

SOCIAL POLICY OF URBAN TRANSFORMATION:
SOCIAL HOUSING POLICIES IN TURKEY FROM THE 1980s TO PRESENT

by

Helin Özge Burkay

Submitted to

The Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History

in the partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of Master of Arts

Boğaziçi University

2006

An abstract of the thesis of Helin Özge Burkay for the Degree of Master of Arts from the Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History to be taken September 2006

Title: Social Policy of Urban Transformation: Social Housing Policies in Turkey from the 1980s to Present

This thesis analyzes the post-2000 policies of social housing in Turkey with reference to urban transformation and gentrification attempts on the one hand and social policies directed at the redefinition of the position of the poor in urban society on the other hand. The aim is to historicize the current developments taking place in the low-income housing in the context of post-1980 capitalist urbanization with a special emphasis on the relation between the formation of the squatter settlements (*gecekondu*s) and state regulation through different legal and institutional frameworks in time. The legal framework of ongoing *gecekondu* transformation projects crystallize the embedded intentions and mentality of the new strategy of the state with the peculiarities of the Turkish case like the specific role of informality, the upward mobility motivation of the *gecekondu* residents, their articulation with the urban life in one way or another as well as the state's reluctance for regulating the issue through formal housing and preferring to set the terms of the bargaining with the *gecekondu* residents by means of electoral politics and reconstruction amnesties in a social and economic setting of free market in the post-1980 period. The main argument of this thesis is that the current policies of the state regarding the transformation of the *gecekondu* areas reflect a radical change in the patterns of regulating the urban poor through housing measures different than the previous periods with implications relevant to the overall organization of the urban space in the post-2000 period.

Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü'nde Yüksek Lisans derecesi için
Helin Özge Burkay tarafından Eylül 2006'da teslim edilen tezin kısa özeti

Başlık: Kentsel Dönüşümün Sosyal Politikası: Türkiye'de 1980lerden Günümüze
Sosyal Konut Politikaları

Bu tez Türkiye'de 2000 sonrası sosyal konut politikalarını, bir yandan kentsel dönüşüm ve soylulaştırma girişimlerini diğer yandan kent yoksullarının konumunu yeniden tanımlamaya yönelik sosyal politikaları göz önünde bulundurarak incelemektedir. Amaç, düşük gelir gruplarına yönelik konut politikalarında 2000 sonrasında yapılan yasal ve kurumsal değişikliklerin, 1980 sonrası kapitalist kentleşme bağlamında, devlet ve *gecekondu* ilişkisinin değişimini de vurgulayarak tarihselleştirilmesidir. Devam eden *gecekondu* dönüşüm projeleri devletin *gecekondu*lara ilişkin yeni stratejisini belirginleştirmekte; aynı zamanda enformel ekonominin, *gecekondu* sakinlerinin yukarı hareketlilik motivasyonlarının ve kent hayatıyla eklemlenme yöntemlerinin çerçevesini çizmektedir. Bu projelerin yasal çerçevesi devletin son yıllara kadar bir politika olarak formel konut sunumunu bu alanda alternatif olarak görmekte tereddüt etmesinin ve bunun yerine *gecekondu* sakinleriyle seçim politikaları ve imar afları dolayısıyla pazarlık içinde olmasının dinamiklerinin de tartışılmasını sağlamaktadır. Bu bağlamda, bu tez, 2000 sonrası düşük gelir gruplarına yönelik konut politikalarının, devletin *gecekondu*larla ilişkisi bakımından incelendiğinde, daha önceki dönemlerden farklı bir çerçeveye oturduğunu ve bu çerçevenin 1980 sonrası sosyal ve ekonomik değişimler ekseninde kent mekanının serbest piyasanın ve küresel ekonominin gereklerine uygun olarak yeniden düzenlenmesine yönelik uygulamalarla beraber anlaşılması gerektiğini iddia etmektedir.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis would not be complete without the academic support and encouragement of my thesis advisor, Prof. Ayşe Buğra who has read the thesis with great attention and interest and motivated me throughout the year with her patience and kindness in hard times. I am also grateful to my jury members, M.Asım Karaömerlioğlu and Nadir Özbek for their valuable critiques and contributions.

My dear friends Ceren, Azer, Ali, Nurçin, Evren, Ceren Ünlü and Ramazan have shared their experiences about the writing process and gave a helping hand for any kind of problem I have faced. I would also like to thank the administrative staff of the Atatürk Institute, Necla Turunç and Kadriye Tamtekin, for helping out with the procedural requirements and reminding the deadlines. Leyla Abla was the one who has showed me that a little sense of humour can make a big difference.

Kathryn Kranzler has edited the whole thesis with great attention and I am indebted to her and Tracy Deliismail for their valuable comments and contributions.

My sister, Gözde, has never withheld her support and been a last minute saver for the organization of the materials of the thesis. I owe a lot to the encouragement of my parents who have never lost his faith in me. My father inspired me with his great enthusiasm and my mother with her unlimited energy. Also, I appreciate their logistic support without which this year would be much more difficult.

Any word of appreciation would be insufficient to express my gratitude for the presence Egemen who has changed my life forever. He has kept surprising me not only with his intellectual energy but also with his passionate commitment to live and share. I cannot thank him enough for always being there for me with his generous love and tenderness, never letting me fall and turning the life we share into a miracle.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. FRAMEWORK OF ANALYSIS.....	14
Social Security and Social Policy.....	16
Urban Poverty and Capitalist Urbanization.....	30
Different Dimensions of Housing Policy.....	40
III. HOUSING IN THE POST-1980 ENVIRONMENT AND ITS HISTORICAL BACKGROUND.....	49
Brief History of Housing in Turkey until the 1980s: State, Informal Economy and the Emergence of <i>Gecekondu</i>	51
New Urban Setting of post-1980 Period.....	57
Mass Housing Fund: Formal Distribution of the Urban Rent.....	60
<i>Gecekondu</i> , Urban Poverty and Informality after 1980.....	67
IV. HOUSING POLICY OF URBAN TRANSFORMATION: THE 2000s.....	77
Legal and Institutional Changes in Mass Housing Policy.....	80
Current Projects.....	89
Two <i>Gecekondu</i> Transformation Projects: Industrial Relocation and Urban Vista.....	102
İkitelli (Ayazma and Tepeüstü) Halkalı <i>Gecekondu</i> Transformation Project.....	104
Ankara Airport Highway <i>Gecekondu</i> Transformation Project.....	113
Concluding Remarks.....	118
V. CONCLUSION.....	121
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	129
APPENDIX	137

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The 2003 Global Report of United Nations Human Settlement Programme was named “The Challenge of Slums.”¹ The challenge posed by the slums was their huge increase in number and the expected future proliferation in the developing world.² The report suggests that upgrading the housing conditions of the urban poor should not be confined to the improvement of the housing conditions of the urban poor; what should immediately be done is take measures for the alleviation of poverty and reduction of inequalities in the urban space. Although the definition of the *ad-hoc* solutions of the urban poor to their housing problem in the urban area varies by context and country, the symptoms are defined more or less the same way, increasing inequalities in the urban area and irregular settlements as their spatial manifestation.³

The issue has entered the agenda of the Turkish policy-makers within the framework of urban transformation after 2000. The Turkish version of irregular settlements of the poor, namely *gecekondu*, has been an urban phenomenon since the 1950s. It has been subject to regulation since its emergence through several measures among which altering the property status of the *gecekondu*s by enacting

¹ *The Challenge of Slums: Global Report on Human Settlements 2003*, ed. United Nations Human Settlements Programme (London, Sterling: Earthscan, 2003).

² *Ibid.*, xxv. In 2001 there were 924 million people living in the slums which makes 31,6 percent of the world urban population. In the developing world the percentage rises up to 43 percent in contrast to six percent in the developed countries. It is expected that the number will be two billion in thirty years if any action for reducing poverty is taken.

³ *Ibid.*, xxvii-xxviii.

reconstruction amnesties has been the one most widely used. As such, on the one hand, the *gecekondu*s were legalized, though not formalized, and have become an integral part of the urban setting. On the other, politics around the selective legalization of the *gecekondu* neighborhoods opened up new bargaining grounds for both the policy-makers and the *gecekondu* dwellers for the regulation of poverty and acquiring a share from the urban rent. In 2002, the government action plan of the Justice and Development Party declared the will to “open up to the world” and “become fully integrated to the global economic system.”⁴ Within the framework of full economic integration, urban transformation has entered the agenda as one of the most important aspects with the aim of creating urban centers that are commercially and touristically more attractive and competitive. With these considerations on the agenda, the *Gecekondu* Transformation Projects were put into action to “prevent unhealthy and ugly urbanization,” pointing out the government’s determination to construct “habitable” cities free from the problems created by the *gecekondu*s.⁵ It is obvious that the UN’s politically correct articulation of the housing issue of the urban poor, that is the “challenge of slums,” has been translated into the “threat of *gecekondu*s” by the current government. More important, however, are the legal and institutional changes with respect to the regulation of the *gecekondu* that have been framed by concerns related to the transformation of the urban area in line with the requirements of the capitalist urbanization in the age of globalization.

This thesis analyses the housing policy of Turkey with a particular interest on the post-2000 developments in the low-income housing policies employed for the elimination of the squatter settlements. The aim is to highlight the social and

⁴ Available [online] at <http://www.akparti.org.tr/acileylem.html>

⁵ Government program of the Justice and Development Party is available [online] at <http://www.akparti.org.tr>.

economic context in which the recent developments take place in low-income housing policy and to historicize the dynamics leading to legal and institutional changes. It is in the social setting of the post-industrial economic order that the polarization of the urban space is perpetuated with mechanisms with which land and housing issues constitute an important component. The state's involvement in the issue is critical in this regard as social housing's policy dimension is limited not to the satisfaction of the basic housing needs of the urban poor. The mechanisms through which it is formulated and put into action and the definition of the problem that the particular housing policy is proposed as an alternative solution is related strongly to the spatial organization of the city, the urban poor's social and economic position within the urban space as well as the attitudes of the policy makers towards the role of the urban poor in the overall social structure. The informal housing practices and their intermingling with the formal state policies as well as the ongoing conflict of different income groups over the urban space should be examined all together. Issues related to housing gives valuable insights into understanding the change after the 1980s as well as the reorganization of the social and economic life in the same era. It is both related to the state's role with respect to poor/ disadvantaged /low-income groups as well as the organization of the urban space.

It is the main argument of this thesis that the current policies of the state regarding the transformation of the *gecekondu* areas reflect a radical change in the patterns of regulating the urban poor through, for the first time, employing country-wide mass housing measures on a large scale. In this context, this thesis aims at analysing the post-2000 policies of social housing in Turkey with reference to the relative weight of urban development and gentrification attempts on the one hand and social policies directed at the redefinition of the position of the poor in urban

society on the other hand. Another aim of this thesis is to historicize the current developments taking place in the urban area in the context of post-1980 capitalist urbanization with a special emphasis on the relation between squatter settlements and state's policies to regulate them through different legal and institutional frameworks. The analysis of the current developments in the housing policy points to a new turn in this relation with implications relevant to the overall organization of the urban space in the period.

In this context, the analysis of the dynamics leading to the change in the patterns of regulation of *gecekondu* in the period after 2000 constitutes a major concern. The current transformation projects are capable of crystallizing the embedded intentions and mentality of this new strategy with the peculiarities of the Turkish case like the specific role of informality, the upward mobility motivation of the *gecekondu* residents, their articulation with the urban life in one way or another as well as the state's reluctance to regulate the issue through formal housing and preferring to set the terms of the bargaining with the *gecekondu* residents by means of electoral politics at the municipal level and reconstruction amnesties.

The analysis of the housing policy of Turkey in the post-1980 environment depends on several theoretical concerns that are considered as fundamental for defining the state's policies towards the regulation of the urban space. The state's involvement in the housing-related aspects of urban life can be formulated as three concerns of the housing policy. One is the concern about public health through the standardization of the building environment; the second defines decent housing as a right and includes it on the agenda of social policy; and the third is the enabling free market as the best way of supplying the housing needs.⁶ The state's position goes

⁶ David Clapham, Peter Kemp, and Susan J. Smith, *Housing and Social Policy* (London: Macmillan, 1990), 22.

back and forth according to the economic and social priorities of the period as well as the demographic pressures and political legitimacy.

Since its emergence in the 1950s *gecekondu*s proved to be very resilient to the changing conditions of both the urban setting and the legal regulations. It can be argued that its adaptive potential to the new requirements of the new circumstances stems from its flexibility both in the housing market and in terms of its architectural characteristics.⁷ It is through this flexibility and adaptability that the *gecekondu*s have transformed themselves into multi-storey apartment blocs with a claim on the urban rent or closed communities on ethnic or religious lines in order to hold on in the city space. After 2000 a new understanding with respect to *gecekondu* has started to be institutionalized through the changes made in the Mass Housing Administration's legal framework.

In this context, in the second chapter, the theoretical concerns of the analysis are framed through the ample discussion of the concepts like social policy, capitalist urbanization, urban poverty and housing. All these concepts are related to each other within the definition of urban poverty. Urban poverty has emerged as a conceptual category of academic and popular interest in the context of urbanization and industrialization. At the same time it has been an important concern of social policy makers. Different from rural poverty as a category, urban poverty implies a multi-dimensional relation of macro-level economic transformation at the global level with micro-level social conditions in the urban area. This multi-dimensional relation can be analyzed with different terms and by different perspectives, each of which opens

⁷ The flexibility of the *gecekondu* and its other characteristics will be developed later. However, the point was made by Tansı Şenyapılı, "Enformel Sektör: Durağanlıktan Devingenliğe/ Gecekondulaşmadan Apartmanlaşmaya," in *Yoksulluk: Bölgesel Gelişme ve Kırsal Yoksulluk, Kent Yoksulluğu*, ed. Halis Akder and Murat Güvenç (İstanbul: TESEV, 2000). See also Ayşe Buğra, "The Immoral Economy of Housing in Turkey," *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 22 (1998).

up new discussions about social exclusion, public policy-making, urbanization and the temporal and mobile links of formal sectors within informal networks. The discussions on these themes were conducted on the basis of the existing literature on poverty, urbanization, social policy and housing.

In the post-1980 context of neo-liberal free market economy, change in the industrial production patterns has had an enormous impact especially in the labor market structures and the organization of the economic activity in the developing countries. Flexible production and the global organization of capital brought in the redefinition of the overall urban economic activity and the position of the labor within. One of the many faces of this change has been the relocation of industrial areas to the outer zones of the city at the concentrated industrial zones and informalization of the economic activity. The centrality of a city started to be defined more in terms of location at the center of financial and commercial networks operating at the global level rather than the level of industrial production.

In this context, as an important social policy item on the agenda of the decision-makers, housing has been used widely as a tool to relocate the urban population, either in the form of encouraging the proliferation of a certain group or implicitly taking advantage of the disadvantageous position of the other, in line with the priorities of the new urban order. Apart from its significance for the spatial expression of the social hierarchies, housing is also important as a sector for the overall economy with all the sub-sectors with which it is connected. It also has a determining power for the access of the economic and social activity. In the context of urban transformation it is the way that the urban space can be spatially re-organized.

In Turkey, social housing policies have not been employed as measures to regulate the residential patterns of the urban poor on a large scale. Rather, the emergence of *gecekondu* has filled the gap with all of its potentials and legitimacy. The potentials were mainly due to the cheap labor force it could supply to the market and its legitimacy derived from a particular notion of social justice stemming from the relation of poverty and *gecekondu*. The informal economic activities have been supportive mechanisms for the functioning of the economy especially during the 1960s and 1970s.

In the beginning, *gecekondus* were located at the outskirts of the city and constituted typical examples of poor housing like those in the other countries. In the 1960s 59 percent of the population in Ankara, 45 percent in Istanbul and 33 percent in Izmir were living in the *gecekondus*. The period witnessed the perception of the *gecekondu* phenomenon within the framework of satisfaction of a shelter need and low-income housing policies were on the agenda of the public as an alternative.⁸ The period also witnessed the adoption of the *Gecekondu* Law entitling legality to the already established *gecekondus* and further improvement of their conditions. In the same period *gecekondus* also attracted a significant level of academic interest stemming from development studies.⁹ Many surveys were conducted with the purpose of analyzing the role of irregular settlements and the functioning of the informal economies with respect to the problems faced by the developmentalist state.

⁸ Buğra, "The Immoral Economy of Housing in Turkey," 304. Also relevant for the discussions about the low income housing alternatives in the period are the articles published in journals. See especially the articles Erhan Acar and Mehmet Adam, "Kapitalistleşme Sürecinde Gecekondu," *Mimarlık* 16, no. 156 (1978), Aliye Pekin Çelik, "Gecekondu dan Sosyal Konuta Geçiş Üzerine Araştırma," *Mimarlık* 8, no. 82 (1970), Fikri Gökçeer, "Sosyal Konut Sorunu ve Belediyeler," *İller ve Belediyeler Dergisi* 33, no. 378 (1977), Yılmaz İnkaya, "Türkiye'de Cumhuriyet Devrinin Başından Günümüze Kadar Konut Sorunu," *Mimarlık* 107 (1972), "Sosyal Konut Standartları Üzerine Mimarlar Odasının Görüşleri," *Mimarlık*, no. 3 (1964).

⁹ Buğra, "The Immoral Economy of Housing in Turkey," 303.

In most of the cases, the studies treated *gecekondu* as a transitory category between urban and rural social and economic organization.¹⁰

However, in the 1980s characteristics of the *gecekondus* changed along with the changes in the economic policy. The irregular one-storey shacks were transformed into multi-storey apartment blocs with a claim on urban land at the expense of losing the ground of their legitimacy built on the satisfaction of the shelter need. The problem started to be defined more in terms of property relations and the *gecekondus* were seen as sources of illegitimate and illegal income generator. Also in this period was the emergence of the Mass Housing Fund with the purpose of channeling credits for housing. However, the Mass Housing Projects were not targeted at the low-income groups; rather they supplied housing for the middle and high income groups thanks to the requirements of the credits available.

The third chapter deals mainly with two themes. First is the housing policy of the period before 1980 with a specific emphasis on the dynamics that led to *gecekondu* formation and the mechanisms through which the state deals with the issue. The analysis is based on secondary sources and theoretical discussions with respect to understand Turkish urbanization. The second part of the chapter is about the post-1980 developments in economic order and its impacts on urban space along with the position of the poor within. The dynamics behind the establishment of the Mass Housing Administration and its relation with the functioning of the free market economy as well as the changing patterns of *gecekondu* formation with more

¹⁰ To name but a few of these academic studies *Ankara-Çınçınbağları Gecekondu Araştırması.*, (Ankara İmar ve İskan Bakanlığı, 1965), Charles William Merton Hart, *Zeytinburnu Gecekondu Bölgesi* (İstanbul: İstanbul Ticaret Odası, 1969), Metin Heper, *Gecekondu Policy in Turkey: An Evaluation with a Case Study of Rumelihisarüstü Squatter Area in İstanbul* (İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Press, 1978), İbrahim Öğretmen, *Ankara'da 158 Gecekondu Hakkında Monografi* (Ankara: Ajans-Türk Matbaası, 1957), Granville H. Sewell, *Squatter Settlements in Turkey : Analysis of a Social, Political, and Economic Problem* (Cambridge: 1964). For a contradictory view on the transition paradigm of the *gecekondu* phenomenon in the period, see Kemal Karpat, *The Gecekondu: Rural Migration and Urbanization* (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1976).

apparent links to the market in the 1980s mark the period. Particularly, this chapter aims to prepare the ground for the analysis of the social housing issue together with the strategies of the urban poor to overcome the difficulties in satisfaction of the housing need and their possible relation to the social housing policies of the state.

The fourth and the last chapter is based on the evaluation of the changes made in the legal and institutional framework of the Mass Housing Administration since 2000 on the grounds of implementing social housing policies for the elimination of the *gecekondu* areas. The argument of the chapter is that the urban transformation in the aftermath of the 1980 economic transformation based on converting the city into financial and commercial centers very much parallel with the dynamics of global trends of deindustrialization in a way leading to the relocation of industry is very relevant to analyze the residential structure and the position of the poor in society under the light of the legal and institutional changes in the 2000s.

The new housing policy of Turkey in the form of *gecekondu* transformation represents a turn both in the mentality of the decision makers and mechanisms through which the mentality is translated into the practical consequences. What is on the agenda, however, is not limited to *gecekondu* transformation. Currently, there are also huge ongoing urban renewal projects. In general, low-income housing policies are only small parts of a larger urban renewal projects designed for the reorganization of the lands at the center of the city for the most part occupied by the poor. The social housing projects apart from serving as a social control mechanisms are used to a large extent as a legitimization for “cleaning” the urban centers of the poor neighborhoods and from certain appearances of poverty.

The second part of the chapter deals with two ongoing *gecekondu* transformation projects as the examples of primary implementations of the changes

made in the legal framework. The empirical analysis was conducted around the questions of what is to be transformed, into what it is transformed, and by which means it is transformed. As one of the aims of the fourth chapter is focused on the mentality and intentions embedded in the institutionalization of the transformation in the urban area as well as the legal ground set for the future developments rather than the consequences of the transformation, the uncompleted projects were not considered as obstacles for conducting an empirical analysis. However, even the legal rules themselves were not settled and have been changed during the process of research. As the changes were not as big as to challenge the main argument of the chapter, they have not constituted a major obstacle for framing the analysis either. In any case, the laws given are the updated versions on which changes have been made until the very last moment.

