesindeyken gündelik hayat nasıldı?" sorusu etrafında formüle edildi. Şentepe ve gecekonduyu aynı anda odakta tutmaya çalışırken, görüşmelerin akışına müdahale etmedim. Çalışma artık var olmayan "eski" bir mekâna ilişkin olduğundan, sorularımın kendisinin gecekondu hayatı için anımsatıcı araçlar olduğu söylenebilir. Bu durum özellikle çalışmanın üçüncü aşaması için geçerlidir. Öte yandan, önceki bölümde tartışıldığı gibi, araştırma sorusunun kendisi alanda görüşmeciler tarafından farklı temalarda sorulmuş olan sorulara verilen cevaplar çerçevesinde formüle edilmiştir. Bu nedenle, görüşmeler mahalledeki önceki yaşamın hatırlanmasını merkeze almış olsa da, cevaplara müdahale edilmemiştir. Bu sebepten de çalışmanın üçüncü fazı için katı bir görüşme yapısı hazırlanmamıştır.

Görüşmeler sırasında, gecekonduya ilişkin anıları odakta tutmaya çalıştım. Ayrıca, kahvehanede ve görüşmecilerin evlerinde yapılan ve birden fazla kişinin katıldığı röportajlar sayesinde, görüşmecilerin kendi aralarında gecekondu ile ilgili hatıraları nasıl tartıştıklarını da görme şansım oldu. Bazen beni bu görüşmelere Yenimahalle'de uzun süredir konaklayan biri olarak dâhil ediyorlardı. Bu aynı zamanda çalışmanın metodolojisini etnografik alan çalışmasına yaklaştırmaktadır.

Araştırmacının pozisyonunun da metodolojik tartışmalara dâhil edildiği kavramsallaştırmada, "alan" aynı zamanda aktörlerin pozisyonlarının etkileşimli olarak müzakere edildiği kişiler arası bir alandır (Orhon, 2014, s.55-56). Bu, aynı zamanda katılımcı olmayan gözlem yöntemine eleştirel bir tartışma zemini açar, çünkü araştırmacı yaşanan gerçekliğin tam ortasında durduğundan "katılmaması" imkânsızdır. Başka bir deyişle, araştırmacı tıpkı analiz ettiği araştırma nesnesi gibi

başka bir toplumsal kategoridir. Daha da önemlisi, alanda karşılaşacağı gerçeklik kendi toplumsal konumu ile dolayımlanmaktadır.

Bu çalışma Yenimahalle'de yirmi yıldır yaşayan bir kişi tarafından yapılmıştır. Bu durum, bu çalışma nesnesine tamamen yabancı olmadığım anlamına geliyor. Çalışmanın ilk aşamasına kadar yıllar boyunca Şentepe'de bulunmamama rağmen, Yenimahalle'de ikamet etmem sebebiyle, Şentepe ve sakinleri hakkında neler söylendiğine aşina oldum. Şentepe hakkında Yenimahalleliler arasında aşina olduğum söylemler, Şentepe sakinlerinin "kent yaşamına entegre olamamış kişiler", "tehlikeli", "varoş", "cahil", "okuma yazma bilmeyen", "yasadışı işlerle meşgul" olan kişiler olduğunu söylüyordu. Böyle bir arka plan bilgisine sahip olarak Şentepe üzerine bir çalışma yapmak, eleştirel bir sorgulama yapılmadıkça önyargılarım çerçevesinde çalışma nesnesine bakıyor olmam gibi bir tehlike ihtiva eder. Bu noktada öz düşünümsel bir perspektifi benimsemek, önyargılarımı eleştirel olarak gözden geçirmek, araştırmacı olarak konumumu ortaya koymak ve bu kötü şöhretin tarihsel kökenini ortaya koyabilmek açısından oldukça önemlidir. Bu nedenle, Yenimahalle ile Şentepe arasındaki sınırın öz düşünümsel bir perspektiften eleştirisi 4. bölümün ilk kısmında ele alınmıştır.