One of the projects that is analyzed in the fourth chapter is in Istanbul and the other is in Ankara. Although there are many ongoing projects country-wide under the *Gecekondu* Transformation, these projects were chosen in terms of their strong relevance for the arguments of this thesis. The project in Istanbul, İkitelli-Ayazma Project, is significant as it is one of the recent *gecekondu* neighborhoods, different from the old ones constituted by mainly the forced migrants and single storey houses built after 1990, with a huge recreational area, Olympiad Village, nearby. With the purpose of developing the region along with the opportunities that the Olympiad Village brings, Ayazma was chosen as an area of transformation through relocation. This project was significant for showing the new dynamics of the urban setting shaped around the relocation of industry and concept of “global city.” The second project in Ankara, though less data was available about the project, was crucial to highlighting the visual side of the urban transformation with respect to the rhetorical

presentations of what was going on, partly thanks to the performative discourse of the current mayor of Ankara, Melih Gökçek. The *gecekondu* neighborhood located at the two sides of Ankara Airport Highway, like the Ayazma neighborhood, consists of single storey *gecekondus*. It can be assumed that the neighborhood has been formed after the last reconstruction amnesty which was in 1984.¹¹ According to the project the area will be transformed into housing and entertainment zone after the eradication of the *gecekondus*. Not to mention the increasing urban rent that would be left to the municipal authorities if both of the projects become successful.

In the final chapter, conclusions derived from the analysis of the social housing policy of Turkey after 1980 with a special emphasis on the changes after 2000 will be made clear.

As has been indicated earlier, this thesis analyses an ongoing process which is both difficult but fruitful at the same time. The main challenge stems from the strong relation of the arguments made throughout the thesis with the factual consequences in the field. In other words, as the low-income housing policies after 2000 are in the making, the impact of these policies to the urban area and the social and economic relations cannot be used as supportive data. However, it is necessary to go beyond unsupported predictions in terms of the conclusions derived from the analysis of the developments. In this context, Brazil's experience with the low-income housing opens up a valuable area of debate.

In the 1960s a new approach has been institutionalized in Brazil by the military regime to deal with the *favelas*. The solution has been formulated around the mechanism to convert the *favela* residents to the regular property owners. The

¹¹ This assumption is based on the fact that the construction amnesties in most cases are responses to the increase of the housing stock in the *gecekondu* neighborhoods in the form of vertical expansion of the buildings by the construction of extra storeys especially before and during the election times. Thus it is possible to estimate the timing of the formation of a *gecekondu* neighborhood by paying attention to the number of the average storeys the buildings have.

essence of the new policy was to use the cheap suburban land to eliminate the physical existence of the *favelas*. The institution responsible for the implementation of the new policy was the National Housing Bank which, within the framework of the economic order of the period, has been able to absorb substantial amounts of popular savings and channeled to the investments. The loans given by the bank was not directly given to the individuals, but to the local authorities. Thus, it could avoid the risk of loss and assured certain level of profit like any other firm in a capitalist economy. The *favela* areas transformed by the loans given by the Bank and new projects were implemented by the local authorities in the areas evacuated. The aim of the program was to stimulate the middle- and upper-class residential construction by clearing the poor from the most central areas of the city.¹²

However, the new policy was defeated “by the very configuration of class interests [it was] designed to legitimize.”¹³ The *favela* residents resisted to be located in the new housing areas for several reasons among which the distance from work, increasing transportation costs, lack of opportunity for finding odd-jobs to support family income, disruption of the informal networks that was crucial for the social life of the *favelas*, and requirements like monthly payments for the new houses can be counted. Soon after the implementation of the relocation of the *favela* residents to the new houses, together with the increasing real estate prices at the city center, an informal transfer of the houses from former *favela* residents to the low-middle classes who could not afford to rent from the city center. This transfer has eradicated the validity of the official program as the former *favela* residents moved back to new *favelas*.

¹² Alejandro Portes, "Housing Policy, Urban Poverty, and the State: The Favelas of Rio de Janeiro, 1972-1976," *Latin American Research Review* 14, no. 2 (1979).

¹³ *Ibid.*: 5.

The consequence of the implementation of the new policy was clear as Portes puts it: “The logic of a profit-oriented economic system completely subverted the original welfare housing program: it made homeowners not of the poor, but of the lower-middle class, and it benefited the former only by giving them a subsidized and unsuspected entry into housing speculation.”¹⁴ When the similarities in the policy approaches of Brazil in the 1960s with that of Turkey in the 2000s are taken into account, although different historical context are also determinant, it is plausible to begin the debates on the possible consequences of the urban transformation from the point Portes makes.

¹⁴ Ibid.: 17.

CHAPTER 2

FRAMEWORK OF ANALYSIS

During the military administration following the 1980 intervention, one of the laws adopted under the supervision of the military leaders was the Mass Housing Law. The enactment of a law regulating a fund for housing seems interesting for a group of military leaders who had taken over the state on the pretext of ending political deadlock and anarchy in the streets. However, the fundamental institutional and legal changes initiated under the military regime and continued after the civilians were returned to office in 1983 mark the social and economic transformation that Turkey was to pass through in the post-1980 period.

The transformation of the post-1980 was not unique to the Turkish context. An outward looking, market oriented economy has been institutionalized in many countries during the period. Nor were the overall change of the post-1980 period limited to the economic transformation. It had many implications for many aspects of the social and political life among which the changes in the organization of the urban life and the position of the urban poor within the urban space are two of the most important dimensions. The transformation in the urban space has been visible through the changes in the spatial reorganization of the cities triggered by factors like the relocation of industry, globalization and the changing organization of the social and economic networks among the different segments of the society. It was also during the 1980s that the urban poverty entered on to the agenda of the policy makers with different priorities than in the previous period. The roots of the systematic

attempts to regulate the poor via social policy along with the attempts to transform the urban setting in conformity with the requirements of a market society can be found in the changes taking place in the period.

In this context, housing has emerged as one of the policy tools for the governments used for stimulating the economy on the one hand and transformation of the urban space on the other. The economic value attributed to the housing sector in the 1980s by the governments placed the housing sector in a central place in the functioning of the economy. For Turkey, the process starting with the centralization of housing authority with the purpose of ensuring a constant flow of financial sources to the private housing sector can be considered as incorporation of a similar mentality. However, the current political role played by the same housing authority is related more to the importance of housing in the transformation of the urban setting. The transformative potential of housing gains more significance when it is thought together with its usage as a policy tool for the regulation of urban poverty and the role of the residential structure in making social segregation spatially visible. The developments in housing policy of Turkey after 2000 can be considered as the institutionalization of a perspective that aims at constructing “global cities” by cleaning the city center from unpleasant elements like the poor and eliminating the spatial expressions of poverty by means of housing. In this context, the role played by the housing policy becomes highly important and opens up discussions on aspects like social policy, urbanization, urban poverty and social housing.

This chapter aims at the analysis of the basic terms and concepts through which the housing issue can be formulated with reference to its social and political implementations at a theoretical level. Accordingly, this concern of the thesis will be developed by the discussion of three concepts all of which constitute an important

dimension for the analysis of housing policies in Turkey after 1980 in a broader context of social and political developments. First, social security and social policy debates will be evaluated with an emphasis on development of a particular type of state presence in the social realm in the aftermath of the World War 2. Second, capitalist urbanization and the emergence of urban poverty with a particular attention to the approaches to poverty will be analyzed. Third and finally, housing as a form of social policy within the framework of capitalist urbanization in the post-1980 period will be reviewed with respect to the significance of the utilization of housing policy for regulating the spatial dimension of the urban poverty in accordance with the requirements of global capitalism. Also included in this section are the *ad-hoc* solutions of the urban poor to their housing necessity through informal mechanisms and the consequent contradictions in the urban space.

Social Security and Social Policy

While in the 1960s the state's role in the social life was shaped by the necessity of negotiation between different interest groups in society through redistributive mechanisms or populist means, the period after 1980 witnessed a shift of priority in favor of the interest of the capital. Thus, social policy measures and related expenditures started to be considered as burdens that increased costs and in turn, decreased the competitiveness of capital at the global level.¹⁵ This change brought debates about social security and the particular form it took in the aftermath of World War 2, especially in the context of the development of capitalism and the social state.

¹⁵ Nadir Özbek, *Cumhuriyet Türkiye'sinde Sosyal Güvenlik ve Sosyal Politikalar* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı, 2006), 23.

In the aftermath of World War 2, the organization of capitalism went through significant change. Having experienced the hazardous consequences of unmanaged capitalism with the Great Depression, the capitalist states took the initiative to control and regulate the economic variables.¹⁶ The state stepped into the economic realm in the roles of direct investor, producer or negotiator between different groups. The years after the war, especially the 1960s, were years in which state planning was the major instrument of economic development. The broadening of the scope of legitimate activity of the state in the economic and social life was not merely a consequence of the Great Depression and the world wars. It was also due to the Cold War environment in which the capitalist states considered socialist alternatives to capitalism as equally threatening.¹⁷ Thus, the aim was more or less to avoid the fluctuations of the market mechanism and reduce its social costs in times of crises to the degree that the normal functioning of capitalist production would not necessitate a fundamental change.¹⁸

Up until the mid-1970s, the state's presence in the economic realm was backed up by social security measures targeting the welfare of the working population. These measures were formulated in order to guarantee a coalition between different actors of the production process under the supervision of the modern state. The stabilization of the economic environment and ensuring a certain degree of demand of the mass produced goods were needed necessarily to integrate

¹⁶ E. A. Brett, "American Deficits, Global Boom and Crisis," in *The World Economy Since the War: The Politics of Uneven Development* (Basingstoke: MacMillan, 1990), 107.

¹⁷ Manuel Castells, "What Happened: The Roots and the Development of the Economic Crisis in the United States," in *The Economic Crisis and American Society* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), 95.

¹⁸ Robert Skidelsky, "The Decline of Keynesian Politics," in *State and Economy in Contemporary Capitalism*, ed. Colin Crouch (London: Croom Helm, 1979), 58.

the workers into the system with adequate redistributive mechanisms.¹⁹ In time, the state strengthened its position as a very significant actor in the social realm that could provide numerous social benefits to its population. Social security measures varied from education to health services as well as unemployment insurance to wage regulations. Whether they are called Keynesian, corporatist or solidarist welfare states, the social and economic life have become more dependant on the state than the previous periods.²⁰ Thus, the state was able to exercise a particular method of control through market relationships.²¹

Exercising legitimate control over almost every aspect of the social and economic life without having to sacrifice the private sector's interests to a certain extent has been a significant dimension for the formalization of economic activity. The productive segments of the population have been under the state's control and their demands have been accepted as bargaining terms in the state-led negotiating environment. This, in turn, has resulted in the distribution of the benefits of the social security system as long as they have formally come to terms with the state.

The post-1980 environment was radically different compared to the social and economic environment of the previous decades. In fact the change had started in the mid-1970s with several crises that has led to the questioning the role of the state within the economy. With the global scale organization of the capital in the 1980s, it can be argued that the state's role was subordinated to the role of the capital in the social and economic realms. However, it also can be argued that the state has been a

¹⁹ Mark Rupert, "Fordism," in *The Cold War: An Encyclopedia* ed. Stephen Burwood (New York: Garland Publishers, forthcoming).

²⁰ Castells, "What Happened: The Roots and the Development of the Economic Crisis in the United States," 130.

²¹ Skidelsky, "The Decline of Keynesian Politics," 55.

crucial actor for the institutionalization of the free market and guaranteeing financial liberalization for many countries of the world.²²

This change had enormous implications for the economic and social life. Social security schemes were re-organized and previously granted social benefits were abolished. The public sector now started to be considered an obstacle to the development of capitalist economy. Public expenditures were cut within the context of increasing efficiency. The economy was redefined as a sphere that was free from political concerns. Politics and the bargaining intermediated by the state between different interest groups as well as decisions in favor of the wage earners were considered as the distortions of the market mechanisms that would otherwise function more efficiently for the benefit of all in the long run.

One other way of increasing efficiency was the change in the production system. As Fordism had reached its limits for creating demand and mass production, a new production system became more dominant in which the production process was fragmented internationally. Capital started to search for countries where labor was cheaper and where the state would not intervene to protect it. As the state's ability to control the productive process gradually decreased, the informal sectors that could provide the producers with cheap labor for the fragmented phases of production started to become visible in the economic realm. It was the flexible production system with subcontracting practices as one of its characteristics. Nevertheless, this type of organization of the production process resulted in radical changes for both the protected and the unprotected segments of the society.

In this context, the 1980s signaled a new era for capitalism as well as for the state. The state, while in appearance withdrawing from economic life, or more

²² Eric Hobsbawm, *Kısa 20. Yüzyıl: 1914-1991, Aşırılıklar Çağı* (İstanbul: Sarmal Yayınları, 2003), 487-520.

accurately, constructed its discourse on leaving the economy to function according to its own internal dynamics without any external and political intervention, had to intervene more than the previous periods to organize the economic and social life in accordance with the requirements of the new economic order. Apeldoorn's term "embedded neo-liberalism" explaining the role of the state in the post-1980 environment is quite significant. The term refers to a particular structure of neo-liberal economy in which markets accept that they have to compromise with the states to the degree that the states are committed to "to implement neo-liberal labor market reform while maintaining social consensus."²³

The periodization above is made parallel to the changes in the social, political and economic realm with respect to the transformation of the mechanisms through which the state intervenes and controls these spheres. These changes in the economic realm had many implications in the social realm and the way that the state handles social issues. This is, in turn related to different definitions of social policy and the historical background of policy formulations. The issue of social policy is not an issue that has been agreed upon by scholars. The main formulations broadly can be centered on two different sets of thought with respect to the intentions, power and the mechanisms through which power is exercised by the state. The first approach defines social policy as the redistribution of the income (wealth) in favor of the disadvantaged groups in the name of the continuity of demand and decreasing inequalities created as an inevitable consequence of capitalist production. The second approach tends to conceptualize it as the intrusion of the modern state into social life by social policy mechanisms to reinforce the social control and regulate and increase

²³ Bastiaan van Apeldoorn, "The Struggle over European Order: Transnational Class Agency in the Making of 'Embedded Neo-Liberalism' " in *Social Forces in the Making of the New Europe: The Restructuring of European Social Relations in the Global Economy*, ed. Andreas Bieler and Adam David Morton (London: Palgrave, 2001), 82.

the productivity of the population using equalizing mechanisms in order to guarantee the functioning of the system.

The first approach, not denying the intrinsic relation of social security with the development and organization of capitalism from the very beginning as a set of necessary measures to strengthen the system itself, examines social policy as a collective mechanism for protecting the vulnerable individual from the side-effects of the market economy. To put it differently, this perspective is inclined to see social policy as a potentially transformative mechanism for capitalism that otherwise would recklessly commercialize and commodify every aspect of social and economic life without any attention to the human factor.²⁴ Considered as such the basic question is to organize the resources in a way to “class divisions and social inequalities are underdone.”²⁵

The principle theoretical foundations of social policy can be found in T. H. Marshall’s articulation of the social rights.²⁶ He has a sequential understanding with respect to the development of rights from civil rights to the political and ultimately the social rights.²⁷ According to his formulation, the economic order and the social one can function in mutually challenging ways, the former through market mechanism and the latter through a form of citizenship granting social rights. Thus while the capitalist market perpetuates inequalities on the basis of social class, citizenship can overcome the excessive disequalizing impact of the market through

²⁴ Ayşe Buğra and Çağlar Keyder, "Önsöz," in *Sosyal Politika Yazıları*, ed. Ayşe Buğra and Çağlar Keyder (İstanbul: İletişim, 2006), 10.

²⁵ Gosta Esping-Andersen, *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990), 11.

²⁶ Thomas Humprey Marshall, "Yurttaşlık ve Sosyal Sınıf," in *Sosyal Politika Yazıları*, ed. Ayşe Buğra and Çağlar Keyder (İstanbul: İletişim, 2006).

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 20.

citizenship-based social rights.²⁸ The definition of social policy as made by Marshall also clarifies this formulation. Marshall argues that the social policy does not necessarily aim at equalizing income levels. The crucial aspect of social policy is to diminish the risk and insecurity and the enrichment of the material aspects of civil life. Thus, equality is achieved not among different social classes but among the individuals within a population, which is treated as classless.²⁹

Thus as long as it is used appropriately and comprehensively, social policy is considered one of the tools that can benefit the whole society. The appropriate and comprehensive use of the social policy includes the institutionalization of the social security measures in a centrally redistributive manner. It is through an all encompassing redistributive mechanism that the material wealth is shared among the different segments of the society and those protected from the materially impoverished situations are also protected from social exclusion and marginalization. Thus the economic measures are being employed in order to achieve social well-being. The scope of social policy can be extended from health and education to housing and unemployment insurances.

The encapsulation of the requirements of a modern welfare state is dated back to the emergence of the Keynesian welfare state in the aftermath of World War 2. The social and economic order of the Western European states in the period is considered as the welfare regime on the basis of the Keynesian tenets. Although these states share a commitment to social policy, the differences also are considered important for the achievement of the public benefit. In this context, the welfare regime typology of Gosta Esping-Andersen is highly instrumental for this

²⁸ Ibid., 26-30 and 32.

²⁹ Ibid., 31.

approach.³⁰ Andersen's typology reflects the variety of the welfare regimes in the European context with respect to the diversities of "logic of organization, stratification and societal integration."³¹

Andersen classifies the welfare regimes in three groups, namely the conservative welfare regime, liberal welfare regime and the social democratic welfare regime. The liberal welfare regime is organized around the encouragement of the market through social policy measures directly or indirectly. The main characteristic of this type is the "means-tested assistance, modest universal transfers or modest social-insurance plans."³² What differentiates the conservative welfare regimes from the others is their corporatist character by attaching the social rights to the class position or professional status.³³ The last welfare regime type, that is the social democratic one, is determined by its promotion of equality at highest standards possible rather than ensuring minimum necessary benefits.³⁴

This typology obviously is relevant to the European context and valid for particular timing in historical development of capitalism. With respect to the non-western experiences of social policy, the analyses mainly are conducted on the basis of difference between traditional and modern forms of social policy.³⁵ In this context, new types, added to the welfare regime typology in order to include the social security formulations with different organizational schemes, have been widely used. One of the most influential of these additions has been the South European welfare regime category. The South European welfare regime implies "combination

³⁰ Esping-Andersen, *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 3.

³² *Ibid.*, 26.

³³ *Ibid.*, 27.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ For a similar approach applied to the East Asian context, see Huck-ju Kwon, "Transforming the Developmental Welfare State in East Asia," *Development and Change* 36, no. 3 (2005).

of extended households, high-rates of self-employment, the incidence of irregular and underground economy and low administrative capacities.”³⁶ These features are also considered as constraints that inhibit the implementation of the social policy measures distributed equally on the basis of citizenship.³⁷

The second approach dates the legitimate intervention of the state in social life through economic means in the form of social policy back to the emergence of the modern state. The crucial point of the essence of social policy is the emergence of the social space as a realm that necessitates and legitimizes state regulation and control. Understood as such, the post-war period is not considered as a new era in terms of the state’s orientations; the novelty lay in the means that the state has started to use to regulate the productivity of the population and ensure the stability of the system. In the aftermath of the World War 2, the requirements of capitalist organization aiming at the efficiency and productivity of the population necessitated a Keynesian welfare regime which is a particular form of social policy-making. What was different was not the social control tendencies of the modern the state; the difference was the measures employed for nothing but the protection of the capitalist market economy.³⁸

The philosophical background of this approach is based mainly on the “governmentality” concept of Foucault.³⁹ Governmentality refers first to the set of institutions and strategies that makes the legitimate use of a specific form of power for the modern state. This power “has as its target the population, as its principal

³⁶ Maurizio Ferrera, "Welfare States and Social Safety Nets in Southern Europe: An Introduction " in *Welfare State Reform in Southern Europe: Fighting Poverty and Social Exclusion in Italy, Spain, Portugal and Greece*, ed. Maurizio Ferrera (London, New York: Routledge, 2005), 8.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Nadir Özbek, "Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Türkiye'de Sosyal Devlet," *Toplum ve Bilim* Spring, no. 92 (2002): 7-13.

³⁹ Michel Foucault, "Governmentality," in *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, ed. Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).

form of knowledge political economy, and as its essential technical means apparatuses of society.”⁴⁰ Second it also implies a form of governing with the ultimate aim of retaining power through means like discipline, surveillance and mobilization for a socially constructed formulation of common good.⁴¹ Social policy constitutes one of the principal means with which these aims could be achieved without the insecurity that would result the questioning of the foundations of the power. Thus all of the social institutions of the modern state are considered within the framework of governmentality that is designed to “observe, monitor, shape and control the behavior of the individuals.”⁴²

Considered as such, the welfare regimes in the aftermath of World War 2 do not imply a truly new and specific form of social policy that diverges from the previous forms of social security measures with respect to the fundamental concerns of the state. Thus, welfare regime is used as a more flexible category that includes any kind of social protection mechanism transcending the historical specificity of the Keynesian welfare state. Welfare regime implies any kind of social protection mechanism regardless of a hierarchical categorization between the traditional forms like familial ties or kinship relations and the modern forms like the universal health insurance or free education.⁴³ What constitutes the main focus of attention for this approach is not the peculiarities of each and every single case - partly because they cannot be categorized as if they are universal categories independent of the transformation imposed on them by time and space and partly because categorizations are not found explanatory for the same peculiarities that it aims at

⁴⁰ Ibid., 102.

⁴¹ Ibid., 95.

⁴² Colin Gordon, "Governmental Rationality: An Introduction," in *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, ed. Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 3.

⁴³ Özbek, "Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Türkiye'de Sosyal Devlet," 8-9.

framing- but the common ground on which they are constructed, that is the employment of the social protection mechanisms by the modern state for the purposes of controlling, regulating and disciplining the population.⁴⁴

These two different approaches are contradicting mainly on the features about what constitutes the “modern.” While the first one uses the “modern” with normatively positive connotations with respect to the social policy, the second uses it with negative undertones though it avoids falling into normative statements. According to the first approach, thus, the modern state is partly the mechanism through which equality can be achieved through granting social rights on the basis of citizenship, whereas the second formulates the significance of the modern state with respect to its capacity of transforming the social sphere into a realm it can control and regulate to increase the productivity of the population. As has been showed above, this contradiction is apparent in giving meaning to the intervention of the state to the social realm with economic measures. This fundamental divergence reflects itself on the debates on the Turkish case.

For Turkey, the international political and economic environment after World War 2 was also influential. The Turkish average rate of growth of GDP was 11% per year between 1945 and 1950 although the growth was considered as a response to the very low levels of economic activity during the war.⁴⁵ During the 1950s although the government of the Democrat Party used rhetoric sympathetic to liberalism, the investments of the state and the influence of it in the economic and the social realms did not diminish.⁴⁶ The first economic development plan was made in 1963 and the Constitution of 1960 adopted the “social state” principle in its Article 2. The 1960s

⁴⁴ Ibid.: 11.

⁴⁵ Erik J. Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History* (London, New York: I. B. Tauris, 2004), 216.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 224-25.

were also years of rapid urbanization and immigration in Turkey. Mass urban migration patterns have their roots in the 1950s as the population growths of the cities clearly demonstrate. Towards the end of the decade the urban centers were growing ten percent a year.⁴⁷

The 1980s witnessed a fundamental institutional and legal change in Turkey having their roots in the changes made during the military rule that lasted from 1980 to 1983. One of the very first steps that were taken under the military government of 1980 was the 24 January decisions, which were considered as the legal framework for the institutionalization of the financial liberalization and free market economics. Consequently, all labor activity was banned, trade unions were closed and political activity was prohibited. After the civilian government was in power in 1983 the disintegration of the protective mechanism continued and wages have been curbed. These years were marked by Turgut Özal and IMF policies aimed at integrating the Turkish economy structurally to the liberal world.⁴⁸ The state was the main actor during the period that exercised its power in accordance with the institutionalization of free market practices. Obviously, one of the major dimensions of such practice was the decrease of the public budget and welfare benefits similar to those in other countries.

The first perspective that emphasizes the transformative function of the social policy measures in a capitalist economy and puts the formal redistribution of the benefits as a requirement considers the Turkish case with reference to two categories, which are Southern European welfare regime and the developmentalist state.⁴⁹

⁴⁷ Ibid., 226.

⁴⁸ Ziya Öniş, "Turgut Özal and His Economic Legacy: Turkish Neo-liberalism in Critical Perspective," *Middle Eastern Studies* 40, no. 4 (2004).

⁴⁹ Ayşe Buğra and Çağlar Keyder, "New Poverty and the Changing Welfare Regime of Turkey," (Report prepared for the United Nations Development Program, 2003), 16. For the discussion on the South European Welfare Regimes and the inclusion of Turkey within this category, see Ian Gough,

Southern European welfare regimes characteristics were mentioned above and they will not be repeated here, however is note-worthy to restate that the domination of the informal sector and the social integration networks stemming from the informal economy are the determining factors to consider Turkey within this category.⁵⁰ Also significant is the developmentalist state in the 1960s in which formal social protection mechanisms are confined to the employment opportunities either in the state enterprises or state supervised private enterprises. Thus, formal social protection was limited to those who were covered by the formal labor market. The others that constitute a population that cannot be ignored were covered through the populist measures incorporating the patronage relationships as their characteristics. Accordingly, Turkey could not develop a welfare regime covering all the risk groups formally; rather the system has been characterized by the informal protection mechanisms to provide social protection to the individual.⁵¹

The second approach, emphasizing the enforcement of social control through social policy and considers the development of the welfare state within the framework of the emergence of the modern state's capabilities and legitimacy of intervention to the social realm, tends to see the Turkish experience after World War 2 within the general framework of the Keynesian welfare state.⁵² Özbek points out to the transformation in the 1940s with respect to the emergence of a social policy agenda centered around labor market and work relations.⁵³ The informal social protection mechanisms that take place within the realm of local solidarity ties and the

"Güney Avrupa'da Sosyal Yardım," in *Sosyal Politika Yazıları*, ed. Ayşe Buğra and Çağlar Keyder (İstanbul: İletişim, 2006).

⁵⁰ Buğra and Keyder, "New Poverty and the Changing Welfare Regime of Turkey," 17-18.

⁵¹ Ayşe Buğra and Çağlar Keyder, "Poverty and Social Policy in Contemporary Turkey," (Boğaziçi University Social Policy Forum 2005), 11.

⁵² Özbek, "Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Türkiye'de Sosyal Devlet," 20.

⁵³ *Ibid.*: 21.

backwardness of the social citizenship in terms of its measurable aspects is considered not as obstacles to determine the Turkish case as a Keynesian welfare state, but evaluated as the peculiarities of the form that the Keynesian welfare state takes in Turkey.⁵⁴

For the purposes of the thesis, social policy is relevant in terms of the potential it possesses for explaining the state's policies towards the regulation of the housing sector with social housing measures. It is also relevant as it is a key term for understanding the state-led solutions for urban poverty. Keeping urbanization, the urban poverty and social housing policies in the post-1980 period in mind, especially for the Turkish case, social policy seems to be employed as regulate and control mechanism of capitalist modern state in the very general sense of the term. It is very much related to the reproduction of the capitalist production in the urban environment although it has a transformative potential for the disadvantaged groups. That is to say, as far as social housing in Turkey and the housing of the urban poor in the form of *gecekondu* are concerned, it is more appropriate to discuss the issue in terms of its implications for labor and social segregation, rather than a merely redistributive mechanism for the improvement of the conditions of the urban poor. It is more of a consequence of a consensus between different parties of the population based on their participation and power in the labor force and legitimate political activity.

This framework gains more explanatory power when the particular form of informal housing in Turkey, namely the *gecekondu*, is taken into account. Thus, throughout the thesis, social policy refers to a set of institutional and administrative mechanisms that aim at reshaping the social order in line with the priorities of the

⁵⁴ Ibid.: 23.

existing economic order in a social setting where the historical background of the power relations are crucial dimensions of its articulation and implementation.

Urban Poverty and Capitalist Urbanization

Urbanization and industrialization have been transformative in many spheres of life through demographic changes and the organization of the social life in line with the requirements of the new economic order and led to the emergence of categories like urban poverty. Urban poverty in time has been one of the areas at which social policy measures in the capitalist societies have aimed at containing and limiting. The analysis of urban poverty brings forth the analysis of the multi-dimensional relation of macro-level economic transformation at the global level with the micro level social conditions in a particular urban area. This multi-dimensional relation can be analyzed with different terms and by different perspectives, each of which opens up new discussions about social exclusion, public policy-making, urbanization and the temporal and mobile links of formal sectors within informal networks.

Operating at the margins of the (in)formal economy, the urban poor at the same time experiences a spatial marginalization in the urban areas. The overlap of poverty, informality and spatial segregation is an area of inquiry in which spatial conceptualizations can be thought of together with social and political processes. In this context, this section aims to analyze the basic perspectives and discussions through which urban poverty is conceptualized in relation to urbanization. Particularly, it aims to prepare the ground for the analysis of the social housing issue together with the strategies of the urban poor to overcome the difficulties in

satisfaction of the housing need and their possible relation to the social housing policies of the state.

As has been indicated, urban poverty is a multi-dimensional phenomenon about which different definitions in different periods have come to the front emphasizing different aspects of its social and economic dynamics. It basically can be defined by reference to two dimensions, namely material poverty, implying the technical limit of poverty and relative poverty.⁵⁵ The technical limit of poverty implies a set of material restrictions for the survival of the individual, while relative poverty is less visible though more effective for the social life of the individual. It refers to the aspects of poverty that are more related to the extra-material consequences of the social experience of poverty. However, it is impossible to separate the material aspects of poverty from its extra-material and social aspects.

The problem of poverty has started to be analyzed more in terms of social policy and collective interest of the society with the modern era.⁵⁶ However, the acknowledgement of these two dimensions of urban poverty is not sufficient to grasp the essence of the social security mechanisms targeted to the urban poor. The literature on urban poverty is quite useful for understanding its dimensions and the way with which it has been dealt with both by the scholars and policy makers.

One of the most influential currents of thought is based on defining poverty with the concept of the “culture of poverty.” Associated with Oscar Lewis and Michael Harrington, the culture of poverty approach emphasizes the specific behavioral patterns of the people living in poor neighborhoods.⁵⁷ Attributing the set

⁵⁵ Bronislaw Geremek, *Poverty: A History* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991), 3.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 238.

⁵⁷ Michael Harrington, *The Other America : Poverty in the United States* (New York: Macmillan, 1962), Oscar Lewis, *La Vida: A Puerto Rican Family in the Culture of Poverty, San Juan and New York* (New York: Random House, 1966).

of cultural properties and communal patterns of the urban poor to their specific internal structure both in terms of their origin and reproduction in turn explains their low economic and social status as a result of their cultural characteristics. This is clearly a problematic perspective that has been criticized on the basis of its neglect of the external political, social and economic factors that perpetuate the poor to remain poor. However, Bryne argues that Lewis's "culture of poverty" thesis is significant because it has highlighted the set of "socially constructed adaptive mechanisms collectively fabricated by the poor from the substance of their everyday lives" and "allows the poor to survive in otherwise impossible material and social conditions."⁵⁸

With the rise of development studies and the political economy approach in the 1970s, attitudes toward poverty took a new form. Poverty was now conceptualized as more of a characteristic of the whole social and economic life than as a stigma attributable to individual behavior or culture. Poverty was no longer perceived as a problem that the governments could overcome by national planning. The issue of poverty and especially relative poverty has been perceived as more of a characteristic of an historical process determined by the mechanisms through which a particular country was linked to the world capitalist system.⁵⁹

For both of the approaches the central concern was to detect and analyze the causes of urban poverty's multi-dimensional structure. Both the political economy and the culture of poverty perspectives share a common attitude towards poverty that tends to conceptualize poverty on the basis of the participation in social life through work.⁶⁰ At the basis of their analysis of what caused poverty was the incapability of the urban poor to participate in social and economic life, namely not being able to

⁵⁸ David Bryne, *Social Exclusion* (Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open University Press, 1999), 119.

⁵⁹ Alan Gilbert, "Introduction," in *Cities, Poverty and Development: Urbanization in the Third World* ed. Alan Gilbert and Josef Gugler (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 1-2.

⁶⁰ Geremek, *Poverty: A History*, 238.

work and earn a decent living. The culture of poverty approach perceives this incapability as a result of an individual cultural structure, whereas development studies see it as a result of the dynamics of world capitalism at a higher level. The emphasis on work goes hand in hand with two other attitudes towards poverty, one of which is its association with a social threat and danger and the second is its association with crime.⁶¹

The unification of the emphasis on work and the perception of the poor as “beasts and criminals”⁶² stems from the belief that “the moral degradation born of poverty goes hand in hand with the depravity born of a life of idleness,” as argued by Geremek.⁶³ It was against this moral background that obligatory work or social aid based on working was used as a policy tool for the governments for the alleviation of poverty. The linkage between poverty and the state attitudes towards the control and regulation of the poor was intermediated by work as an effective social policy tool usually in the form of repressive measures and discriminatory social programs.⁶⁴

In this context, social aid mechanisms and the relief schemes were granted to the poor conditionally. The condition was about guaranteeing their social behavior in a way that would not constitute a threat to the functioning of the social and economic system. The inclusion of the poor in the social life and providing social and economic aid were linked to the condition that they work.⁶⁵ The systematic reproduction of the existing order and the elimination of any individual or collective

⁶¹ Ibid., 239-40.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Ibid., 238.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Frances Fox Piven and Richard A. Cloward, *Regulating the Poor : The Functions of Public Welfare* (Vintage, 1993), 22.

threats to its fundamentals increased its significance and vitality as the society and the economic system get more complex through industrialization and urbanization.⁶⁶

As the analysis of Fox and Piven demonstrates, the eventual creation of “dependant-poor/outcast class” at the bottom segments of society is crucial where market values and market controls are comparatively less. The relief mechanisms dealing with poverty in order to “buttress weak market controls and ensure the availability of marginal labor” in turn, “serves to celebrate the virtue of all work, and deters actual or potential workers from seeking aid.”⁶⁷

The administrative and controlling relation of the modern capitalist state to urban poverty also has changed with time. In a post-industrial era a new debate about the changing nature of poverty has emerged. The term “new poverty” has started to correspond to the situation with which the urban poor are faced in an era of the decline of welfare the state and unemployment policies. With the decomposition of the former social protection mechanisms, be they of informal character or social security based, or de-regulation policies starting with the 1970s, a new category of urban poor that has not faced the obligation of producing strategies of survival in the previous periods has started to be visible. Buğra and Keyder count “transition from Fordist to flexible production systems, the advent of post-industrial societies through the tertiarization of economic activity, forces of globalization, and demographic pressures that affect both age structures and family types” among the factors that have resulted in the extreme marginalization of previously protected segments of society and the emergence of the “new poor.”⁶⁸

⁶⁶ Ibid., 39-40.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 165.

⁶⁸ Buğra and Keyder, "Poverty and Social Policy in Contemporary Turkey," 11.

The “new poverty” debate is very much on the agenda of the European countries as the conditions to which the new poor are subject is relevant for Europe.⁶⁹ Room defines the new poverty in Europe by reference to five factors. First, the increase in the number of people living on social assistance, second the rise of unemployment and the insecurity of unemployment, and third, the situation of many people who did not experience a low-income living in the previous periods and suffer from high debt rates and long-term financial commitments. The fourth factor that contributes to the “new poverty” in Europe is the change in family patterns and the increasing number of single-parents. Fifth is the increasing visibility of poverty in the form of the increasing number of people living in the streets without any housing opportunities.⁷⁰

In this context, the blurring distinction between the formal and informal sectors has contributed to the altering of the conditions through which the urban poor are to survive through. Very much related to the transition from a mass productive Fordist system to flexible production functioning on the basis of sub-contracting, the change in the overall economic structure has had many implications for the urban poverty. Patterns of urbanization and the place of the urban poor both in spatial and

⁶⁹ The term *new poor* is used to imply a specific version of poverty which will not be directly relevant to define urban poverty for the Turkish case. However, if the term *new poor* is defined not only in terms of the decomposition of the formal social protection mechanisms of the welfare the state in the post-1980 period and can be extended to include the transformation of all kinds of social protection, family, kinship ties and professional protection as well as formal redistributive mechanisms, it can be used as a crucial term to explain the situation of urban poverty in Turkey to a certain extent. A detailed discussion of “new poverty” in Turkey can be found in Işık and Pınarcıoğlu in their work on urban poverty and *gecekondü* formation in the 1990s. They argue that the term “new poverty” is not relevant for the Turkish urban poor’s experience as the formal sphere has never been as significant as to institutionalize redistributive mechanisms and create a protected sphere for the urban poor in Turkey. The upward mobility orientation and producing adaptive mechanisms of the urban poor is an old strategy different from the marginalized segments of the population that are unprotected and lacking the strategic social and political equipment for the challenge of urban poverty. However, they also add that it may be the case in the future as the polarization of the urban space is further reinforced by the dominant free-market order. For the extended discussion of the term see Oğuz Işık and M. Melih Pınarcıoğlu, *Nöbetleşe Yoksulluk: Gecekondü ve Kent Yoksulları, Sultanbeyli Örneği* (İstanbul: İletişim, 2005), 67-84.

⁷⁰ Graham Room, *'New Poverty' in the European Community* (London: Macmillan Press, 1990), 10-12.

social terms in the urban area is another dimension that has been affected by these developments. Thus, it is necessary to turn to the urbanization trends under the light of these discussions.

In many countries the free market order of the 1980s required a new organization of the urban space which reflected the income disparities in the form of the extreme marginalization of the urban poor in the social realm without any mechanisms of social protection and reinforced further segregation of the different income groups in the city. The state has also been an actor in the transformation process of the urban space through public works and mass housing projects. In a much generalized framework, with such a transformation, many of the previously organized spheres of social life have started to be re-organized according to the needs of the new neo-liberal order. Different segments of society have started to act with different concerns.

Parallel to the changes in the economic policy, the organization and the function of the urban area has been redefined in a way to reflect the new economic order of neo-liberal export oriented economy. Big cities have been re-organized not in terms of industrial production but as gateways to international economy in a highly competitive environment.⁷¹ The competition was conducted on the basis of marketing the services supplied in the city together with the city itself. The drive of attracting more people, cities themselves as well as their historical representation areas have started to be commercialized with a touristic, if not folkloric, logic.⁷² This logic has brought an increasing attention to the visual dimension of the spatial organization. The visual aspects of the urban area have emerged as an important

⁷¹ Çağlar Keyder and Ayşe Öncü, *Istanbul and the Concept of the World Cities* (Istanbul: Friedrich Ebert Foundation, 1993), 7.

⁷² Asuman Türkün and Hatice Kurtuluş, "Giriş," in *Istanbul'da Kentsel Ayrışma*, ed. Hatice Kurtuluş (Istanbul: Bağlam 2005), 13.

dimension of a particular marketing strategy through which the city has been a product.

The changes in the economic organization are considered as one of the major reasons behind the emergence of a new urban setting in the post-1980 period. The change of the economic realm was marked by the transition to flexible production methods from Fordist production in many countries coupled with privatization and drive for global integration. This transition symbolizes a corresponding change in many spheres of the urban life. As the production process became more flexible, the work process needed more flexible workers in terms of both working time and skills. The flexibility of the production process brought individual flexible wage contracts together with subcontracting system.⁷³ The visible dimension of such an organizational change at the urban level has been the definition of the urban centers as “global” or “world” cities standing “at the intersection of global transaction networks, mediating between world productive activity and markets.”⁷⁴

In the 1980s sectors that eased the mobilization of capital and control the production and marketing emerged as the chief sectors that dominate the urban economic activity. The producers’ services like communications, financial institutions, marketing firms, design and engineering services have been instruments of the “global functioning of the capital and its centralization by allowing headquarters to exercise remote control on distant units of production or sourcing or markets, through the newly available technologies.”⁷⁵ Thus, the cities underwent a transformation from industrial cities centered around a certain network of production

⁷³ David C. Thorns, *Kentlerin Dönüşümü: Kent Teorisi ve Kentsel Yaşam* (İstanbul: Soyak Yayınları, 2004), 71.

⁷⁴ Keyder and Öncü, *Istanbul and the Concept of the World Cities*, 7.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 11.

activity and reflecting the social and economic hierarchy particular to that kind of organization into post-industrial cities as the centers of services sectors.

Another dimension of the mentioned transformation was the growing weight of the informal sector in the economic activity. The flexible production, by its organization, favors a certain type of informal activity as it functions through subcontracting firms with the lowest cost of labor possible. The 1980s witnessed the proliferation of informal economic activity and an unprecedented intermingling of the formal sector with the informal ones. For Turkey, informal economies have been an important component of the overall economy since the 1960s. However, according to the urban setting of the previous decades the informal economies were organized within the “vast numbers of labor intensive, small scale manufacturing and commercial enterprises in and around city core.”⁷⁶ In the period after 1980 and especially in the 1990s, the informal economy in the big cities started to locate the labor force to the services sectors.⁷⁷

Gilbert argues that the urban form cannot exist “without a central power and a mechanism to generate a surplus over consumption and to concentrate it in to urban areas.”⁷⁸ Similarly, Castells defines the urban question as “organization of the means of collective consumption at the basis of the daily life of all social groups.” He also emphasizes the “spatial expression” of the inequalities in the urban centers as an important dimension of social and economic relations.⁷⁹

⁷⁶ Ibid., 17.

⁷⁷ For the sectoral distribution of the economic activity and its spatial segregation, see Murat Güvenç, "İstanbul'da İşyeri-Statü Temelinde Segregasyon; 1990 Sayımı Üzerinde İlişkisel Çözümler," in *Yoksulluk: Bölgesel Gelişme ve Kırsal Yoksulluk, Kent Yoksulluğu*, ed. Murat Güvenç and Halis Akder (İstanbul: TESEV, 2000).

⁷⁸ Alan Gilbert, "Urban Development in a World System," in *Cities, Poverty and Development: Urbanization in the Third World*, ed. Alan Gilbert and Josef Gugler (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 14.

⁷⁹ Manuel Castells, *City, Class and Power* (London: Macmillan Press, 1978), 3.

Castells argues against the formulation of the urban question as technological developments determining the spatial organization of the city in turn are determinants of the structure of the society and its problems. He points out that such formulated the possible solutions to the conflicts are expected to be derived from technical developments not political decisions.⁸⁰ However, the state is one of the most important actors in the city space determining the political organization of the urban space to the extent that the different segments of the society are willing to compromise with its priorities. Thus, on the one hand, the state intervention in this area plays an increasingly strategic role in the economy and politics, and on the other, “because it is through these themes that most often are considered the relation of the political with the material conditions of the organization of everyday life.”⁸¹

When one considers the increasing importance of the cities as the centers of economic and political life through their growth rates and increasing populations through migrations the picture becomes clearer for the issue of poverty and social policy in general, the urban poor and social housing policies in particular. According to the 2003 Global Report on Human Settlements of the UN-Habitat, quoted in Buğra and Keyder’s work on poverty and social policy, since the 1950s urban centers have grown tremendously. The number of cities with a population of more than one million was 86 in 1950, whereas it has increased to 400 today.

The report gives valuable insights also into the composition of urban population. The share of the population employed in the informal sectors has grown with an average rate of 50%.⁸² These rates imply that the growing population of the urban centers faces a challenge of social segregation through informal jobs and

⁸⁰ Ibid., 6.

⁸¹ Ibid., 2-3.

⁸² Buğra and Keyder, "Poverty and Social Policy in Contemporary Turkey," 14.

shelter conditions which in return creates greater income disparities and exercise of control and an environment in which regulation over the poor is eased.

Different Dimensions of Housing Policy

It is in this social setting of the post-industrial economic order that the polarization of the urban space is perpetuated with mechanisms with which land and housing issues constitute an important component. The state's involvement in the issue is critical in this regard as social housing's policy dimension is limited not to the satisfaction of the basic housing needs of the urban poor. The mechanisms through which it is formulated and put into action and the definition of the problem that the particular housing policy is proposed as an alternative solution are related strongly to the spatial organization of the city, the urban poor's social and economic position within the urban space as well as the attitudes of the policy makers towards the role of the urban poor in the overall social structure. The informal housing practices and their intermingling with the formal the state policies as well as the ongoing conflict of different income groups over the urban space should be examined all together. Issues related to housing gives valuable insights into understanding the change after the 1980s as well as the reorganization of the social and economic life in the same era. It is both related to the state's role with respect to poor/ disadvantaged /low-income groups as well as the organization of the urban space.⁸³

⁸³ A remark about the use of terms throughout the thesis should be made. The terms *urban poor*, *low-income* or *disadvantaged groups* are used interchangeably in the thesis as the translation of urban poor to the language of the policy makers, who tend to pay more attention to the measurable aspects of poverty, can be made as low-income or disadvantaged groups for most of the cases. Though there are slight differences with respect to its usage in the context of social policy, it is one of the aims of this

However, the evaluation of the relation between housing policy and social policy is not an easy task because of the importance of the housing sector in the overall economy as well as of the structure of the land ownership in the urban areas. Another difficulty arises from the concept of the “house” itself when it is considered that it is a crucial point in the social networks where people can draw the borderline between public and private life. Although the public and visible dimensions of housing are more significant for the subject at hand, the house/home distinction must be kept in mind in order to grasp the essential characteristics of the development of a particular housing policy and its popular legitimacy and practical consequences.