Bölüm 3'te, görüşmelerden elde edilen verileri analiz etmek için gecekondu, bellek ve nostalji olmak üzere üç kavramsal araç olarak ele alınmıştır. İlk kısımda gecekondu olgusu ve Türkiye akademisinde gecekondu olgusunun ele alınışı tartışılmıştır. Bu kısımda, Tahire Erman'ın (2001) literatürdeki gecekondu çalışmaları üzerine yaptığı analiz bir model olarak ele alınmıştır. Bu modelde Erman, Türkiye akademisinin gecekonduluları ele alma şekillerine bakar. Bu çalışmada teorik temel olarak, Foucault'nun bilginin kullanımından ayrı olarak tartışılamayacağını belirten perspektifini benimseyen Erman, gecekondu sakinlerinin, 1950'lerden 2000'lere kadar yapılmış çalışmalarda ele alınış biçimlerini geniş çapta inceler ve gecekonduluların Türkiye akademisi tarafından "alt öteki" olarak ele alındığını ortaya koyar (ibid, s. 983). Akademik söylemde gecekonduluların temsillerindeki değişimi tanımlamak için dört ana periyod

belirlemiştir: 1950'lerde ve 1960'larda "köylü Öteki"; 1970'lerde ve 1980'lerin başında "sömürülen/dezavantajlı Öteki"; 1980'lerin ortalarında ve 1990'ların ortalarında "haksız Öteki (ler)" ve "alt kültürlü/düşük kültürlü Öteki" ye karşı "kent yoksulu Öteki (ler)"; ve son olarak 1990'ların sonlarında "sakıncalı / varoşlu Öteki". Bu model, 4. Bölümde Şentepe'nin 1923'ten 2000'lere kadar değişiminin sunulduğu bağlamsallaştırmanın temelini oluşturmak için önemlidir.

Ankara, Türkiye'deki gecekondulaşma ve kentleşme tartışmalarından özgün bir yere sahiptir. Yine ilk kısmın içinde bir başlık olarak, 1923'ten 1960'a kadar Ankara'da gecekondulaşmayı etkileyen sosyo-politik faktörler, Tansı Şenyapılı'nın (1985) yaptığı önemli çalışmalar ışığında tartışılmıştır.

Aynı bölümün ikinci kısımda ise, bellek kavramı, görüşmecilerin anlatıların analizi sırasında kullanılabilmesi için ayrıntılı olarak tartışılmaktadır. Bu bölüm, literatürde var olan bellek yaklaşımlarından başlamakta, değişen paradigmalarla devam etmekte ve bu sayede kavramın bu çalışmada kullanılmaya uygun operasyonel zemini tartışılmaktadır. Ayrıca, bellek çalışmalarının içinde bir bölümde bu çalışma için oldukça merkezi olan bellek mekân ilişkisi de tartışılmıştır.

Bellek kavramının sosyal bilimler içinde ele alınış biçimlerinin çoğunun Maurice Halbwachs (1991) tarafından inşa edilen temel üzerine kurulduğu söylenebilir. Toplulukların değerlerinden bağımsız mutlak bir bellek olmadığı varsayımıyla, aktörlerin bireysel anıları bellek kavramı aracılığıyla izlenir. Böylece, bellek bir anılar yığını olmanın ötesinde, toplumsal olarak inşa edilen bir çerçevedir. Dahası, böyle bir çerçevede, bellek, geçmişin değil, bugünün değerlerini ve anlamlarını ortaya çıkaran, toplumsal, aktif, dinamik ve çoklu olarak inşa edilmiş bir süreçtir. Belleği oluşturan iki kuvvet olarak hatırlamak ve unutmak, antagonist olarak çalışan süreçler olmaktan uzaktır. Aksine, bir anıyı hatırlamak ve bir bağlam içinde anlamlandırabilmek ancak olanların bir kısmını unutmakla mümkün olabilir. Böylece bu iki kuvvet birlikte, belleği oluştururlar. Ayrıca, bellek şimdinin çerçevesi ile yapılandırılmıştır. Bu haliyle kaydedilmiş geçmiş olayların atıldığı kapalı bir kutusu olmaktan uzaktır. Aksine, şimdiki zamandan bakarak, yani şu anın

gözlükleri ve pozisyonları ile dolayımlanarak inşa edilir. Dahası, bellek bireyin içinde bulunduğu mevcut pozisyonları meşrulaştırmak için kullanılır (Connerton, 1989). Ayrıca, bu boyutlar belleği bir içerikten ziyade, özellikle toplumsal bir çerçeve oluşu ile benzer diğer terimlerden ayırmaktadır.