“*House*” implies a crucial dimension of human life in both social and economic terms. Burnett points out that, “houses are physical structures; homes are social, cultural and economic institutions.”⁸⁴ Thus, it is the place where public and private spheres overlap and there are many social and economic aspects attached to the house in the urban space because it is a highly visible dimension of the social life in cities. In terms of its spatial referents, where one lives first determines the possibility of one’s access to certain social facilities as well as one’s social status. At the same time, the condition of the house in which one lives is very important for health and other aspects of private life.

This visibility is significant because it is in terms of this visibility that one can shed light on the ways of the urban poor’s connection to the economic and social life. As a basic need, the satisfaction of shelter has taken different forms and the state’s role in the transformation of the ways, through which it has been satisfied, especially

thesis to highlight the construction and definition of “urban poor” in the minds of decision makers and the way the urban poor have been labeled as low-income groups in time.

⁸⁴ John Burnett, *A Social History of Housing: 1815-1985* (London and New York: Routledge, 1991), 3.

for the low-income groups. With different concerns in different periods the state's attitudes can change towards the real estate market and low-income housing. Also, the organization of the urban space also has taken different directions parallel to these changes. Therefore, the urban poor's position with respect to other segments of society and patterns of access to social life and participation in the economic activity changes.

Housing is related directly to the real estate market's organization and land property issues (land speculation, rents, etc.) as well as wages and the variables of economy. It is a very important determinant of the power relations in the city as land is a very significant income generator. The state's intervention, thus, is crucial in understanding whether the present power relations between social groups have been perpetuated or transformed. The attempt to locate housing with other aspects of social life more than macro-economic variables is significant in this context.

Kemeny argues that without due attention to the "locus of power in the modern societies" and taking only the statistical accounts and vast numbers about consumption and production patterns into consideration, the point in urban and housing studies will be missed.⁸⁵ Kemeny uses a scheme as a starting point for the analysis of different policies of housing. He puts household at the center of the scheme with two more concentric circles around it corresponding to dwelling and locality. Around the three-fold distinction of levels of housing there are other social forces, namely the state, market, voluntary action and the informal sector. He uses this scheme in order to analyze different social policy patterns in different social settings.⁸⁶

⁸⁵ Jim Kemeny, *Housing and Social Theory* (London and New York: Routledge, 1992), 37.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 78.

In this context, social housing is mostly an urban phenomenon through which the state can use its power directly to organize the urban space and regulate the urban poor. It is through social housing regulations and requirements that one can grasp the idea of the needy, urban poor and low-income categories in the minds of policy makers. Whatever its practical consequences, the legal arrangements can tell a lot about the intentions and motives of the state elites who have the authority to make legally binding rules.

Through housing policies in general the state intervenes and regulates the real estate market which is a significant market for the overall economy. At the same time through social housing in general and low-income housing policies in particular, it attempts to organize both the city space by motivating a social group to live in particular places of the city. Thus, the state is able to have a determining power for the construction of the social and economic relation of that group to the city space.

Social housing as a social policy thus works in two ways. It aims at housing a particular social group, mostly the poor, but the mechanisms through which these groups are housed determine and in turn reproduces the social hierarchies and spatial segregation. Empowered with such financial and social facilities the state's role is crucial to understanding the transformation through which cities pass in terms of social and economic organization.

However, the state is not the only actor in social housing policies. The case of Turkey clearly exemplifies the fact that in the absence of direct the state-made rules for the housing of the urban poor; the practical and informal mechanisms by which the poor house themselves can become the rule in time. Nevertheless, it is by no means a one-sided mechanism. The role of the state and the urban poor must be analyzed as acting on the basis of everyday negotiation at least for Turkey in the

period in which social housing has been included on the agenda. The state tries to include itself in the process because housing is a very critical area of policy making and exercise of power.

The state's involvement in the housing-related aspects of urban life can be formulated as three concerns of the housing policy. One is concerns about public health through the standardization of the building environment; the second is defining decent housing as a right and including it on the agenda of social policy; and the third is the enabling free market as the best way of supplying the housing needs.⁸⁷ The state's position goes back and forth according to the economic and social priorities of the period as well as the demographic pressures and political legitimacy.

Considered as such, the policy of social housing is linked directly with poverty and urbanization. To put it differently, as social houses are targeted to the groups that do not have the chance to own homes in urban centers, considered the disadvantages they suffer due to the free market mechanisms and high land costs, the low-income groups'/urban poor's position in the urbanization process should be included in the discussion. In an urban setting different housing strategies emerge in relation to the local factors and the historical relationship of the state with the urban poor as well as the economic pressures. In terms of social housing there can be identified different names given to different housing measures provisioned by the state in different geographies and historical periods. Mass housing, public housing, social housing, self-help housing, lodgment type of housing are used as terms to indicate a particular housing strategy of the state. Also a distinction between owner-occupied vs. rental housing is worth mentioning. The basic criterion is the degree of

⁸⁷ Clapham, Kemp, and Smith, *Housing and Social Policy*, 22.

involvement of the state directly both in the production and the distribution/selling process for the purposes of clarifying the mechanisms through which the state aims at housing the poor segments of the population or intervening in the housing market in order to save deadlocks of housing stock or saving a huge sector from pressure.

Housing in urban areas is provided either by the public or the private sector. But the state also can subsidize the private sector by sharing the risk of credits payments or guaranteeing demand to a certain extent. So, the greater the involvement of the state, the better the crystallization of the intentions and expectations of the policy makers towards the regulation of the urban poor in the city space.

In general, low-income housing policies are only small parts of a larger urban renewal projects designed for the reorganization of the lands at the center of the city for the most part occupied by the poor, especially in developing countries. The social housing projects apart from serving as a social control mechanisms are used to a large extent as a legitimization for “cleaning” the urban centers of the poor neighborhoods.

The general theoretical framework discussed above also is relevant for the Turkish case, but when at closer examination one can see that little differences have ended up being highly relevant for policy outcomes. Turkey experienced a huge growth of the cities and increasing migration in the period after World War 2. However, the inclusion of mass housing on the agenda of the policy makers was to wait until the establishment of the Mass Housing Administration in 1984. In the period before the adoption of the Mass Housing Law and the establishment of the Mass Housing Administration, there have been several mechanisms in Turkey that have been employed as a means to supply housing for the population among which

cooperatives, housing credits, lodgments for civil-servants and squatter settlements can be counted in the first place.⁸⁸

For Turkey, one of the alternatives to the formal housing policy has been the squatter settlements from the very beginning. Squatter settlements increased drastically during the period after World War 2. In 1940 there were 1,699 squatter units in Istanbul, while in 1949 there were 5,000 and 8,240 in 1950. In 1965, squatter settlements amounted to the 35% of the total housing. In 1969, Land Office has been established with the aim of planning urban development, controlling the land prices and supplying land by the state initiative.⁸⁹

The squatter settlements were built at the peripheral regions of the big cities and industrial centers in the form of single-storey shacks. They have been the first stop of the migrants from rural centers to urban centers. The squatter settlements have appeared on the agenda of the political decision makers but the issue has not been discussed in terms of property issues. Rather, it was considered as a possible way of the urban poor to shelter themselves. Buğra argues that the way that the squatter settlements were regarded at the very beginning is an example of the prevalence of “socially defined human needs ... over the principles of private property and contract underlying the market economy.”⁹⁰

However, this common attitude also may be related to the characteristic of the land that was occupied by the migrants as well as value of the occupied land in the market. In the period before 1950 the squatter settlements were built mostly on land owned by the Treasury whereas in the 1950s they were built on land that was

⁸⁸ İlhan Tekeli, *Türkiye'de Yaşamda ve Yazında Konut Sorununun Gelişimi* (Ankara: T.C. Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığı, 1996), 67-70.

⁸⁹ "Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığının 2002, 2003 ve 2004 Yılları Eylem ve İşlemlerinin Araştırılıp Denetlenmesine İlişkin Rapor Özeti," (T.C. Cumhurbaşkanlığı Devlet Denetleme Kurulu, 2004).

⁹⁰ Buğra, "The Immoral Economy of Housing in Turkey," 307.

excluded from the municipal reconstruction zone but owned by private individuals on the basis of share-holding.⁹¹

In the period after 1980, housing policy in Turkey took a new turn. The liberalization of the market and the financial system, in accordance with the developments in the world towards privatization and the domination of the neo-liberal capitalism, housing has been more important than ever for Turkish economy. Previously, housing sector and investments had not been taken seriously in terms of formulation of a systematic government policy. It has been mostly left to the private sector and *gecekondu* builders, and public housing projects carried out by the state were extremely limited. It was mostly because housing was considered neither as a productive sector for the overall growth of the economy nor it was thought of as an item on the list of social security arrangements.

As was the case in the previous decades, the low income families and the urban poor have kept on providing housing for themselves in the form of *gecekondu*. However, the *gecekondu* is not the same *gecekondu* as it was before 1980. In the years after 1980, a clear commercialization and privatization of the *gecekondu* market in the hands of land-mafia related land lords is observed. The relationships between the owners and the tenants of the *gecekondus* and the state have been formalized both with amnesties and title deeds as well as the general trend of marketization of any item in the economy.⁹²

The changes of the places of housing in general and *gecekondu* in particular have parallels with the changes towards the urban poor living in the *gecekondus* at the discursive level. Tahire Erman tracks this change in the academic discourse in an

⁹¹ Tekeli, *Türkiye'de Yaşamda ve Yazında Konut Sorununun Gelişimi*, 43 and 98. For the formation of the land market in Turkey, also see Ayşe Öncü, "The Politics of the Urban Land Market in Turkey: 1950-1980," *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 12, no. 1 (1988).

⁹² Buğra, "The Immoral Economy of Housing in Turkey," 311.

illuminating way. She argues that the representation of the *gecekond* population “from the ‘rural Other’ in the 1950s and 1960s to the ‘disadvantaged Other’ in the 1970s and early 1980s, to the ‘urban poor Other(s)’, the ‘undeserving rich Other(s)’ and the ‘culturally inferior Other(s) as sub-culture’ between the mid 1980s and mid 1990s, and finally threatening ‘varoşlu Other’ in the late 1990s.”⁹³ These changes can be considered relevant for the representations of the decision-makers.

As the attitudes as well as the structure of the urban poor has changed, housing policy in Turkey has not changed in a way to produce systematic and open attempt to deal with *gecekond*s until 2000. In the period after 2000, the attempts of urban transformation targeted primarily the *gecekond*s. The Mass Housing Administration took initiative in the building of low-income housing for the urban poor. The changes are taking place within the context of a larger urban transformation through which the place of the urban poor in the social hierarchies and the state’s role for the determination of these hierarchies is re-formulated.

⁹³ Tahire Erman, "The Politics of Squatter (*Gecekond*) Studies in Turkey: The Changing Representations of Rural Migrants in the Academic Discourse," *Urban Studies* 38, no. 7 (2001): 983.

CHAPTER 3

HOUSING IN THE POST-1980 ENVIRONMENT AND ITS HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The 1980s were marked by the logic of the export-oriented free market economy in Turkey. Obviously, Turkey was not an exceptional case and many states underwent similar economic change in the period as the new capitalist order required an integration of free market economies on the global level.⁹⁴ Export orientation and the necessary structural adjustments for the institutionalization of a neo-liberal free market economy resulted in a social and economic transformation that would have far-reaching effects. The components of the new economic model required less state involvement in economic and social life and promoted privatization and export orientation which led to a new institutional and legal set-up. Although a dominant discourse was built on the withdrawal of the state from the economic realm, the state was an important actor in the respect that it stipulated the rules of the new order and establishing mechanisms for its functioning in the 1980s. Housing was one of the areas in which the state started to assume a more central role.

As a government policy tool and an economic activity, housing had been considered neither productive nor profitable in the previous decades not only for Turkey but also for the international economy. The new economic model of the 1980s brought new sectors to the front among which housing had acquired a significant weight in time. The private sector's interest in the housing construction

⁹⁴ Ziya Öniş, "Political Economy of Turkey in the 1980s: Anatomy of Unorthodox Liberalism," in *Strong State and Economic Interest Groups: The Post-1980 Turkish Experience*, ed. Metin Heper (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1991), 7.

has increased with the states' attributing a major initiative role to the housing for the economy. Having different priorities from the international institutions, the private sector entered the sector mostly building luxurious houses for middle to high income groups.⁹⁵

For Turkey, although housing was included in the Development Plans as a part of the national economic policy, state did not get involved in large scale housing projects to a great extent. The appearance of low-income housing on the social security agendas in the form of social housing was very limited as *gecekondu* filled the gap of housing need for the poor segments of the society both as cheap and fast housing. However, in the period after 1980, housing policy in Turkey seemed to take a new turn with the establishment of the Mass Housing Fund and Mass Housing Administration in 1981 and 1984, respectively, as centralized state institutions.

Housing policies have played a significant role in the transformation of the urban area. It was also during the 1980s that the social and the economic function of the urban poor went gone through change. Under the light of the developments taking place in urbanization trends and the transformation of the definitions and perceptions of urban poverty in big cities in post-1980 environment, this chapter analyses the low-income housing policies of the state together with the transformation that *gecekondu* phenomenon went through during the 1980s. First, however, the history of mass housing and *gecekondu* before the 1980s will be presented briefly. The aim is to historicize the development of urban areas as well as the state attitudes towards the transformation of the urban space with an emphasis on the emergence of the *gecekondu* in the period as an urban phenomenon due to the

⁹⁵ Hobsbawm, *Kısa 20. Yüzyıl: 1914-1991, Aşırıliklar Çağı*, Tansı Şenyapılı, "Charting the 'Voyage' of Squatter Housing in Urban Spatial 'Quadruped'," *European Journal of Turkish Studies* Thematic Issue, *Gecekondu* (2004): 24.

high levels of immigration as well as the direction of the efforts of the state with the aim of regulating the urban poor and housing.

Brief History of Housing in Turkey until the 1980s:
State, Informal Economy and the Emergence of *Gecekondu*

Direct state involvement in housing can be dated back to the pre-Republican Orphan's Chests (*Eytam Sandıkları*) that functioned like a mortgage system to supply shelter to widows and orphans. In 1926, these chests were organized by the Real Estate and Orphan's Bank (*Emlak ve Eytam Bankası*) and in 1938, the Real Estate and Construction Corporation (*Emlak Yapı Anonim Şirketi*) was established as a part of the Real Estate and Orphan's Bank and was transformed to the Real Estate Credit Bank (*Emlak Kredi Bankası*) aiming at mass housing projects in general.

The housing of civil-servants occupied a central position in the early Republican period. In 1925 a law stipulating the subsidies given to civil servants of up to half of their salaries for housing was adopted. A few years later public rental housing construction was allowed the civil servants by another law.⁹⁶ In 1929, a law stipulating a certain amount of housing compensation was enacted and in 1937 a special fund was created with the aim of financing public housing construction. Finally, in 1944 the Law on the Housing for the Civil Servants (*Memur Meskenleri İnşası Hakkında Kanun*) was adopted and in Ankara the Saraçoğlu district project with 434 dwellings as well as several other housing projects in the eastern parts of the country amounting to 711 dwellings were put into action within the framework of the law. Another major mass housing project of the period was the Ankara Yenimahalle district project. The Ankara municipality was involved actively in the

⁹⁶ Ruşen Keleş, "Housing Policy in Turkey," in *Housing Policy in Developing Countries*, ed. Gil Shidlo (London: Routledge, 1990), 147.

project for which credits were supplied by the Real Estate Credit Bank. In three years, more than 2,000 units of 2,915 were completed. In Istanbul, in 1949, Levent Farm was transferred to the Real Estate Credit Bank from the municipality with the aim of mass housing construction and 400 unit project were included in the Bank's program.⁹⁷

In the early Republican period housing policy was centered around the logic of nationalism rather than the needs of capitalist urbanization. It was housing civil servants and public officials that was on the agenda together with the planning of Ankara as the capital of the new Republic.⁹⁸ In this context, the state's involvement in housing was determined by the symbolic value attached to the spatial organization of the residential areas of the elites and the bureaucrats rather than the organization of the urban space in accordance with industrial urbanization.⁹⁹ Of course, it was also in the first decades of the Republic that workers were also considered among those who needed shelter on a systematic basis. However, as the definition of the workers was limited to those working in the state enterprises, the above mentioned concern of the state was prevalent for the housing of the industrial workers.¹⁰⁰ In addition, immigration and the related housing shortage was still not an issue significant enough to produce a country-wide housing policy.

In Turkey, the years after World War 2 were determinant in many respects in the formulation and definition of the housing issue in the next decades.¹⁰¹ The roots of the urbanization trends, labor market dynamics, the formulation of housing

⁹⁷ Tekeli, *Türkiye'de Yaşamda ve Yazında Konut Sorununun Gelişimi*, 5-8. For the discussion of the development of housing and architectural culture in the early Republican period, also see Sibel Bozdoğan, *Modernizm ve Ulusun İnşası: Erken Cumhuriyet Türkiye'sinde Mimari Kültür* (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2001).

⁹⁸ Keleş, "Housing Policy in Turkey," 147-48.

⁹⁹ Bozdoğan, *Modernizm ve Ulusun İnşası: Erken Cumhuriyet Türkiye'sinde Mimari Kültür*, 243.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 239-41.

¹⁰¹ Tekeli, *Türkiye'de Yaşamda ve Yazında Konut Sorununun Gelişimi*, 14.

policies and the economic and social dynamics that led the emergence of *gecekondu* can be found in this period. The characteristics of the period can be summarized as rapid urbanization, growing non-agricultural labor and the growing weight of irregular settlements in the urban centers together with the changing economic policy.¹⁰² As the housing supply could not be increased to meet the demand created by the immigration, the focus of housing policy shifted from the construction of Ankara to the irregular urban settlements.

The change of the economic model characterized the social and economic dynamics after 1945. The adoption of import substitution economic policy for industrialization with the developmentalist role assumed by the state, the economic priority of the period was the expansion of the domestic consumer market through the incorporation of the masses both into the consumer and labor markets by means of redistributive measures and a populist rhetoric.¹⁰³ The industrialization model based on import substitution combined with the effects of demographic transition was the structural characteristics that was highly influential in the formulation of a housing policy for the low-income groups in the form of taking advantage of the *ad-hoc* solutions of the urban poor as *gecekondu*s. In this context, housing was not considered as an important item on the agenda and was left to the dynamics of the domestic market. The period after 1960 up to the 1980s witnessed the further proliferation of *gecekondu* in an environment where a substantial low-income housing policy did not exist. The demographic change and the rate of immigration were as significant as the economic model for understanding the urban environment in the period. While the population growth rate was 2.7 percent between 1950 and

¹⁰² Keleş, "Housing Policy in Turkey," 148-49.

¹⁰³ Keyder and Öncü, *Istanbul and the Concept of the World Cities*, 16.

1960, it increased to fifty percent between 1960 and 1965. The urbanization rates also increased substantially by doubling in the years between 1950 and 1965.¹⁰⁴

These developments were very influential in the formation of the labor market in the period as well as the definition of the urban poor with respect to the roles it play in the urban arena. One of the most important developments of the period was the emergence of the informal sector as an integral part of the economic model of the period. The contributions of the informal sector to the ISI, a model depending on the continuity of supply and demand in the domestic market, was decisive in the formulation of the attitudes towards the urban poor in the period. First, the informal sector supplied cheap labor to the market. Also it guaranteed a certain level of demand. According to Şenyapılı, this demand created by the urban poor was triggered by the drive for integration to the urban area. She argues that consumption was one of the main channels in which this integration could take place and thus, their demand for consumer goods was significant. The participation and integration through consumption brings forth another contribution of informal sector to the economy. As the urban poor were not able to afford first quality consumer goods, a market for cheap replicas of these goods of lower quality was created. Also the second quality production has been important for the supply of the goods and services that were necessary for the maintenance of the first quality products in terms of repair and replacement. Finally, the informal sector was crucial for the formation of the channels of distribution of the consumer goods in the urban area.¹⁰⁵

The spatial expression of such an informal labor market and urban economy was the proliferation of *gecekondu*. It was during the 1960s that the *gecekondu*

¹⁰⁴ Tekeli, *Türkiye'de Yaşamda ve Yazında Konut Sorununun Gelişimi*, 62.

¹⁰⁵ Şenyapılı, "Enformel Sektör: Durağanlıktan Devingenliğe/ Gecekondulaşmadan Apartmanlaşmaya," 165-68.

became visible in the urban area. While there were 15,000 *gecekondu*s in 1950, the number rose to 240,000 in 1960 and amounted to 430,000 in 1965 corresponding to the 22.9 percent of the overall housing.¹⁰⁶ Most of them were one-storey houses in the form of shacks on the outskirts of the urban area. Şenyapılı argues that the main characteristic of the *gecekondu* in this period was its flexibility in conformity with the flexible labor force it supplied to the urban areas, rather than its illegality.¹⁰⁷ The formation of the housing sector in the form of *gecekondu* also was significant for the immigrants in terms of the survival strategies of the poor in the urban area through informal channels. As Erder also suggests, *gecekondu* signified more than shelter to its residents. It was the encapsulation of the channels by which the poor could integrate themselves into the urban life and gain bargaining power by being spatially apparent.¹⁰⁸

In response to these developments, the state determined its position and policies by several mechanisms. During the Democrat Party government between 1950 and 1960, housing was not on the agenda of the policy makers as a problem of urbanization or with reference to the emergence of the *gecekondu*. Towards the end of the period, however, the policy makers felt the lack of a regulatory institution for the urban land and urban planning on a large scale and the establishment of the Ministry of Reconstruction and Settlement took place in 1958. The housing issue entered the agenda as a component of the overall economic planning with the First Five-Year Development Plan in 1963.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁶ Tekeli, *Türkiye'de Yaşamda ve Yazında Konut Sorununun Gelişimi*, 89.

¹⁰⁷ Şenyapılı, "Enformel Sektör: Durağanlıktan Devingenliğe/ Gecekondulaşmadan Apartmanlaşmaya," 69.

¹⁰⁸ Sema Erder, *İstanbul'a Bir Kent Kondu: Ümraniye* (İstanbul: İletişim, 1996), 17-18.

¹⁰⁹ Tekeli, *Türkiye'de Yaşamda ve Yazında Konut Sorununun Gelişimi*, 63-65.

In the planned period the housing policy of Turkey was mostly left to the formulation of the issue by the five year plans. Although the Constitution prioritized housing for the poor in Article 49, there was no concrete attempt to centralize housing authority for supplying housing on a systematic basis. In the First Five-Year Development Plan in 1963, housing was considered an unproductive sector as far as the middle and high income housing was concerned. However, the plan stipulated also that low-income housing was crucial for urbanization and the amount of the units should be increased without increasing the amount appropriated for construction. The Second Five-Year Development Plan of 1968 stipulated the indirect involvement of the state in the housing sector rather than direct investor or supplier. The Third and the Fifth Five-Year Plans more or less repeated the necessity of combination between public and private sectors for housing.¹¹⁰

The most important development in the period, however, was the enactment of the *Gecekondu* Law in 1966.¹¹¹ This can be considered in many respects as the legal incorporation of the illegal settlements and a response of the state to the undeniable presence of the *gecekondu* in the urban area. The law defined *gecekondu* as the “buildings constructed on the land or plot without the consent of its owner and without due regard to the binding rules and the general laws regulating settlement and reconstruction acts.”¹¹² The definition was made on the basis of the property status as well as legality. There was no references to the relation of the *gecekondu* to urban poverty or urbanization. As done with many other construction amnesties during and after the period, reference to the property status signifies the problem has been attempted to be solved by regulating the legal status of the *gecekondu*. This can

¹¹⁰ Keleş, "Housing Policy in Turkey," 149-51.

¹¹¹ "Gecekondu Kanunu," (Resmi Gazete 12362, 1966).

¹¹² Ibid. “*İmar ve yapı işlerini düzenleyen mevzuata ve genel hükümlere bağlı kalmaksızın kendisine ait olmayan arazi ve arsalar üzerinde sahibinin rızası alınmadan yapılan izinli binalar*”

be considered as significant in two respects. First it demonstrates another channel of institutionalization of capitalist property relations in Turkish social and economic life. More importantly, however, is that not referring to the relation of poverty and *gecekondü* does not necessarily mean that this connection was undermined for it was obvious although it is explicitly excluded. Such a definition implies a political choice consenting the position of the poor in the urban area without having to regulate their social and economic conditions but defining the scope of their activity in legal terms. In other words, poverty has not been considered as an aspect that has to be regulated by social policy measures with reference to *gecekondü*, what was more crucial was the property conflict. Thus, this definition can be considered as determining for the later developments and regulations on the issue that can be characterized as an ongoing bargaining on the urban rent framed by property relations.

New Urban Setting of the Post-1980 Period

In the 1980s the urbanization patterns changed in a way to reflect the priorities of the new economic order of the period. The export-oriented market economy forced cities to be more open to the global opportunities emerging out of financial activities or industrial relocation. This change created a competitive environment in which cities themselves became items on the market. One other dimension of this change took place in the attention paid to the visual aspects of the city and considering the social and economic developments more in terms of the impact they created on the overall appearance of the urban area. The 1980s were also marked by the transformation from Fordist production methods to the flexible

production which would have disrupting impact on the previous organization of the labor market. The urban economic activity was centered around new sectors like services and marketing, which led to the re-organization of the urban space and the social and economic hierarchies within it. The location of the labor force more to the services sectors informally in towards the end of the 1980s and more in 1990s was one of the crucial characteristics of the period.

In the 1950s Istanbul had a total share of 19% and 40.8% of the small and large scale industry of Turkey, respectively. In 1964 the proportion had rose to 42.9 % in large-scale industry.¹¹³ According to the data available in 1985 Istanbul had 44.9% of the large-scale industries and 21% of the small-scale industries in Turkey. Although the volume of industrial production increased in Istanbul, the industrial activity started to spread to the outer zones of the city like towards İzmit, leaving the center for other activities.¹¹⁴ In 1990 nearly half of the settled labor force had flexible, non-protected jobs open to conjectural fluctuations. M. Güvenç argues that the unemployment problem of the period has been solved by increasing flexible employment among the unemployed in the 1990s that has changed the character of the labor market in the period.¹¹⁵

In such an environment Istanbul started to assume a crucial role compared to the previous decades. The previous center, Ankara, lagged behind Istanbul to a certain degree in the new organization of the city space depended less on the political logic of the nation-state and more on the logic of capital.¹¹⁶ Keyder and Öncü indicate that it was in the 1980s when the state subsidies were reduced and public

¹¹³ Erol Tümertekin, *İstanbul: İnsan ve Mekan* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları 1997), 42.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 67-73, 81.

¹¹⁵ Güvenç, "İstanbul'da İşyeri-Statü Temelinde Segregasyon; 1990 Sayımı Üzerinde İlişkisel Çözümler," 112.

¹¹⁶ Keyder and Öncü, *Istanbul and the Concept of the World Cities*, 7.

budget was cut and the eventual social consequences of worsening income distribution were felt, that “Istanbul received a major influx of state funding.”¹¹⁷ These state fundings have enabled the Istanbul metropolitan government to start urban renewal projects and infrastructural investments in accordance with the new concept of the urban centers as preliminary steps towards changing the urban setting.¹¹⁸

Housing policies has become a major tool for urban re-organization at the spatial level in the 1980s. The funds generated by the Mass Housing Administration channeled funds that were used as policy tools for re-structuring the big cities. Apart from the impact of housing as an activity and the functioning of the economy, the changing housing policy and the selective usage of the funds resulted in a change in the visible dimension of the city together with the new spatial hierarchy. As the Mass Housing Fund was designed to function within the framework of a free market economy, it became a tool of “government encouragement of private initiative in housing construction.”¹¹⁹ Furthermore, housing, considered as a visible dimension of social hierarchies has been a significant source of segregation and organization of city space in the form of islands composed of isolated spheres of social and economic activity.¹²⁰

The urban renewal projects and gentrification attempts have become very important sources of re-creating the city in line with the new requirements of neo-liberal capitalism. . These policies have become tools for “cleaning” the cities of the

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 19.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 23.

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

¹²⁰ Türkün and Kurtuluş, "Giriş," 14.

poor as the urban rent increases in the city centers and forces the poor to find shelter in the new poverty areas at the periphery of the urban area.

The Mass Housing Fund: Formal Distribution of the Urban Rent

Before the establishment of the Mass Housing Fund there were several institutions in Turkey that were in charge of the formulation of a general housing policy and urban planning that should be mentioned in brief. The Ministry of Public Works and Settlements, established in 1958, was one of the most influential in situations responsible for the formulation of the general framework of housing strategy. The General Directorate of Housing was within the body of the ministry as in charge of providing homes for those who were unable to own or rent. The directorate functioned until 1985 when it was abolished and its authority in financial aspects of housing was transferred to the Mass Housing Public Partnership Corporation. While the transfer of authority on financial matters was realized, the other responsibilities of the directorate were given to any other institution. The ministry has totally left the area of housing policy formulation since then.¹²¹

There are two other directorates in the ministry that are closely related to the formulation of a general housing policy. The first one is the Building Material General Directorate; responsible for the low-cost housing and the second is the Land Office, which is engaged in the prevention of the rise of land prices, speculation and overall price regulation of the land market primarily. However, although its scope of responsibility is highly important for housing and generation of the urban land, due

¹²¹ Keleş, "Housing Policy in Turkey," 143-44.

to the insufficiency of the financial resources its influence over the urban land market has been insignificant.¹²²

The State Planning Organization and the State Housing Bank can also be counted among the actors of the housing policy. The State Planning Organization has the authority to assess the performance of the housing sector as well as its prospective development with a macro-economic outlook while the State Housing Bank has been used as a financial tool for funding the ownership of high-income groups and engaging in building expensive units.¹²³

Municipalities have been important actors in the *de-facto* formulation of housing policy at the local level. They have been very influential actors in generating urban land and regulating urban land markets than directly engaging in building activities.¹²⁴ Their role until the 1980s, as Öncü indicates, has been crucial through the non-exercise of legal regulations or their selective relaxation as a basis of political power within a clientelistic electoral politics.¹²⁵

It is known that the housing sector was in crisis towards the end of the 1970s. With the decrease of purchasing power, the sector faced a problem of over production in the period. It was also in this period that the low-income groups were facing a serious problem in finding adequate housing at affordable prices. As has been pointed out by Pulat, in the first years of the 1980s in which high-inflation rates were prevalent, it has become almost impossible for low or middle income groups become home owners.¹²⁶ One of the major consequences of an inflationist

¹²² Ibid.

¹²³ Ibid., 144-46.

¹²⁴ Ibid., 145.

¹²⁵ Öncü, "The Politics of the Urban Land Market in Turkey: 1950-1980," 54.

¹²⁶ Gülçin Pulat, *Dar Gelirli Kentlilerin Konut Sorunu ve Soruna Sosyal İçerikli Mekansal Çözüm Arayışları* (Ankara: Batıkent Konut Üretim Yapı Kooperatifleri Yayını, 1992), 49.

environment was the increase of urban land speculation reflected directly on the monthly rent rates and housing prices. In the same period, urban housing shortage rose up to 300,000 units as a record rate of all times.¹²⁷

The idea of the establishment of an institution responsible for the central planning of housing started to be discussed widely towards the end of the 1970s as the other institutions were found more insufficient for the housing sector and policy implementation. It was due primarily to the deadlocks of the housing sector in generating new demand as well as the increasing squatter population with migration. Although changed in its formulations, hot debates and detailed formulations about the housing policy can be found in the professional and popular journals of the period. The issue started to be discussed in terms of the state's role in respect to engagement in mass housing projects. For example, one of the leading professional journals, *Mimarlık* (Architecture) published a thematic issue on mass housing in 1978.¹²⁸ The Mass Housing Fund was established in 1984 under very particular circumstances of both the Turkish economy and urban transformation. The increasing gains by the speculative environment of the late 1970s resulted in a financial boom, part of which was constituted by the urban property rents. The real estate market was a major source of speculative gain, especially in this period.¹²⁹ The increasing interest in the housing as a productive sector emerged where the gain of urban rent and urban property prices was at their heights.

Keyder and Öncü argue that Mass Housing Fund was able to function through two mechanisms that were present at the time. "One was that to-be-developed residential land which had been the object of speculation by private investors was

¹²⁷ Ruşen Keleş, *Kentleşme Politikası* (Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 1990), 13.

¹²⁸ *Mimarlık* 3, no. 56 (1978).

¹²⁹ Keyder and Öncü, *Istanbul and the Concept of the World Cities*, 24-25.

now sold at a profit y the purposes of mass housing... Secondly, because of the rise in the real estate prices, the usual functioning of the market through private arrangements and suppliers' credit had become impossible to sustain. A significant proportion of the would-be house owners had no recourse except the MHF in their quest for ownership.»¹³⁰

Its economic function was paralleled to the spatial consequences it created in the urban area. Large areas of houses constructed by the Mass Housing Fund changed the appearance of the big cities as they were built along the highways in the remote and empty areas of the cities and resulted in the re-location of middle income groups by moving them away from the city center to the newly constructed areas.¹³¹ Although, originally the fund was intended to solve the problem of housing for the middle and low income groups, eventually it proved to be a mechanism of house ownership for high and middle income groups. Such a consequence is related to the concerns and priorities of the political decision makers embedded in the institutional and legal framework of the Mass Housing Fund as much as the economic logic of the period. Thus, a brief history of mass housing in Turkey in the 1980s may help to analyze the social, political and economic background on which it was established together with its consequences.

As it has been indicated earlier, the establishment of the Mass Housing Fund stands at a particular conjuncture of economic dynamics which have important social and political implications. The formulation of its legal framework reflects the priorities of the period, which can be summarized as facilitating the private housing sector with state funds. The very first Mass Housing Law was enacted during the military regime as a law for the promotion of mass housing projects targeting low-

¹³⁰ Ibid., 25.

¹³¹ Ibid., 30.

income groups. However, as the financial mechanisms designed were not adequate for that particular income group and other finance tools were found costly, the first law was abolished.¹³² However, the stipulation of a law on mass housing was the sign of the change of perspective as for housing. The change that took place emphasized the productive and profitable side of the housing both in terms of economic activity and the achievement of social regulation in the urban area.¹³³ Previously discussed and formulated more in terms of shelter and necessity, the enactment of such a law was one of the many signs that housing was now seen more in terms of its commercial value in the market. The second law on mass housing was enacted with the same priorities but with a different financial resource. The first law had stipulated the financing of credits for housing projects, be them private or public, through budgetary resources by devoting five percent of the national budget to the housing sector and the credits for the implementation of the projects. The second law, adopted in 1984, altered the status of the financial resources to extra-budgetary means like new taxes and fees outside the national budget.¹³⁴

During the parliamentary discussions of the law one of the most repeated criticisms was concerned with the discretionary credits and lack of a monitoring mechanism for the implementation of the fund. Also it has been argued that the law was stipulating a fund that could be used by anyone regardless of the priorities of the housing policy and it could be used for building any kind of house, the fund does not necessarily finance social housing projects.¹³⁵ The report of the commissions preparing the law and the draft of the Mass Housing Law indicated the aim of the

¹³² Keleş, "Housing Policy in Turkey," 151.

¹³³ Ibid., 152.

¹³⁴ Ibid., 153.

¹³⁵ "Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Tutanak Dergisi," 17. Dönem 40. Birleşim (1984): 351-63.

law was house ownership of the middle and low income groups, improvement of the conditions of the squatters, providing a continuous flow of resources for housing finance and decreasing the cost of building.¹³⁶ The government of the period kept the draft as it was and paved the way for a new flow of state funds to the housing sector that was used as a means of private housing sector's encouragement.

With the same law the Mass Housing and Public Partnership Corporation also was been established to be responsible for the administration of the Mass Housing Fund by making rules and regulations concerning the fund and its implementation. Keleş argues that the administration was only in charge of technical side of the administrative aspects of the fund without any concern for the development of a broader housing policy.¹³⁷ However, as its legal attachment to the Prime Ministry is considered with the magnitude of the funds it distributes, the decisions, in some way or another, leads a particular type of housing policy. Although the formulation of a country-wide housing policy was not counted among the duties of the corporation, the funds distributed by the corporation were effective in changing the face of the big cities and creating a new urban environment. In addition, as was indicated earlier, the central administration changed its perspective with respect to housing and urban planning after 1980. The emphasis on the importance of housing both in terms of its social and economic significance through legal and institutional arrangements is a clear sign of a development of a housing policy in a particular direction primarily based on the logic of capital.

The potential of the corporation for changing the urban environment through housing policies can be traced from the magnitude of the funding and the

¹³⁶ İmar Bayındırlık, Ulaştırma ve Turizm; Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonları "Toplu Konut Kanun Tasarısı ve Bayındırlık, İmar, Ulaştırma ve Turizm; Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonları Raporları " (TBMM, 1/452,1984), 15.

¹³⁷ Keleş, "Housing Policy in Turkey," 144.

countrywide distribution of the Mass Housing Administration funded housing projects in the 1980s and 1990s. In the first place it was very effective in funding the cooperatives that were a source of major housing supply in the period. In 1983 there were 279 cooperatives countrywide, in 1984 the number increased to 1,219. 2,397 in 1985 and a total of 5,201 cooperatives in 1987 were engaged in housing activity.¹³⁸ So the fund was effective in increasing the housing supply through cooperatives at a substantial level in less than ten years. The share of the mass housing credits provided by the Mass Housing Fund in the overall housing financing rose up to 80% in 1985 just a year after its foundation.¹³⁹ In a study that aimed at estimating the influence of the mass housing projects on urban development by 1993 data, it is demonstrated that mass housing credits were significant factors of urban development especially for the western parts of the country. Obviously, the credits were used either by cooperatives or middle and high income groups rather than as funds for social houses for the poorer segments of society.¹⁴⁰

The Mass Housing Administration was established where no other source of housing credit was available from a centralised institution. Partly deriving its importance in the 1980s by filling the institutionalised housing credit gap the projects of the Mass Housing Administration symbolised a turn in the housing strategy of the state. The cooperatives and fast urban development at the outer zones of the urban areas supported by the credit facilities resulted in the formation of fragmented island-like housing areas that created new areas of housing for the

¹³⁸ "Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığının 2002, 2003 ve 2004 Yılları Eylem ve İşlemlerinin Araştırılıp Denetlenmesine İlişkin Rapor Özeti," 4.

¹³⁹ Ibid., 5.

¹⁴⁰ Numan Tuna et al., *Türkiye'de Toplu Konut Uygulamalarının Kentsel Gelişmeye Etkileri* (Ankara: TC Başbakanlık Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığı, 1996), 225-50.

middle classes.¹⁴¹ As such, the physical changes deriving from globalization coupled with the requirements of the dominant mode of capitalism resulted in “the attempt to recover the downtown, to make the center city into a service center and a ‘consumption artefact’ attracting tourists, businessmen, and weekend visitors was a principal policy measure of urban governments during the early 1980s.”¹⁴² The significance of the Mass Housing Administration and the credit facilities for the middle and high income groups was the major source of spatial renewal of the city through housing.

Gecekondu, Urban Poverty, and Informality after 1980

During the 1980s and 1990s *gecekondu*s continued to be strong alternatives for housing the urban poor. However, the characteristic of the *gecekondu* proliferation in the urban area changed in such a way that although *gecekondu* were more centralized physically, the 1980s marked the beginning of the segregation of the urban poor in socially more isolated relationships and separated neighborhoods. Moreover, *gecekondu*s also passed through transformation in terms of the housing methods. They ceased to be one-storey self help housing alternatives and were transformed into multi-storey apartments. Obviously, in line with the physical changes, the definition of the *gecekondu* population as well as urban poverty issue took new forms. The influence of the change in the immigration patterns and the further growth of the informal economic activities added up on the income disparities

¹⁴¹ Özcan Altaban, *Toplu Konut Alanlarında Örgütlenme ve İşletme* (Ankara: TC Başbakanlık Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığı, 1996), 2.

¹⁴² Keyder and Öncü, *Istanbul and the Concept of the World Cities*, 32.

created mainly by the neo-liberal economic policies of the 1980s and 1990s and all have resulted in the transformation of the city space.

As housing as a government policy changed its direction after 1980, the dynamics of the squatters as the chief concrete alternative of shelter for the urban poor since the 1950s also underwent a radical transformation. The transformation can be related to several factors among which labor dynamics can be counted in the first place. The urban labor market was subject to change by the general change of the economic policy from import substitution to export orientation which had disrupting effects on the previous organizations of the labor market and the linkages to the city system. The lesser degree of absorption of the labor force through external migration to Europe was also significant together with the increasing rates of domestic migration from the eastern part of the country due to forced migration policies of the martial law in the region.¹⁴³ The second important aspect of transformation in the dynamics of *gecekondu* in the 1980s is, as Şenyapılı puts it, squatters' own adoption to the market environment by converting the previously one-storey houses to the multi-storey low-income apartments.¹⁴⁴ The major source of this kind of a transformation was also related to the increasing urban rent in the squatter areas with the help from what Keyder and Öncü called "ANAP's discovery of urban populism."¹⁴⁵

The change in the migratory patterns both external and internal were influential both in the social composition of the *gecekondu* population of the period and the economic dynamics of the urban life that they are subject to in turn. Added to the major reduction in the state subsidies to the rural sector, the forced migration

¹⁴³ Şenyapılı, "Charting the 'Voyage' of Squatter Housing in Urban Spatial 'Quadruped'," 23.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid.: 26-27.

¹⁴⁵ Keyder and Öncü, *Istanbul and the Concept of the World Cities*, 20.

dynamics created a group of urban poor who were at the same time ethnically separated. As their “motivation” for migration was not similar to those in the previous decades their articulation to the urban life was also different. First, they did not have any material or psychological preparation before migration and they mostly experienced absolute poverty conditions in the cities.¹⁴⁶ As they also did not have a chance to go back to their home town for a long while and the neighborhoods they live in spatially and economically segregated from the others, the city became a scene of increasing social tensions which entered on the political agenda of the 1990s.

However, one of the most crucial dynamics for the transformation of *gecekondu* and its spatial organization emerged out of the labor dynamics. To put it differently, the change that the form of *gecekondu* and the social composition of its residents underwent in the 1980s and 1990s can be traced from the labor market dynamics resulting from the new urban setting and the requirements of the capitalist organization of the period. Şenyapılı, in her article with the same concern, puts forward “the pyramid model” for the period before 1980 with a “block” alongside it.¹⁴⁷ The pyramid model implies a kind of stable labor market with a certain degree of permeability between the sections that are adjacent to each other. The formal works with union protection, high level bureaucracy and high level service sector occupied the top of the pyramid while small-scale manufacturers, clerical and service workers occupied the middle section. At the bottom part the informal work was the dominant form.¹⁴⁸ The “block” standing alongside the pyramid is the sector of illegal

¹⁴⁶ Şenyapılı, "Charting the 'Voyage' of Squatter Housing in Urban Spatial 'Quadruped'," 28.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid.: 30.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid.

and criminal activity with its internal rules of functioning but also with an ability to establish different types of relationships with every section of the pyramid model.¹⁴⁹

She argues that the dominant pyramid labor market model of the years before 1980 disintegrated with the change of the economic model. As the new model required service sector professionals more than any other sector especially in the metropolitan areas, the top section can be considered as separate and independent from the pyramid. This kind of a separation corresponds to the spatial segregation in the city through luxury housing areas isolated from the rest of the city and “gated communities.”¹⁵⁰ The middle part, peripheral section became subject to disintegration as “small-scale businesses [went] of the market along with narrowing down of government and of industrial sectors and with the increasing standardization demands of the European market.”¹⁵¹

Şenyapılı argues that the informal sector, the bottom section of the pyramid model of the previous period, is enlarging and passing through a process of internal transformation with the influence of the peripheral section and new joinings from the illegal/criminal “block.” The permeability pattern of the informal sector has changed through the enrichment of some of its members and transferring the shift to the newcomers, namely the forced migrants of the big cities who were living at absolute poverty levels. The cycles or shift of poverty through the exploitation of those at the edges of the social and economic life that was composed of people closely related to the illegal/criminal block created the most significant “absolute poverty” groups in the urban areas, according to Şenyapılı’s analysis.¹⁵² She also argues that this scheme

¹⁴⁹ Ibid.: 32.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.: 33.