3. Bölümde tartışılan son kavramsal araç olarak, nostaljinin sosyolojik çerçevesi Fred Davis (1979) tarafından çizilmiştir. Nostalji, hafızanın özgül bir şeklidir ve nostaljinin bu münhasırlığı, "geçmişin" olumlu hatırlanan olaylarına işaret etmesinden kaynaklanmaktadır. Bir başka deyişle, aktörler olumlu bir bağlamda hatırladıkları anılara karşı nostaljik hissederlerken, olumsuz çağrışımları olan hatıralar hakkında nostaljik değillerdir (Davis, 1979, s.14). Nostaljiye özgü ikinci nokta, "önce" ve "sonra" arasındaki zıtlıktan gelir. Bu, olumsuz olayların başlangıcı olan bir değişim olarak "düşüş" e işaret eder. Bu tür bir tahayyülde, "önce", bir tür "gerçek olamayacak kadar iyi" döneme işaret etmektedir. Bu nedenle, geçmişe nostaljik bakış, aynı zamanda bir dönemselleştirme eylemidir (Tannock, 1995, s. 456-457). Toplumsal değişimlerden önceki deneyimlerin "iyi" yönleri nostaljik bir biçimde hatırlanır. Aslında, olayların "iyiliği" olumsuz olarak değerlendirilen şimdiki zamanın bağlamından gelir (ibid).

Nostalji çoğunlukla bir tür "geri çekilme" olarak ele alınır. Hatta siyasi literatürde de, ütopya daha çok sol eğilimli görüşler ile ilişkilendirilirken, nostalji, daha çok muhafazakârlık ve sağ görüşler ile ilişkilendirilmiştir. Nostalji, geçmiş bağlam ve çerçevelere ait gelenekleri koruma özelliğine sahipken, ütopya genellikle gelecekteki hayal gücü, beklentiler ve fantezilerle ilişkilidir. Bu tezde, bu ikilik sorunsallaştırılarak nostaljinin ütopya ile ilişkisi ortaya konmuştur. Ayrıca, bireylerin sosyal değişimlere nostaljik bakışı üzerinden, yalnızca mevcut toplumsal yaşama olan rahatsızlıklarından değil aynı zamanda gelecekteki beklentileri ve hayallerinden de kaynaklanabileceği iddia edilmektedir.

Birden fazla nostalji türü olduğunu belirtmek çok önemlidir. Buna göre, bu farklı nostalji bireylerin ve farklı sosyal çerçevelerin ve bağlamların farklı deneyimlerine işaret etmektedir (ibid, s. 454). Bu bölümün başında belirtildiği gibi, nostalji

muhayyel ya da patolojik olmaktan uzaktır. Özellikle aktörlerin "düşüş" diye tanımladıkları momentin nasıl tartıştıklarını ele edebilmek açısından nostaljik bakışın analizi önem kazanmaktadır. Bu noktadan hareketle, aslında, ortaya çıkan nostaljik bir örüntü, hem bireysel hem de sosyal düzeyde ihtiyaçlarına, hayallerine ve gelecek beklentilerine işaret edebilmektedir. Sonuç olarak, nostaljinin toplumsal bir işlevi vardır.

4. Bölümde, toplamda dört başlık altında, Şentepe Mahallesi'ndeki gecekondu olgusu, 1960'lardan 2000'lerin başlarına ele alınmaktadır. Bu bölüm, Yenimahalle ile Şentepe arasındaki sosyal sınırın tartışılması ile başlayıp Şentepe mahallesinin yakın tarihinin periyodlar halinde ele alıyor. Bu periyodlar: "1960-1970 yıllarında Şentepe", "1980 askeri darbesinden hemen önce Şentepe", "1980 Sonrası Şentepe" olarak üç başlıkta oluşmaktadır. Ankara'da gecekondunun sosyal ve politik dinamikleri ile ortaya çıkışı ile mahallenin "kurtarılmış bölge" den kentsel dönüşüm projelerine dönüşümü, Erman'ın (2001) çalışmasında yaptığı bağlamlaştırma mantığı doğrultusunda, basılı kaynakların ve görüşmecilerin anlatılarını izleyerek sunulmaktadır.

Söz konusu hususlar göz önüne alındığında, çalışmanın amacına uygun olarak Şentepe, bu çalışmada tarihsel bir bağlamda ele alınmıştır. Ancak, bu tarihsel bağlam resmi bir tarihin sunumu olmaktan uzaktır. Görüşmecilerle mülakatlarda toplanan veriler, Ankara'nın kentinin ve ülkenin söz konusu periyodlarda içinden geçtiği küresel değişimlerle ilişkili olarak Şentepe mahallesi özgül örneği üzerinden tartışılmıştır. Diğer bir deyişle, sıradan aktörlerin hayatını etkileyen ve alandan elde edilen veriler, aktörlerin eylemleri üzerinde etkisi olan küresel ve ulusal ölçekteki toplumsal ve siyasi dinamiklerle ilişkilendirilerek analiz edilmiştir.

Şentepe'ye Ankara'nın civar illerinden ilk gelenler genellikle 1960-1970 yılları arasında gelmiş ve oradaki arazilere çevirerek gecekondular inşa etmişlerdir. İlk başlarda Şentepe'nin zorlu topografik coğrafyasına tek tük olarak yayılan gecekondu evleri, 1970'lere doğru gecekondu mahallelerine dönüşmüştür. 12 Eylül askeri darbesine kadar takip eden 1970-1980 arası dönemde, devrimci sol örgütlerin

hızla örgütlendiği Şentepe, "kurtarılmış bölge" olarak anılmaya başlamıştır. 12 Eylül askeri darbesi ile tasfiye edilen sol gruplar ile birlikte mahalle de 2000'lere kadarki dönemde pek çok dönüşüm geçirmiştir. Bu dönemde yeni seçilen Özal hükümeti gecekondu sakinlerine esasında tam olarak tapu olmayan ve "tapu tahsis belgesi" adı verilen bir belge vererek gecekonduluların kentsel mekândaki varlıklarını tanımıştır. Bununla birlikte gecekondu sakinlerinin oturdukları arazileri müteahhit firmalara vererek apartmanlar yapılmasına da izin vermiştir. Şentepe'de 1980 sonrası ilk dönüşümler belediyenin öncülüğünde 1984 yılında başlamıştır. Bu süreçte gecekondu sakinlerinden bir kısmı birden fazla daire sahibi olmuştur. Ancak değişimlerin başladığı bu moment, aynı zamanda mahalledeki eski toplumsal yapının da değişmeye başladığı ilk "düşüş" anlarından biridir.

Eski gecekonduluların anlatılarındaki nostaljik örüntünün tartışıldığı 5. Bölüm, 2000'li yıllardan sonra yapılan kentsel dönüşüm ve sahaya gidilerek gözlemlenen mahalledeki mevcut koşullar ile başlamaktadır. Şentepe'de 2000'li yıllardan günümüze kadarki değişimler nostaljik anlatıların ikinci "düşüş" momentini oluşturmaktadır. Bu değişimler nostaljik tona odaklanan bu bölümde sunulmuştur; çünkü anlatılarda nostaljik olarak yaklaşılanlar, yakın zamanda yaşanan değişimler ve sakinlerin şu an mahallede bulamadıkları ile yakından ilgilidir. Bu bölümün ilerleyen kısımlarında görüşmecilerin anlatılarında ortaya çıkan dört ana tema, toplumsal cinsiyete ilişkin anlatılarla birlikte ortaya konmuş ve izleyen kısımlarda bu kalıpların anlamı nostalji terimi ile açılan kavramsal alan içinde tartışılmıştır.

5. bölümde nostaljik olarak bakılanlar, toplumsal cinsiyet rollerine bağlı anlatılarla da dahil olmak üzere toplamda beş kısımda toplanmıştır. Bunlar, komşuluk, gecekondunun zorluğu ve dairelerin konforu, güvenlik ve bahçedir. Görüşmelerde bu ana temalar üzerinde tartışılan bağlamlarda gecekondudaki hayata özlem duyulduğu sonucuna varılmıştır.

Temalara bakıldığında, konut sakinlerinin şu anda mahallenin sosyal ortamında bulamadıkları hakkında nostaljik oldukları söylenebilir. İkincisi, "öncesi ve sonrası"

anlatılan hatıralar, 1980'den sonra meydana gelen değişikliklerin, öncesinde "altın çağın" yaşandığı bir "düşüş" olduğuna işaret etmektedir.

Pilot çalışmanın sonunda ortaya çıkan araştırma sorusu, eski gecekondu sakinlerinin, kentsel dönüşüm projesi sırasında arazilerini müteahhit firmalara satmalarına rağmen hangi olası sebeplerle gecekondudaki yaşamı nostaljik bir tonda anlatıyor oldukları idi. Önceki iki bölümde tartıştığım bulgunun ışığında, bunun "rasyonel" bir nedeni olmadığını söyleyebilirim. Bu nedenle, araştırma sorusunun kendisinin tartışılması gerekir. Her şeyden önce, mahalledeki dönüşümlere katkıları yadsınamayacak olmasına rağmen, özellikle 1980 sonrası pek çok açıdan köklü bir şekilde dönüşen Türkiye'de, aktörlerin seçenekleri oldukça sınırlıdır. Bu nedenle, topraklarının satılması ile mahallenin değişmesinin doğrudan gecekondu sakinlerinin elinde olduğu direkt bir ilişkiden söz edilemez. İkincisi, insanlar bilinçli olarak değiştirdikleri koşullara karşı da nostaljik hissedebilirler. Gecekondu sakinleri kırsal alandan göç etmiş ve kırsal alana ait yaşamın pastoral unsurlarını bahçe teması üzerinden özlemle anmıştır.