¹⁵¹ Şenyapılı, "Charting the *'Voyage'* of Squatter Housing in Urban Spatial *'Quadruped'*," 33.

¹⁵² Şenyapılı, "Charting the *'Voyage'* of Squatter Housing in Urban Spatial *'Quadruped'*," 35.

of the new labor market with an enlarging informal sector was instrumental in the containment of the social order through the absorption of the increasing unemployed although it did not function perfectly in terms of containing poverty and inequality at the same time.¹⁵³

The cycles of poverty approach that Şenyapılı employs to analyze the enlargement and reproduction capacity of the informal sector also implies significant levels of intermingling of the formal sectors with the informal ones along with the illegal/criminal block. As has been indicated earlier, the new order of capitalism favoring flexible production also favors a meaningful level of informal sector involvement. Thus, the pyramid model of Şenyapılı, disrupted totally in the 1980s and new inequalities with new spatial reflections sprang up in the urban area. As the formal sectors also had permeability, if not intermingling, with informal networks, the status of *gecekondu* emerged as a very particular example in the 1980s and 1990s, bringing in all the dynamics of the labor market of the post-1980 order.

Following the analysis of Şenyapılı based on labor market dynamics, the emergence of *gecekondu* neighborhoods consisted of multi-storey low-income apartment blocs in the 1980s and 1990s can be explained in terms of labor mobility. The reduced possibility of permeability between different sections of the labor pyramid as a result of internal structure of industrial and service sectors as well as the mode of economic cooperation of these sectors with the peripheral sectors led to a new organization of the labor market. According to the analysis of Şenyapılı, “the earlier, comparatively more frequent and widespread intra and intersectoral labor mobility was now limited to the far narrower, less organized and less specialized

¹⁵³ Şenyapılı, "Charting the 'Voyage' of Squatter Housing in Urban Spatial 'Quadruped'," 36.

sections of the sectors.”¹⁵⁴ The reduction in the labor mobility possibilities and increase in the numbers of family members participating in the labor market combined with the amnesty laws providing a substantial amount of rental gain to the previous squatter owners and led to the eventual emergence of apartment-type squatters in the period.¹⁵⁵ The transformation of squatter labor’s status from marginal to informal and then to peripheral together with the old mechanism of legal relaxations for deriving more urban rent thus have been significant sources of the transformation that the squatters passed through in the 1980s and 1990s. The transformation in the housing environment of the squatter settlements strengthened their ties with the urban area by establishing “relational networks in this space independent of the labor market.”¹⁵⁶

The significance of the informal ties both economically and socially in the creation of the new urban areas has been dealt extensively by Erder in her study on Ümraniye, one of the *gecekondu* neighborhoods of Istanbul.¹⁵⁷ She points out that the essence of informality not only is crystallized in the labor market related aspects of the urban area. Accepting the undeniable significance of the labor market for understanding the settlement type of the newcomers, she argues that the informality transcends economic activities and that the informal channels created by the *gecekondu* population should be observed in its multi-dimensional functioning.¹⁵⁸

The distinction Erder makes between *gecekondu*s and “new urban areas” is highly significant in these respects. She analyses the development of *gecekondu* areas into multi-storey apartment neighborhoods in the 1980s and concludes that

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.: 27.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid.: 40.

¹⁵⁷ Erder, *İstanbul'a Bir Kent Kondu: Ümraniye*.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., 16-17.

these areas, like the previous *gecekondu* areas, existed outside of the prevailing urban formality; however, their emergence and functioning shows different characteristics. In these areas, production, especially housing production, and social reproduction took place in a market where its complex dynamics were known by its residents and workers. In that sense, the market that the system operated through was a closed one.¹⁵⁹ Furthermore, the closed market of the new urban areas, having adopted the dominant form of exchange relationships, has created its own hierarchical structure.

The market which Erder described in detail was the squatter housing market mainly, in which different segments of the population supplied differentiated types of products to the highly differentiated group of population. The channels of operation were constructed informally and when the other formal or informal actors wanted to enter into the market they operated through these channels. That is why when the urban land production was the case, the institution for that activity was popularly termed “land mafia.”¹⁶⁰ It also demonstrates that the interest of the big or medium capital should also be counted among the factors shaping the economic and social realm in the new urban areas. Erder points out to the similarities of the informal mechanisms that were employed in the commercialized informal urbanization processes in the 1980s with those that had been prepared in the previous *gecekondu* dominated urbanization processes.¹⁶¹ The opportunities created by the already settled and agreed mechanisms of informal networks combined with the rates of speculative urban rent in a commercialized environment led to the entrance of formal capital to the domain of informality from the “back door,” which has been a unique

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., 299.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid.

¹⁶¹ Ibid.

mechanism for the intermingling of the formal and informal sectors in the housing market in the post-1980 period.¹⁶²

In the new urban areas of Erder, similar to their characteristically organized housing market structure, it is not possible to determine any social or economic organization outside the specific market, be it public administration authorities or capital, as enjoying explicit and planned hegemony over the totality. However, this does not mean they have little or no effect over the course of events in these areas. Their activities and mechanisms of operation are rather implicit compared to the ones in the formal realm and this results in turn different articulation of both parts.¹⁶³ Thus, institutions like municipality or *muhtarlık* function with different priorities and through different channels in these areas.¹⁶⁴

As it been inserted several times, one dimension of the particular characteristic of the *gecekondus* during the period was a consequence of the legal framework. More accurately, the selective implementation and relaxation of urban land and reconstruction codes followed by an amnesty for the dwellings built outside the regulations, most of the time, were sources of legitimation for building new illegal buildings with the expectation of further relaxation in the near future. It was by no means a new phenomenon when urban centers were the case. What was different about the 1980s was, according to Keyder and Öncü, “ANAP’s discovery of urban populism,” which can also be thought in terms of Erder’s account on the “new urban areas.”

The urban populist outlook, different from the rural populism of the previous decades, was used by the first civilian government of the neo-liberal period, namely

¹⁶² Ibid.

¹⁶³ Ibid., 298.

¹⁶⁴ Sema Erder, *Kentsel Gerilim : Enformel İlişki Ağları Alan Araştırması* (Ankara: um:ag, 1997), 53.

the ANAP government and implied “the promise of a market model free of government tutelage, and likely to reward initiative and luck ... attractive to the urban marginal population who could dream of ‘making it.’”¹⁶⁵ The promise of the free market ideology together with the new urban populism and the selective implementation of land codes or their relaxation, though employed with more “design and determination” compared to the previous periods, were used as a means of legalizing the urban rent for those groups that were strategic for the electoral politics.¹⁶⁶ As the decline in real wages and the decomposition of many previously organized areas of the labor market took place in the 1980s and during the economic crises of the 1990s, these regulations eventually were sources of unequal distribution of the urban rent to the groups suffering from the economic consequences of the free market ideology which created further segregation and poverty for different segments this time.¹⁶⁷ The competitive environment for obtaining limited urban land and its rent were sources of organization along severe ethnic and religious lines to acquire power in the urban area.¹⁶⁸ Combined with the unequal and *ad-hoc* characteristics of the informal economic activity over the valuable urban land in the big cities with high levels of competition for power in the urban areas, there emerged what Buğra calls “the immoral economy of housing” in Turkey.¹⁶⁹

The squatter formation mechanisms in the post-1980 environment have led to increasing political economic and social tensions among the ethnically, politically or religiously organized groups, paving the way for specific types of relations constructed between the groups that only can be understood within a framework of

¹⁶⁵ Keyder and Öncü, *Istanbul and the Concept of the World Cities*, 20.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid.

¹⁶⁸ Şenyapılı, "Charting the 'Voyage' of Squatter Housing in Urban Spatial 'Quadruped'," 43.

¹⁶⁹ Buğra, "The Immoral Economy of Housing in Turkey."

general economic changes. The impact of the economic change in the formation of establishing new areas of tensions in the urban area also have been severed by the interference of the state in the issue with its security forces. It is also necessary to note that, as Erder has put it, it is widely known that the Turkish state's attitudes towards the problems related to the social realm has been employing intelligence and security mechanisms as solutions.¹⁷⁰

As the tensions rise and urban land continues to be a source of gain more than ever in the Turkish economy, the rental gain acquired by the population living in those areas started to be questioned. As the moral legitimation of squatter settlements derived from the satisfaction of a basic need of shelter for a group of migrants and not questioned on the basis of property rights in the 1950s and 1960s,¹⁷¹ the commercialization of *gecekondu* was a challenge to the discourse that the urban population and politicians shared with respect to urban poverty and low-income housing. The *gecekondu* population labeled as “urban poor Other(s)”, “undeserving rich Other(s)” and the “culturally inferior Other(s) as Sub-culture” in the 1980s and mid 1990s started to be represented as “threatening/*varoşlu* Other” in the late 1990s.¹⁷²

¹⁷⁰ Erder, *Kentsel Gerilim : Enformel İlişki Ağları Alan Araştırması*, 100.

¹⁷¹ Buğra, "The Immoral Economy of Housing in Turkey," 306.

¹⁷² Erman, "The Politics of Squatter (*Gecekondu*) Studies in Turkey: The Changing Representations of Rural Migrants in the Academic Discourse," 993-98.

CHAPTER 4

HOUSING POLICY OF URBAN TRANSFORMATION: THE 2000s

Housing in Turkey started to be used widely as a policy tool for the stimulation of the real estate market.¹⁷³ As far as mass housing projects are concerned the stimulation has been mediated through the direct and indirect financial involvement of the state. Although originally in the 1980s the Mass Housing Law stipulated the promotion of low-income housing and social housing, this type of projects was very limited in number and scope, as the previous chapters have made clear. In the period after the centralization of mass housing in 1984, the projects that were financed or directly built under the authority of Mass Housing Administration were middle or high income housing projects especially in terms of their payment requirements, locations and spatial organizations.

However, after 2000 a new approach started to be institutionalized with regard to low income housing. For the first time in Turkey, a central authority like the Mass Housing Administration started to finance and promote projects targeted at the low income groups and the urban poor on a very large scale. Consequently, it was also for the first time that the *gecekondu* phenomenon was taken into account together with social housing projects under “*Gecekondu* Transformation” projects. The scope of the new projects was very much larger than the previous ones and they

¹⁷³ Fulin Bölen, "A Comparative Study of Formal and Informal Housing Markets in Istanbul" (paper presented at the European Network for Housing Research International Symposium, ITU Building and Earthquake Research and Application Centre, 1991), A014.

constituted an important item on the agenda of municipalities and the central government.¹⁷⁴

Thus, these policies became very important determinants of the urbanization trends in the period. Following the 1980s' urbanization trends and migration patterns, it can be argued that the 2000s have not been radically different from the 1980s as far as the mentality of the policy makers is concerned. However, it does not mean to undermine the differences that carry the potentials of creating new social and economic dynamics in the urban area. What is radically different in the 2000s is the further extension of the urbanization perspective of the 1980s to the previously uncovered segments of society. This perspective aims not only at centering the cities around new economic sectors like services, finance and marketing, but also at marketing the city itself as a commodity in order to take advantage of being a "world city." One other dimension of this perspective is shifting the structure of the already established networks of social and economic interaction in the urban area by re-arranging the distribution of the rent created as a result of spatial centrality.

As it has been indicated above, the post-1980 order of the urban area requires the centralization of finance, industrial and service sectors in different areas of the city. While finance and services are being organized within the city centers many of the industrial sectors are relocated to the outer zones of the city. For Istanbul, this dynamic started to be determining since the second half of the 1980s with the attempts of the metropolitan municipality to create finance and commerce centers that would attract the foreign capital to the city center. In time new construction plans entered in to the force to for implementing these priorities to the Maslak-

¹⁷⁴ Since its establishment in 1984 the Mass Housing Administration completed 43,145 units before 2002. Since 2002 the number of units constructed by Mass Housing Administration has far exceeded its performance in the previous 18 years and reached up to 180,000 units. For the details, see Erdoğan Bayraktar, *Gecekondu ve Kentsel Yenileme* (Ankara: Ekonomik Araştırmalar Merkezi Yayınları, 2006).

Büyükdere zone on the one hand and Altunizade-Kozyatağı zone on the other. The industrial firms have reacted to the relocation, however the plans were implemented.¹⁷⁵

In the 2000s the implications stemming from such an urbanization outlook have been extended to low-income housing in a way to result in both the generation of new urban land through eliminating *gecekondu* and the redefinition of the physical and social position of the urban poor. In particular, housing has been started to be used as a policy tool for the enforcement of the mentioned perspective to shape the metropolises and it has expressed itself through the new organization of the institutions related to the formulation of a national housing policy like the Mass Housing Administration and municipalities.

In this context, this chapter attempts to evaluate the current policies of mass housing with reference to the relative weight of urban development and gentrification attempts on the one hand and social policies directed at the redefinition of the position of the poor in urban society on the other hand. As the urban question has entered the agenda of the policy makers in the period after 2000 with new terms and priorities among which the elimination of *gecekondu*s and urban transformation along with the increasing the supply of low-income housing constitute a significant part, mass housing can be considered as a very important aspect of the overall transformation.

These recent developments in low-income housing take place in a political and economic environment of a large scale urban regeneration which highlights the new direction of the urban spatial order. The analysis of this process also paves the way for questioning the approaches to urban poverty and social security mechanisms

¹⁷⁵ Binnur Öktem, "Küresel Kent Söyleminin Kentsel Mekanı Dönüştürmedeki Rolü: Büyükdere-Maslak Aksı," in *İstanbul'da Kentsel Ayırışma*, ed. Hatice Kurtuluş (İstanbul: Bağlam, 2005), 44-51.

in an era of neo-liberal free market economy. Some of the previously subsidized *gecekondu* areas are now being evacuated and new housing projects are being initiated directed not only to their residents but also for the market. The change is significant; however, the intentions and mentality is open to discussion. With these concerns in mind, in this chapter, first the new institutional and legal set up of the mass housing will be examined. Also a general evaluation of the low-income and *gecekondu* transformation projects will be made with respect to their country-wide distribution, location, scope and targets. In this chapter, the significance of certain projects in terms of their location in the city space, their target population, payment requirements and the policy implications will be evaluated. The empirical research is conducted on the analysis of two *gecekondu* transformation projects, one in Istanbul and one in Ankara.

Legal and Institutional Changes in Mass Housing Policy

The institutions that occupy significant positions in the determination and application of housing policy have undergone significant changes in the period after 2000. Most of the institutions responsible for the housing policy have been regulated in the period in order to bypass the financial bottlenecks they faced as well as to re-define their functions in line with new urbanization trends. Particularly, these changes reflect the necessity to reorganize both the financial sources and the administrative principles of the mass housing in Turkey in line with both the status of the real estate market in a free-market economy and re-defining the role of *gecekondu*.

First, the Real Estate Bank (*Emlak Bankası*) the establishment of which dates back to the early years of the Republic was closed down as it faced enormous financial problems to the degree that it became unable to operate as a bank. The closing down of the bank has coincided with an economic crisis in which some other public or private banks went bankrupted. In 2001 the Real Estate Bank was merged with two other public banks and its assets as well as the publicly owned property were transferred to the Mass Housing Administration.¹⁷⁶

After 2000 the law regulating the Mass Housing Administration has all but re-written. Most of its articles were either annulled or amended in order to fit the administration to the new priorities of the period. Together with altering the legal status of the administration and the fund, the scope of mass housing has been broadened in a way to include the segments of the population that have never been targeted by the state directly. Since 2000, housing and the Mass Housing Administration has started to be a critical tool for urban transformation projects in metropolitan areas and in the organization and planning of city space.

Until 2004 the duties of the Mass Housing Administration as stipulated by law did not include a reference to low income housing or urban transformation. They were limited to deriving financial sources and credits for housing through bonds and banks. Establishing housing firms or holding shares in already established ones are also among the legally defined rules of the administration.¹⁷⁷ However, in 2003 the Mass Housing Administration gained new areas of action in housing through including the low-income housing on its agenda.

As mentioned above, Mass Housing Fund was established in 1984 and provided with extra-budgetary financial resources. The fund, however, was included

¹⁷⁶ Bayraktar, *Gecekondu ve Kentsel Yenileme*, 201-02.

¹⁷⁷ "Toplu Konut Kanunu," (Resmi Gazete 18344, 02/03/1984).

in the national budget with a legal change in 1993 and in the end the fund was totally abolished in 2001 with Article 7 of Law No. 4684.¹⁷⁸ In the law the article regulating the fund was named “The Revenues, Spending and Monitoring of the Mass Housing Administration” in 2001.¹⁷⁹ Before the amendment the fund used to derive its resources through extra-budgetary channels like taxes put on alcoholic beverages, tobacco products, electricity as well as a special tax levied on those going abroad.¹⁸⁰ Also included in the fund were the payments of credits given to individuals or institutions, state bonds or donations. After the amendment of Article 2 of the Mass Housing Law started to finance the credits given to the projects through selling or renting the dwellings or land owned by the administration, through the interest of the credits supplied to the housing projects as well as their back payments.

Also, what was new about the function of the Administration was formulated within the framework of new credit areas like the development of rural housing, the transformation of *gecekondu* areas and urban and rural gentrification projects. The Administration is now entitled specifically to give credits to the above mentioned projects as well as subsidizing the interest rates of the credits. Before the amendment the administration’s duty had been limited to supplying individual or mass housing credits and subsidizing the interest rates of the housing credits.¹⁸¹ With the legal changes in 2004, the Mass Housing Administration was re-given the authority to establish housing firms or have shares in already established ones. With the same amendment the Mass Housing Administration was given the right to participate not

¹⁷⁸ "Bazı Kanun ve Kanun Hükmünde Kararnamelerde Değişiklik Yapılmasına Dair Kanun," (Resmi Gazete 24451, 2001).

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., Article 7.

¹⁸⁰ "Toplu Konut Kanunu."

¹⁸¹ "Bazı Kanunlarda ve Bayındırlık ve İskan Bakanlığı'nın Teşkilat ve Görevleri Hakkında Kanun Hükmünde Kararnamede Değişiklik Yapılmasına Dair Kanun " (Resmi Gazete 25192, 2003), Article 3.

only in housing firms as share holder but also in financial institutions that were related to the housing sector.¹⁸² The administration was given the opportunity to utilize the potential of the finance sector for its functioning by this amendment. Thus, when the growing impact of the finance is considered for a neo-liberal economy, it can be observed that the administration's linkages to the market have been strengthened.

This change in the status of the fund is significant when it is considered as a sign of the transformation of the mentality on which the Mass Housing Administration is based. Compared to the period in which the credits were financed through extra-budgetary funds outside the tax regime as well as the payments of those that were used for housing projects, the 2000s in which the revenues of the administration were started to depend more on its ability to sell and rent its own projects reflect a more private firm-like organization of the administration. Depending only on its potential to sell and rent projects for the continuity of financing resulted in an interesting but yet more significant combination of operational priorities for the institution.

Currently the administration is engaged directly or indirectly in both low-income and high and middle income projects. The low-income housing projects under the name *gecekondu* transformation are presented as a public duty of the government and the administration for planned urbanization and betterment of the residential conditions of the *gecekondu* residents, whereas the middle and high income housing projects are considered as part of the overall supply of housing to the market. However, the financial organization of the administration is more likely to

¹⁸² "Toplu Konut Kanununda ve Genel Kadro ve Usulü Hakkında Kanun Hükmünde Kararnamenin Eki Cetvellerin Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığına Ait Bölümünde Değişiklik Yapılması Hakkında Kanun " (Resmi Gazete 25460, 2004), Article 3.

end up in formulating a policy directed to profit-making like any other private firm, which may result in questioning the privileges it possesses for conducting and financing projects for public interest.

The administrative unit of the fund, the Mass Housing Administration, and the Land Office has been linked to the Undersecretary of Housing, which was established in 2001 as the central institution for determining the housing policies instead of the Mass Housing Administration. However, the undersecretary also was abolished in 2003 with Law No. 4966¹⁸³ and the Mass Housing Administration and Land Office were transferred to the Ministry of Reconstruction and Resettlement.¹⁸⁴ Another institutional rearrangement took place in January 2004 when the administration and the office were linked directly to the Prime Ministry.¹⁸⁵ The establishment and consequent abolition of the Undersecretary of Housing can be considered as a sign of the lessening centrality of the Mass Housing Administration in the overall housing market in terms of its financial effectiveness and housing policy. However, as has been observed by the developments taking place after 2000, the institution was reorganized in order to fulfill its new function.

Another important legal change concerning the Mass Housing Administration has been about land expropriation. In its original version the law gave the right to give permission for the expropriation of the land to be used by the administration for mass housing projects to governors.¹⁸⁶ The allowed expropriations were to be made through the Land Office; hence, the administration was not authorized to expropriate an area by its own decision. With the amendment made on the relevant article, the

¹⁸³ "Bazı Kanunlarda ve Bayındırlık ve İskan Bakanlığı'nın Teşkilat ve Görevleri Hakkında Kanun Hükmünde Kararnamede Değişiklik Yapılmasına Dair Kanun ".

¹⁸⁴ "Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığının 2002, 2003 ve 2004 Yılları Eylem ve İşlemlerinin Araştırılıp Denetlenmesine İlişkin Rapor Özeti," 6.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., 7.

¹⁸⁶ "Toplu Konut Kanunu," Article 4.

Mass Housing Administration was authorized to expropriate the land determined for its own projects. The article did not stipulate any exceptions other than a vague definition of appropriateness to the environmental conditions and reconstruction requirements for the expropriation authority of the administration.¹⁸⁷

Broadening the expropriation authority is significant for reasons which are related to the shortening the time and work for the implementation of the projects through entitling the administration indirectly to urban planning. More crucial is however The Mass Housing Administration could now implement urban planning measures by its own decision and contribute directly to the organization of the urban space as a more powerful actor. When the institutional and financial structure of the administration is considered together with the authority it can exercise over urban space with the potentials of changing the social and economic dynamics of a particular area through housing, it can be argued that the urban planning authority is partially given to an institution that aims at profit-making in the first place. Accordingly, if the choice of the to-be-transformed *gecekondu* areas also are taken into account, as will be shown in the following section, it is seen that the administration uses its authority in favor of constructing projects that are more likely to bring the easiest and fastest urban rent by using its expropriation privileges although it emphasizes its public duty for the urban poor at the discursive level. What is more striking still is the potential it bears for further change in the urban area through dislocating some very rentable *gecekondu* areas and engaging in projects supplying housing or land for high income groups.

¹⁸⁷ "Toplu Konut Kanununda ve Genel Kadro ve Usulü Hakkında Kanun Hükmünde Kararnamenin Eki Cetvellerin Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığına Ait Bölümünde Değişiklik Yapılması Hakkında Kanun ", Article 2.

The Squatter Settlements and Housing Directory (*Gecekondu ve Mesken Mdrlğ*) is another important actor supporting the urban transformation projects through land transfers, the evacuation of the *gecekondu* areas, orienting the social housing projects and determining those who are entitled to own dwellings in them. It is connected to the local municipality and it is entitled to act as an intermediary institution between the Mass Housing Administration and the residents of the *gecekondu* areas that are subject to transportation. Its main function is providing land for the municipality and the organization of the infrastructural facilities for the low-income housing areas, be they *gecekondus* or social houses. Before the adoption of the regulations concerning the urban transformation and low-income housing by the Mass Housing Administration, the only institution for the low-income social housing was the Directorate. Its scope of authority is stipulated by the Squatter Settlements Law (*Gecekondu Yasası*) that was adopted in 1966.¹⁸⁸ Currently, the directory is linked to the Bureau of Real Estate and Expropriation (*Emlak ve İstimlak Daire Başkanlığı*). The present function of the directory is to provide temporary shelter for *gecekondu* residents living in the areas subject to transformation. In general, the directorate is responsible for the actions to be made by the part of the municipalities for the transformation projects. The Squatter Settlements and Housing Directory are entitled to decide on the areas that are to be determined as “*squatter containment areas*” as well as new social housing areas. However, it does not have a legal obligation to provide those whose *gecekondus* have been destroyed with low-income or social housing alternatives. Throughout its history since 1966, this function has been considered as secondary and one that can be ignored where the destruction and

¹⁸⁸ "Gecekondu Kanunu."

evacuation of the *gecekondu* areas are considered to be more urgent than providing the residents of the area with affordable housing.

Very much relevant to the developments taking place about the prevention of *gecekondu* and increasing the low-income housing has been the enactment of a law on urban gentrification.¹⁸⁹ Although the law does not include any direct reference to the *gecekondu* prevention or transformation, the timing of its enactment and the definitions related to the transformation of the urban sphere is crucial to seeing the perspective of the policy makers. As has been indicated above, the transformation projects be they only *gecekondu* transformation or urban gentrification, are integral parts of a big urban transformation trend linked to the re-definition of the urban space and the social and economic networks within it. *Gecekondu* issue, thus, stands at a critical point where the dynamics of the re-definition can be observed. In the draft document of the law the necessity for enactment of such a law is explained in the following way:

Rapid urbanization is among the chief problems of our country. This process has negatively affected the historical urban sites located especially at the urban centers and the cultural heritage that should be protected. These areas in which the cultural heritage is concentrated has become threatening for the security of the life and property of society as they are either aged old and neglected or occupied and used intensively in an uncontrolled manner. Ensuring security in these areas constitutes a significant problem especially for the developing cities.¹⁹⁰

The security problem created by the occupation of the *gecekondu*s in these areas is repeated several times throughout the document among the grounds of the

¹⁸⁹ "Yıpranan Tarihi ve Kültürel Taşınmaz Varlıkların Yenilenerek Korunması ve Yaşatılarak Kullanılması Hakkında Kanun," (Resmi Gazete 25866, 2005).

¹⁹⁰ "Hızla gelişen kentleşme ülkemizin önemli sorunlarının başında gelmektedir. Bu süreç özellikle kentlerimizin merkez bölgelerindeki eski kent dokularının ve korunması gerekli kültürel mirasın olumsuz etkilenmesine neden olmuştur. Kültürel mirasın yoğun olarak bulunduğu alanlar, gerek eskimleri ve bakımsız kalmaları, gerekse yoğun olarak denetimsiz bir şekilde iskan edilmeleri ve kullanılmaları nedeniyle toplumun can ve mal güvenliğini tehdit eder duruma gelmiştir. Bu bölgelerde güvenliğin sağlanması özellikle gelişen şehirlerimizde büyük problem teşkil etmektedir." *Kentsel Dönüşüm ve Gelişim Kanunu Tasarısı* (2005 [cited 08.07.2006 2006]); available from <http://www2.tbmm.gov.tr/d22/1/1-0984.pdf>.

requirement of such a law.¹⁹¹ Although the legitimation of the law has been based solely on the problem of security resulting from the irregular occupation of the historical sites by the urban poor, it is obvious that the increasing rent of these areas is also another dimension of urban gentrification attempts. The areas that were previously neglected suddenly have become the “cultural heritage” and sources of historical enrichment. The improvement of the physical conditions as well as opening these areas to touristic activity has entered the agenda of the policy makers with the aim of transforming some parts of the city in accordance with the requirements of the contemporary urbanization trends. As mentioned in the previous chapters, the metropolitan centers have been conceptualized as “world cities” in the period after 1980 when the city itself became a marketable item. Another aspect of the change in urban space after 1980 has been the further segregation of both the residential and economic spheres in accordance with income levels and consumption patterns. Thus, the urban space has been subject to a transformation in which spatial characteristics change in a way to reflect the social and economic inequalities experienced in the urban area. It is this setting that has enabled the policy makers to label the residents of the to-be-transformed areas as “threatening” and emphasize the necessity to accommodate them in places other than the highly rentable regions.

¹⁹¹ Ibid. One of the expressions of the security problem in these areas is as the following “There emerged the necessity to declare these areas as ‘urban transformation and development areas’ and open up the possibility to implementations with the aim of transforming these areas from threatening centers of urban security through healthier occupation and renewing and making them functional in line with the contemporary necessities.” (*“Kentlerin merkez alanlarının sağlıklı bir şekilde iskan edilerek şehrin güvenliğini tehdit eden denetimsiz bölgeler olmaktan çıkarıp yenileştirmek ve günümüz gereklerine uygun olarak kullanılabilir hale getirmek amacıyla bu alanları ‘kentsel dönüşüm ve gelişim alanı’ ilan etmek ve bu alanlarda uygulama yapmaya imkan vermek gerekliliği ortaya çıkmıştır.”*)

Current Projects

The estimated housing shortage in general is declared as 2.5 million and the Mass Housing Administration aims at supplying five to ten percent of the necessary housing.¹⁹² The activities of the Mass Housing Administration can be classified as credit facilities for housing, land generation with completed infrastructure, agricultural village projects, housing projects for immigrants, housing projects in the areas affected by natural disasters, rent and prestige projects on lands owned by the Mass Housing Administration especially in bigger cities, *gecekondu* transformation and housing projects on the lands owned by the Mass Housing Administration for middle-income groups and low-income groups including the elderly, widowed, orphans and the handicapped as well as the public sector personnel without lodgments. The Administration has declared the aim of reaching 250,000 housing units before the end of 2006 with priority to the *gecekondu* transformation, social housing projects for the low-income groups, construction of agricultural-villages and land generation with completed infrastructure.¹⁹³ The number of dwellings that has been declared to be constructed can be considered quite high when the amount of housing that has been constructed by the Administration since its establishment is considered, which is 43 000.¹⁹⁴

The priority of the housing projects on the lands owned by the Mass Housing Administration for middle-income groups and low-income groups including the elderly, widowed, orphans and the handicapped as well as the public sector personnel

¹⁹² Bayraktar, *Gecekondu ve Kentsel Yenileme*, 208.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, 208-10.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 211.

without housing has been expressed by the authorities as subsidizing those who cannot afford to buy a house under free-market conditions.¹⁹⁵ Another goal of the advancement of these projects is the prevention of further *gecekondu* formation.¹⁹⁶ These projects are presented as social housing projects, thus as a social security measure, for the economically vulnerable segments of society. However, when the requirements and ownership conditions are taken into consideration, it can be seen that, though cheaper, these houses are sold like any other dwelling on the market, far from being subsidized by the redistributive mechanisms of social security measures. And it also can be noted that what decreases the cost of the units is not the subsidy mechanism favoring the ownership of those who cannot own a house under free-market conditions, but the low cost of the land on which the projects are built. All of these projects are constructed on lands owned by the Mass Housing Administration and mostly land far from city center is used. Yet to be seen is the quality of the houses in terms of construction techniques and maintenance necessities.

The cost of a unit is determined on the basis of its construction cost and houses are offered for sale during the process of construction. A down payment of ten to forty percent of the price is demanded by the Administration at the first hand depending on the affordability for the targeted group. The rest of the payments are required to be completed in 84 months to 20 years as installments.¹⁹⁷ The houses are completed usually in 14 months. The projects that are implemented and offered to sale with these conditions constitute the social housing projects of the Mass Housing Administration. In principle, anyone who cannot afford to buy a house has the right

¹⁹⁵ Ibid., 212.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁹⁷ The monthly payment increases used to be adjusted on the basis of either increases in the salaries of the civil-servants or the inflation depending on the income group concerned. However, after the salary increases were linked to inflation rates, increases in the monthly payments started to be determined only on the basis of salary increases.

to apply to own one from the social housing projects of the Mass Housing Administration. The Administration targets its projects to those whose income level is at the bottom twenty to forty percent of the income distribution.¹⁹⁸ Up to now, among those who have purchased a home from this kind of social housing projects, workers constitute 31 percent, civil servants 30 percent, middle-scale tradesman 13 percent, pensioners seven percent and other professional groups 19 percent.¹⁹⁹

The Mass Housing Administration classifies its target population of social housing projects into four groups, which are middle-income or modest-regular income groups, low-income groups and the poor, including the elderly, widowed and the orphans, the handicapped and public sector personnel without housing.²⁰⁰ The houses for middle-income groups are 75 to 130 square meters, offered for sale for ten year long monthly installments with a requirement of ten to twenty-five percent of the amount as the down payment. The low-income social housing projects are 65 to 75 square meters offered for sale with a 2,000 YTL fix down payment and an average of 200 YTL installments for fifteen years.²⁰¹ The down payment constitutes a share of six percent of the total amount to be paid for the low-income groups. The group that is defined as the poor by the Administration has the right to apply for

¹⁹⁸ Bayraktar, *Gecekondu ve Kentsel Yenileme*, 214.

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 213.

²⁰⁰ Mass Housing Administration uses different terms in different circumstances to define its target population for its projects. For example the middle-income group also includes an income group termed as *modest-regular income group* (dar gelirli). Also the low-income group and the poor are used separately but usually together. What differentiates the middle-income earner from modest-regular income earner is as unclear as what differentiates the low-income groups from the poor as far as the Mass Housing Administration's criteria are concerned. In this context, as no data was available to show the differences it is assumed that the Mass Housing Administration uses middle-income group and modest-regular income group interchangeably. It is as well assumed, depending on the formulation of the sentences in several documents of the Administration that the low-income groups and the poor constitute two different categories though their income levels do not differentiate much. The low-income group is the 20 % of the population with the lowest income while the poor is used instead of the elderly, widowed the orphans and the handicapped included in the low-income group. "Social housing" is used for projects targeted to any one of these groups be them middle/modest-regular income or low-income groups.

²⁰¹ The amounts are the declared amounts of the Mass Housing Administration for 2006.

different houses than the low-income group. The units constructed for the poor are 55 to 65 square meters, no down payments are demanded and the total amount can be paid in twenty years.²⁰²

The application requirements for the housing projects targeted to the low-income groups and the poor are also different with respect to the income levels required for being eligible to own a house from one of the projects of the Mass Housing Administration. First, depending on the city in which the houses are constructed, a minimum period of residence in the same city is required. For example for the low-income houses in Istanbul this period is five years while for Ankara it is three years.²⁰³ The second criterion is neither having bought a house from the projects of the Administration nor having taken up credit for housing, and fourth is not owning any kind of estate either by the applicant or any of the family members. Being over 35 years of age is another criterion for the application requirements of the low-income housing projects. Most importantly, however, and most determinant in most cases is the maximum income level of the household, which has been declared as 650 YTL for the low-income groups.²⁰⁴

In addition to the first four requirements necessary for the low-income groups in order to apply for a house in the poor group project is a minimum age of 40. Also required with respect to income level is either having a Green Card or receiving

²⁰² Bayraktar, *Gecekondu ve Kentsel Yenileme*, 214.

²⁰³ The application requirements of the projects are declared on the website of the administration before the houses were offered to sale. The examples were retrieved from the same website on June 2006, links of which are the following: <http://toki.gov.tr/html/satis/istanbul/tasoluk/duyuru.htm> for a low-income housing project in Istanbul and http://toki.gov.tr/html/satis/ankara/yenikent/yoksul_duyuru.htm for a poor project in Ankara. It may not be possible to reach the details of the projects currently via internet as the application deadlines of the projects have passed and the announcements have been replaced with the new ones.

²⁰⁴ Bayraktar, *Gecekondu ve Kentsel Yenileme*, 215.

salary within the meaning of the Law No. 2022²⁰⁵ or benefiting from the Social Aid and Solidarity Encouragement Fund within the meaning of the Law No. 3294²⁰⁶ or not having been dependant on any one of the social security institutions. Also for the poor group houses, only one person from the family can apply.²⁰⁷ Among those who fulfill the criteria the ones that can own a house are determined by lottery if the number of the applicants is grater than the number of the houses available. In the case of insufficient application, the Mass Housing Administration offers the houses for sale without any requirements for application with respect to residence period, age, income level, etc.²⁰⁸

“*Gecekondu* Transformation Projects” have been initiated by the Mass Housing Administration in collaboration with the local governments in the period since 2000 in which terms and priorities of a large-scale urban transformation have been formulated by the authorities. Since then the transformation projects have been a very important item of the agenda both of the central and the local governments aiming at preventing the further proliferation of *gecekondu*. In 2004 the *Gecekondu* Transformation Directorate was established within the Mass Housing Administration to deal with the process of transformation.²⁰⁹

The process of the *Gecekondu* Transformation Projects are quite complicated and usually show variances depending on the municipality in which the project is carried out due to the possible social and economic reactions of the residents of the area subject to transformation. However, the technical details are more or less the

²⁰⁵ "65 Yaşını Doldurmuş, Muhtaç, Güçsüz ve Kimsesiz Türk Vatandaşlarına Aylık Bağlanması Hakkında Kanun " (Resmi Gazete 15642, 1976).

²⁰⁶ "Sosyal Yardımlaşma ve Dayanışmayı Teşvik Kanunu," (Resmi Gazete 19134, 1986).

²⁰⁷ Bayraktar, *Gecekondu ve Kentsel Yenileme*, 216.

²⁰⁸ Ibid.

²⁰⁹ Ibid., 240.

same and require a high level of collaboration between the Mass Housing Administration and the municipalities. The process can be separated into two periods, the first of which is the level at which the decision makers formulate the project among themselves and enact the necessary legal arrangements and the second being the level carried out by the authorities with the residents of the area subject to transformation.

In the first place the local authorities determine the area that will be transformed and apply to the Mass Housing Administration with the necessary data on the social and demographic structure of the area as well as the real estate property statuses of its residents. With the approval of the administration a protocol is signed between the Administration and the municipal authorities for the transformation of the area. In the aftermath of the protocol and declaration of the initiation of the project, the right owners in the area are determined based on the criteria announced by the Mass Housing Administration and the municipal authorities.²¹⁰

The second level starts with setting up a commission that will determine whether the right owners demand dwellings from the housing project that is to be built after the evacuation of the area. Also the commission is responsible for specifying whether the same right owners demand the money in cash that is supposed to be paid by the municipality or the Mass Housing Administration in return for the expropriation of their land or houses. The money that is to be paid to the right owners is determined on the basis of property status. Those who have title deeds to building in which they reside are entitled to be paid for the land, the building and the additional stuff constructed on the land. However, those who do not have the title

²¹⁰ Ibid., 241-43.

deed are only entitled to a wreckage payment.²¹¹ As the wreckage payments are lesser than the expropriation value of both the land and the buildings on it, it is more likely that the neighborhoods whose residents have fewer title deeds are preferable. Accordingly, if the linkage between the distribution of the title deeds and the time passed since the construction of a *gecekond* neighborhood is taken in to account, the most recently established areas are the most preferable areas of *gecekond* transformation projects in terms of their cost as they would be less likely to have acquired title deeds through any reconstruction amnesty of the government.

The *Gecekond* Transformation Projects are carried out within the framework of two methods, the first being “transformation through relocation” and the second being “transformation *in situ*.” In the projects in which the transformation through relocation method is adopted, the property owners in the area that is under transformation are relocated to another housing area that is found appropriate by the Mass Housing Administration. Before the relocation, however, it is expected that an agreement between the parties specifying the status of the property owned and the money to be paid in return by the municipality for the expropriation of that property will be concluded. If the property owner in the transformation area accepts to buy houses from the new housing area the value of his/her property is counted for the down payment of the new house and the remaining is divided into monthly installments. If the property owner does not accept to buy houses from the new houses that are to be built by the Administration for relocation, the amount is paid in cash in return for expropriation. In the case that the parties cannot reach an agreement, the relevant municipality expropriates the land or the houses depending

²¹¹ Ibid., 243.

on its legal property status by force depending on the law.²¹² On the land evacuated by the municipality and transferred to the Mass Housing Administration a new project is initiated depending on its location and rent opportunities.²¹³ One of the examples that is under transformation by this method is the Istanbul Ayazma *Gecekondu* Transformation Project.

As can be noted from the process of the application of “transformation through relocation” method, the residents of the *gecekondu* transformation area are not guaranteed that they will have a house after they have been dislocated. Although they are offered to have a chance to buy one from the houses of the Mass Housing Administration the method seems like “transformation through dislocation” rather than relocation. The method also provides a certain level of demand for the houses constructed by the Administration. Thus, while the Administration and the municipalities generate land for more rentable projects through dislocating the residents of a *gecekondu* area, the financial resource necessary for the Administration is derived indirectly by the dislocated residents if they can afford to be relocated.

The second method applied for *gecekondu* transformation is “transformation *in situ*.” This method implies the relocation of the residents of the transformation area to the same place after the area is transformed. In other words, the new houses that are to be built by the Mass Housing Administration are not built in another place like in the previous method, but constructed on the land evacuated. The same procedure of agreement between the municipal authorities and the *gecekondu* residents are applied in this method, too. However, when the property owners in the

²¹² The laws that constitute the basis of expropriation of the properties in the transformation areas are subject to regular expropriation laws which are Law 2942 and 4650. For the full text of the law and the technical details of expropriation process, see "Kamulaştırma Kanunu," (Resmi Gazete 18215, 1983). Also relevant is "Kamulaştırma Kanununda Değişiklik Yapılması Hakkında Kanun," (Resmi Gazete 24393, 2001).

²¹³ Bayraktar, *Gecekondu ve Kentsel Yenileme*, 244-46.

area accept to buy a house from the Administration, in this case they are temporarily accommodated by the municipality until the construction in the transformation area ends. One of the areas that has been transformed with this method is the Karabük Cevizlidere *Gecekondu* Transformation Project.²¹⁴

Currently there are eight transformation projects in Istanbul, three in Ankara, two in Izmir and a total of 40 projects in other cities. The total number of units that are to be built under the *gecekondu* transformation sums up to 34,778.²¹⁵ It is noted that the number of units will increase if it is considered that there are some projects for which the number of units to be built has not been determined yet. None of the projects in Istanbul, Ankara or Izmir has been completed currently. The completed ten transformation projects are in 224 unit Burdur city center, 192 unit Denizli city center, 153 unit Erzincan city center, 1040 unit Erzurum city center, and 752 unit Kars city center. The totally completed and sold *gecekondu* transformation projects make up approximately to eight percent of the total number of units which can be considered as a low proportion. However, the projects in Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir as well as some others in different cities are sold though they are not completed yet.²¹⁶

As far as the functioning of the Mass Housing Administration and the legal framework for conducting the *gecekondu* transformation projects are concerned it is seen that the Mass Housing Administration has been transformed institutionally especially for the purpose of enlarging the scope of its action and strengthening its power of urban planning and transformation in a way to include the areas that have

²¹⁴ Ibid., 247-48.

²¹⁵ See “List of *Gecekondu* Transformation Projects” table in the appendix for the full list of projects that has been completed or under construction and for the number of units for each project.

²¹⁶ *İnşaatları Tamamlanan ve Devam Eden Uygulamalar* ([cited 03.04 2006]); available from <http://www.toki.gov.tr/programlar/uygulamatakip/ilharita.asp>.

not been covered by the Administration's projects in the previous decades. The organization and activity scheme of the Administration demonstrates that it has acquired unprecedented power of action in the urban space through its right to planning, expropriation and engaging in transformation projects. The power that it can exercise and its transformative potential is striking when it is coupled with the activities and authority of the municipalities. In this context, the choice of the areas that is to be transformed and the methods used for their transformation gains a highly political character through which social fabric of the urban area can be transformed through housing and *gecekondu* transformation.