Yukarıdaki noktalar, ortaya çıkan nostaljik örüntünün anlamsız olduğu anlamına gelmez. Bu sonuç, bu nostaljik görünümün salt paradoksal olduğunu varsaymak yerine, olumlu çağrışımın bağlamını ve çerçevesini tartışmanın daha anlamlı olduğunu göstermektedir. Bu nedenle, araştırma sorusu "Şentepe'deki sakinlerin mahallenin gecekondu geçmişine nostaljik bakışları, şu anki yaşamlarına ilişkin ne anlatır?" olarak değiştirilebilir. Burada en önemli nokta, belleğin ve nostaljinin "geride kalmış" bir geçmişe bakmaktan başka bir şey olmadığını belirtmek ve şu anda var olan fonksiyonlarına işaret etmektir. Bu çalışmanın ana iddiası, nostaljik bakışın, gelecek için de işleve sahip olmasıdır. Bu çalışma sonucunda bulduğum nostaljik temalar, Tahire Erman'ın (2017) çalışmasıyla paralellik göstermektedir. Erman bu çalışmasında mahallede radikal değişiklikler olduğu sürece nostaljik bakışın artacağı ve geçmişe ilişkin romantik bakışın devam edeceği sonucu varmıştır ve bu tespit önemlidir. Ancak, bu çalışmanın farklılaşan yönü ve katkısı, geçmişte gecekonduya dair nostaljik bakışın sakinlerin gelecekteki beklentilerine

işaret ettiğidir. Aktörlerin geçmişte özlemle andıkları temalar olumlu bir bağlama sahip olduklarından, bu temalar gelecekte ne tür bir mahallede yaşamak istediklerinin çerçevesini çizer. Bu tartışmadaki önemli nokta, gecekondu evleri ve onların zorlu fiziksel koşulları değil, gecekondu geçmişinde gecekonduluların özlemeye değer buldukları anlam ve bağlamlardır. Buna göre, öne çıkan nokta, hangi noktaya "düşüş" olarak tanımladıkları ile "düşüş öncesi dönemi" nasıl tanımladıklarıdır.

Şentepe özelinde konuşulacak olursa, aktörler tarafından "düşüş" olarak tanımlanan dönemin 1980 ve 2000 sonrası kentsel dönüşümler olduğunu göz önünde bulundurularak denebilir ki, gecekondudaki birlikte güçlükleri aşma ve dayanışma pratikleri olumlu bir anlam taşımaktadır. Bu sonuç, konut sakinlerinin beklentilerini göz önünde bulundurularak yapılması gereken kentsel dönüşüm projelerine alternatif yaklaşımlar için bir temel oluşturabilir. Bu katılımcı yaklaşım ayrıca, gecekondu sakinlerine Erman'ın işaret ettiği gibi "alt öteki" olarak bakan paradigma için de alternatif bir yaklaşımın temelini oluşturabilir.

D. THESIS PERMISSION FORM/ TEZ İZİN FORMU

<u>**ENSTİTÜ /**</u> <u>INSTITUTE</u>

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

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences ■

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences ☐

<u>**YAZARIN /**</u> <u>AUTHOR</u>

Soyadı / Surname   : Arık
Adı / Name   : Gözde
Bölümü / Department   : Sosyal Antropoloji

<u>**TEZİN ADI /**</u> <u>TITLE OF THE THESIS</u> (**İngilizce** / English) : ŞENTEPE IN MEMORIES: A FIELD RESEARCH ON GECEKONDU, MEMORY AND NOSTALGIA

<u>**TEZİN TÜRÜ /**</u> <u>DEGREE</u>**:** **Yüksek Lisans** / Master ■   **Doktora** / PhD ☐

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. /** Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide.   ■

2. **Tez <u>iki yıl</u> süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **<u>two years</u>. ***   ☐

3. **Tez <u>altı ay</u> süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for period of **<u>six months</u>. ***   ☐

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

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