The power that can be exercised by the Administration in collaboration with the local governments has so far been used in line with the requirements of the post-1980 capitalist urbanization trends which are more likely to end up creating cities that are spatially segregated in social and economic terms, "cleaned" from the dangerous and threatening elements, centered around service and information sector activities rather than industrial production and in no urgent need of industrial workers for its sustainment. This trend is very much relevant for the metropolises like Istanbul and the cities like Ankara whose local authorities claim to create a metropolis. In this context, the *gecekondu* issue comes to the front with different terms and problematized by different formulations than the previous decades. *Gecekondu* Transformation Projects are, thus, parts of huge urban transformation trends aiming at constructing a city center in the first place, visually more pleasant and attractive, that is to say, more marketable, for those who can afford to buy the services sold in the trade centers or entertainment areas.

The legal framework also points to the change in the position of those who would be "cleaned" from rentable urban center. Previously the *gecekondu* issue has

been defined as a problem in terms of the property statuses more than the economic and social dynamics resulting in urban poverty on such a large scale. Although, the *gecekondu* phenomenon went under transformation by adopting itself to the market mechanisms and creating its own informal market that is capable of generating high levels of urban rent and thus becoming more of an issue of property and power relations in the urban space, the proliferation of *gecekondu* has never lost its relation with urban poverty. Thus, any intervention to the structure of the *gecekondu* is related strongly to urban poverty.

The perspective embedded in the legal changes and the organizational transformations to deal with the *gecekondu* issue through the *Gecekondu* Transformation Projects of the Mass Housing Administration, however, can be considered different in two respects. First, it is for the first time in the housing policy of Turkey that the central authority has attempted systematically to transform the *gecekondu*s with a measure different from reconstruction amnesties or granting title deeds. The measure that has been adopted by the Administration recently implies a shift of the priorities of the state policies to deal with the *gecekondu*s. As has been indicated several times, since the *gecekondu* has emerged as an urban phenomenon, state's choice was towards regulating the issue within the realm of informal economy. Thus, the *gecekondu*s have been formalized as they were through title deeds and amnesties. However, after the adoption of the laws and regulations regarding urban transformation, *gecekondu*s have started to be regulated through measures targeting to the formalization of the housing opportunities of the urban poor rather than the retrospective change of the status of the *gecekondu*s.

To put it differently, as none of the residents of the *gecekondu* areas are granted new houses in place of the old ones but given the option of buying from the

houses constructed by the Mass Housing Administration for low-income or poor groups, the possibility of the urban poor for obtaining a legally approved title deed is linked to the market conditions. It can be argued that, the informal housing activity in the form of *gecekondu* is under the pressure of formalization through free market mechanism mediated through a central public authority for the first time since its emergence. The mechanism put forward by the state for the formalization of the housing of the urban poor is mediated through the mentality of the free-market to a significant extent.

The second point is very much related to the first one, but highlights another dimension of the process. As the transformation is not limited to the *gecekondu* areas but of the overall urban space, it is more likely that the criteria for a municipality to determine a *gecekondu* area for transformation would be the possible rent opportunities and centrality of the land which is occupied by the *gecekondus* rather than the gravity of the conditions of its residents with whichever terms this “gravity” is defined. It is this priority that leads to the choice of certain *gecekondu* areas but not others. Thus, what determines the location of a particular transformation projects is its relative potential for income generation for future rather than the social and economic circumstances to which its residents are subject today.

The mentality expressed through the means that the Mass Housing Administration can employ for the conduct of the urban transformation processes that carries huge potentials of changing the balance in the urban space stems from the legitimacy of the free market order in the eyes of the decision-makers and discloses the specific way that the public and private interest intermingles in the functioning of the housing authority. Nevertheless, the issue has not ceased to be discussed in terms

of property relations and put into a framework of the causes of inequalities in the urban area resulting in urban poverty.

Another dimension of the urban transformation in general and *gecekondu* transformation in particular is the way that the issue is discussed popularly in the newspapers and by the politicians. The discovery of the language that contributes to the construction of popular perceptions of the issue is possible through a small survey of the news and articles as well as the statements of the politicians. One of the crucial aspects of the language that formulated the *gecekondu* issue and urban poverty at the popular level has been the transformation of the notion of social justice since the 1960s. As the transformation in the attitudes toward urban poverty was discussed in the previous chapter, it will not be mentioned here. However, the elements that have been added to the debate as well as the slight change in the old terms of the discussion should be overviewed briefly. Starting with the emergence of the apartment type *gecekondu* neighborhoods in the 1980s, the rent informal housing generates started to play an important role in the formulation of the terms of the popular discourse. It led to the erosion of the legitimacy of the *gecekondu* in the urban area as they ceased to be the humble shelter for the poor. With the increase of the social and economic polarizations of the urban sphere another dimension has also been added which is defining the urban poor as “threatening” and “dangerous” for the other parts of society.²¹⁷ This tendency has continued into the 2000s as the

²¹⁷ One of the most astonishing expressions of this discourse has been written out by Kırıkkanat in *Radikal*. While telling about her displeasure of the entertainment habits of the urban poor she carries the discussion to the level of arguing that the poor would not look so ugly and dirty if they would ever had the culture of having a better diet like fish. (“*Belki balık sevseler, pişirmeyi bilseler, kirlî beyaz atletleri ve paçalı donlarıyla yatmazlar, hart hart kaşınmazlar, geniş getirip geçirmezler, zaten bu kadar kalın, bu kadar kısa bacaklı, bu kadar uzun kollu ve kıllarla kaplı olamazlardı!*”) She, then, develops her argument to question the right to public appearance of the urban poor in the rich neighborhoods and to enjoy the facilities of the municipality like the other residents of the district. She finalizes her argument by putting the blame on those who voted for the politicians that let the *gecekondus* contaminate the atmosphere of Istanbul and expresses the naïve side of thinking that the “dangerous” groups in the urban area would not threaten the life style of the rich one day by only

regulation of these groups has been taken more seriously and systematic attempts have been initiated to end the “problems.”

For example, Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan repeatedly uses “tumor” and “elements that deform the city” with reference to the *gecekondu*.²¹⁸ In accordance with the definition of the *gecekondu* residents, the *gecekondu* neighborhoods are described in visual terms. The “visual contamination” that the area causes for the rest of the population and the “wreckage view” of the poor neighborhoods are the cornerstones of the same rhetoric.²¹⁹ Thus, as the issue is not discussed with reference to the dynamics resulting in the urban poverty on such a large scale and limited only to the appeared consequences of the situation for the rest of the population, the solutions suggested do not aim to reduce the economic and social inequalities in the urban area but are confined to the elimination of appearances of urban poverty. In this context, a discourse legitimizing the urban transformation with the pretext of improvement of the conditions of the urban poor is coupled with the “opening up to the world” discourse.²²⁰

Two *Gecekondu* Transformation Projects: Industrial Relocation and Urban Vista

In this section two *gecekondu* transformation projects will be analyzed in order to see a clearer picture of the spatial dynamics of the ongoing urban transformation. In other words, it is obvious that the metropolitan areas suffer from low infrastructural capacities and high levels of problems due to the planning

being visible in the public space. For the full text of the article, see Mine G. Kırıkkanat, "Halkımız Eğleniyor," *Radikal*, 27/07/2005.

²¹⁸ Selim Efe Erdem, "40 Gün 40 Gece İstanbul," *Radikal*, 13/04/2006.

²¹⁹ Ünsal Ereke, "Şehirlerde Büyük Göç Başlıyor," *Milliyet*, 24.01.2006.

²²⁰ Hatice Kurtuluş, *Kentsel Dönüşüm: Toplumsal Dışlanma, Yok Sayma* (2005 [cited 20/06/2006]); available from <http://www.bianet.org/2005/08/19/65506.htm>.

problems for low, middle and high income groups. This situation has been considered a problem for city life by the decision makers since the 1950s. However, while the problem has been defined in more or less the same way, a new method is being applied as a solution by the local or central authorities. As efforts are being made to restructure and reorganize the urban space to the extent that it was not attempted in the previous decades, both by the central government through the Mass Housing Administration and the local municipalities, the mechanisms through which these actors attempt to transform the urban space is crucial. These mechanisms are crucial as they highlight the new spatial order of the metropolitan area in which social hierarchies are experienced and access to social life is determined.

In general, as has also been discussed above, the plan and the requirements of these projects do not seem to be related to poverty alleviation or subsidizing the urban poor. They are part of the general transformation projects through which the city space is going. Therefore, it is not surprising that low income housing has appeared on the agendas of the Turkish political and economic decision-makers in an era in which the neo-liberal policies of the free market ideology are at their peak. The decision makers aim at transforming the general appearance of the city space which cannot sustain the *gecekondu* owners in the centers of the urban area. The rent that can be gained by the government and the municipalities will be much greater if these areas are somehow sold or given to projects like trade centers or high-income housing projects than the political or economic gain in return for bargaining with the residents of the *gecekondus*, as was the case in the previous decades. In this context, the areas that are centered around industrial activity are going through a transformation with a purpose to both relocate industrial areas to the outer city and re-organize these areas for new projects that can be more rentable.

Therefore, as will be illustrated below, the conditions and requirements for low income housing target the evacuation of the *gecekondu*s in the central places and utilize the evacuated area with different projects rather than providing any kind of decent living standard for the urban poor. At the discursive level, the urban transformation projects have been legitimized by providing home ownership for those who cannot own a decent house otherwise. However, the projects, especially in Istanbul and Ankara, can explain why the areas that have been subject to transformation have been evacuated and its residents have been moved to other places and why transforming the *gecekondu*s with the participation of their residents has not been thought of as an alternative.

Choosing one project from Istanbul and one from Ankara relied on several factors among which the population size of the cities and their characteristics as the two biggest municipalities can be counted on the first hand. Also crucial was the agenda of the urban regeneration and *gecekondu* transformation for the municipalities of these two cities. These two projects are also illustrative for analyzing the two important dimensions of urban transformation which are relocation of industry and making the city visually more attractive. However, none of the transformation projects in Ankara or Istanbul has been completed yet. Although they are very large scale projects in terms of their area and number of units, the houses have yet to be built. The project in Istanbul aims at transforming an area which was previously been organized around an industrial complex and is now attempted to be converted into an attraction center for entertainment activities. The Ankara Project in particular is important with respect to revealing the visual aspects of the new urban organization.

Nevertheless, as one of the aims of the chapter is focused on the mentality and intentions embedded in the institutionalization of the transformation in the urban area as well as the legal ground set for the future developments rather than the consequences of the transformation, the uncompleted projects were not considered as obstacles to the empirical analysis. On the other hand, as with the whole thesis, the account of the legal and institutional changes is not the only concern of the chapter. Within the framework of urban transformation and the state involvement in low-income housing, the aim is also to demonstrate the *gecekondu* side of the issue.

Ikitelli (Ayazma and Tepeüstü) Halkalı *Gecekondu* Transformation Project

Ayazma is a neighborhood in district of Küçükçekmece, located on the western side of Istanbul. The district's strategic importance has increased with the construction of the TEM (Trans European Highway) and the allocation of industrial facilities along the road. The most important industrial complex is the Ikitelli Organized Industrial Area and it is separated from the other industrial area by the Halkalı mass housing project region. *Gecekondu* areas are located along the TEM and scattered industrial areas around. Urban transformation has become an important item in the agenda of the district in 1999, after the construction of the Olympiad Village, which is a huge project area with a stadium and several complexes around it.²²¹

The local government determined the areas around the Olympiad Village as the first regeneration area. Just near the Olympiad Stadium is located the Ayazma

²²¹ Dilek A. Özdemir, Pınar P. Özden, and Sırma R. Turgut, eds., *Istanbul 2004 International Urban Regeneration Symposium: Workshop of Küçükçekmece District* (Istanbul: Küçükçekmece Municipality Publication, 2004), 308-19.

region, which shows the characteristics of a squatter area. The population of Ayazma is 7,800, according to 2004 data, and 55% of its land is used as residential area. 47% of the residential areas in the region was established between 1993 and 1998 and 22% between 1987 and 1992. So, the neighborhood is quite a new squatter area considered that squatting started in the 1950s in Istanbul. The heights of the buildings are thus not more than one storey in general. The 2004 data also illustrates that 89% of the buildings are one storey, following two storeys with six percent and three storeys with three percent. The rate of privately owned houses is 32% in the area. 22% of the land belongs to the treasury and the rest of 46% is the land purchased without real estate registry records. In the area, 75% of the residents are owners whereas 25% of them are tenants. Those who pay one third of their income to rent are 58%. Out of the Ayazma population, wage earners constitute 99%.²²²

The Ayazma neighborhood is one of the areas that has been subject to *gecekondu* transformation and it has been decided that the population residing in the squatter area is to be moved to the mass housing area in Halkalı Gümrük region. Before proceeding to the analysis of the transformation itself, the discourse that has been used by the local and central government to justify the evacuation of that particular area and accommodating the residents of the Ayazma region to Halkalı Gümrük mass housing area should be mentioned in brief.

As has been mentioned above, Küçükçekmece in general and Ayazma in particular are centered around TEM and industrial complexes. However, after the construction of the Olympiad Village into the middle of the district, the center of the economic activity as well as social outlook started to change. In the aftermath of its establishment, the Olympiad Village became the new center of the district in terms of

²²² Ibid., 310-15.

income generation and popular attraction. Obviously, with the shift of the center overall outlook of the district has been subject to a change in which the transformation of the *gecekondu* regions nearby constitutes an important part. Thus, it is not a coincidence that the first transformation project was initiated in the *gecekondu* area closest to the Olympiad Village.

Although the projects for the evacuation of the *gecekondu* areas have been initiated and are carried out with the pretext of providing better standards for the urban poor living in the area, it can be argued that the main concern of the policy makers is the betterment of the conditions around the Village rather than the accommodation of the urban poor to mass housing areas. The need to reconstruct the Ayazma region is justified on two bases at the discursive level. The two following two the statements are significant for the justification of the projects:

Regarding the Olympiad Village, the construction of which has been initiated five years ago, the existing profile of its surroundings not only fails to match with the function to be newly allocated at the area, but also embodies plenty of fundamental problems like construction safety, urban quality, and healthy physical and social environment.²²³

The neighborhood [Ayazma] is disintegrated from and located at the outskirts of the city with a population profile which may be considered as ‘the others’, who try to hang on to the city, indeed to life as under extremely primitive conditions of living at a sub-area likely to be the most prestigious one in the Istanbul Metropolitan Area.²²⁴

Not only do these the statements justify the dislocation of the residents of the squatters settlements on the basis of their inappropriateness for the visual and functional side of the area but they also take the centrality of the Olympiad Village for granted and find it legitimate to organize the area with the new needs of the social and economic activities brought in by the Olympiad Village rather than the residents of the area and also the needs of industrial production. The construction of the

²²³ Ibid., 309.

²²⁴ Ibid., 310.

discourse of justification with an emphasis on the newly constructed urban facilities rather than the rights and living conditions of the urban poor residing in the area is done with the pretext of improvement of the living conditions of the urban poor, while the way that the urban poor are perceived with respect to the others illustrates that the concern for the urban poor is determined by the extent that their presence intersects with the more “prestigious” projects.

Another aspect is related to the justification of the location of the new mass houses that are to be sold to the *gecekondu* residents. The local government presents the facilities that will be created by the transformation of a *gecekondu* area into a part of Olympiad Village as one of the most beneficiary achievements of the project. These facilities would necessitate a certain amount of labor in the services sectors and the local government presents the transformation also with reference to the fertility of the area in terms of potential labor force.²²⁵ The local government also justifies the transformation project and legitimizes the necessity to carry out the *gecekondu* elimination in the eyes of the residents of the *gecekondu* neighborhood through arguing that new employment opportunities will emerge with the construction of the Olympiad Village.

The legal arrangements regarding to the regeneration of the area are made within the framework of the ordinary procedures. Like the other transformation projects, this project was initiated with a protocol signed between the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality, the Mass Housing Administration and the Küçükçekmece County Municipality in June 2004.²²⁶ The protocol included both the evacuation and transfer of the *gecekondu* area in Ayazma as well as the details of social housing

²²⁵ Ibid., 277.

²²⁶ "İstanbul-İkitelli (Ayazma ve Tepeüstü)- Halkalı Bölgeleri Kentsel Yenileme (Gecekondu Dönüşüm) Projesine İlişkin Protokol," (June 2004).

projects for the dislocated *gecekondu* population in the area. The county municipality was responsible for the evacuation of the *gecekondu* area, while the Mass Housing Administration was responsible for the building of social houses on land owned by the metropolitan municipality. The protocol both included the legal status of the residents of the area that would be subject to transformation as well as the terms and conditions of the mass housing projects.²²⁷

Article 3 of the protocol stipulated the construction of houses by the Mass Housing Administration for those who would be dislocated due to expropriation of the land in the area. As the article puts it, as it would not be possible for the residents of the area who did not have any kind of social protection to own a house elsewhere with the payments made to compensate expropriation of the land regardless of having a title deed, as well as to avoid the problems of the residents of the squatter settlements due to the legal status of their houses, the Mass Housing Administration had been authorized to build houses for them in the Halkalı Bezirgan region.

After the area was evacuated, the land of the Ayazma neighborhood was given to the Mass Housing Administration. The Mass Housing Administration was also authorized for the construction and sale of the evacuated areas to third parties. However, Article 6 of the protocol also stipulated that the use of the land in Ayazma would be in conformity with the Olympiad Village and other recreational areas nearby. The system functioned in the following way: First, in the aftermath of reaching an agreement between the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality, Küçükçekmece Municipality and the Mass Housing Administration, the construction of the new housing area was initiated. At the same time, the owners of the houses in Ayazma neighborhood were notified officially that the area was subject to

²²⁷ Ibid.

transformation through expropriation and evacuation. They either agreed to buy a house from the new mass houses, or they were left with finding another solution for their accommodation. In both ways they were paid the wreckage compensation by the local government which could be counted as the down payment if the owners of the houses in Ayazma decide to buy a house from the new housing area. In case of application for buying a house from the mass housing project, they were given priority and their units were excluded from the lottery system, which was used to determine the owners of the newly constructed houses by the Mass Housing Administration.

In the case of Ayazma *gecekondu* transformation, the residents of the *gecekondu* neighborhood were given the right to apply for some of the houses that were determined by the protocol mentioned above in the Ikitelli, Halkalı mass housing area. The area was one of the largest mass housing area in Istanbul in which the total number of houses ranges from low-income to high-income houses sums up to 20,000 units for now. There are 2,600 units in Halkalı that are separated for the residents of previous *gecekondu* areas subject to transformation. However, it must be mentioned that even all of the 2,600 units of the mass housing area are not exclusively devoted to the residents of Ayazma neighborhood. The residents of transformed or to-be –transformed squatter areas do also have a priority in the application process for the Halkalı mass houses.

The area subject to social housing under the *gecekondu* transformation project is still under construction and approximately 50% of the work has been completed up to the present. 678 units have been completed. They started to be sold to their future owners in August 2005. The houses consist of two rooms and a living room, ranging from a total of 84 square meters to 95 square meters. The payments

were to be started in 16 months, which is the estimated period for the completion of the project.

As has been mentioned before, *gecekondu* transformation has two processes, one the expropriation of the area and its evacuation and the other is accommodation of the previous owners to adequate dwellings. Compared to the first part of the process, the second part raises more questions about the mechanisms through which the ex-owners in the evacuated area are to be accommodated. One of the most important questions is about the tenants in the area. 25% of the residents in Ayazma are tenants and the protocol for the transformation of the area as well as the other supporting regulations does not give any priority to the tenants for ownership of the houses in Mass Housing Areas. They also are not compensated with wreckage payment as they do not have any property rights in the house in which they live. In addition, when it is thought that the poorest section of the population living in a squatter area consists of the tenants not the landlords, the system does not seem to meet the needs of the tenant group. The problem is relevant also for the landlords who also live in the area. Although multi-storey *gecekondus* are not common in Ayazma, it can be considered that the small proportion of the residents who own more than one house would be worse off in terms of their monthly income. The picture gets more blurred if the duration of the payments is also considered. The payments last for 10 to 20 years optionally and it can be considered as a very long term.



Fig.1 Ayazma before transformation²²⁸



Fig.2 Ayazma during transformation



Fig.3 Ayazma after transformation

²²⁸ All of the pictures are taken from Bayraktar, *Gecekondu ve Kentsel Yenileme*, 262-63.

As has been indicated earlier, the maximum income to apply for the low-income houses of the Mass Housing Administration is 650 YTL. Setting 650 YTL as the maximum monthly income means that the target population is minimum wage earners. However, for a person who earns not more than the minimum wage and lives in a *gecekondu* as an owner of a house previously, it seems quite unrealistic to pay at least one-third of his/her wage on payments for a house for ten to twenty years. For those who can pay the installments with a formal wage of not more than 650 YTL, we can assume that there is an informal income with which the payments can be made monthly. Thus, the system favors those who have an extra income in the informal sector and those who have already saved a certain amount of money. Thus, as far as the payment system is concerned, the regulation as such is not adequate for those who are living on the minimum wages in *gecekondu* areas.

In addition, as it is considered that owners and not tenants of the *gecekondu* areas are favored in the application process, as it has been implied, the picture gets more complicated. For the project makers and the municipal authorities, still the target population is not the most vulnerable and poor segments of the society but those who already owned a house. The housing projects take advantage of the heterogeneous structure of the *gecekondu* areas and the flexible definition of *gecekondu*, as has been discussed in the previous section. As *gecekondu*s vary from single-storey small shacks to multi-storey apartment buildings provided with infrastructural facilities like natural gas, central heating etc., this type of policy making and projects favor not those who live in shacks on a daily income basis, but those who are closer to middle or high income groups.

In spatial terms, the transformation in Ayazma has been initiated by the economic concerns related to the construction of the Olympiad Village and the shift of the center in the district from the industrial center to a new urban entertainment area. One of the residential areas of the workers of the industrial facilities that was the previous center of the district has been considered as an obstacle to the new face of the area both in visual and social terms. So, under the light of these concerns and as a part of the general tendencies of the central government towards the stimulation of the real estate market, the *gecekondu* transformation in Ayazma continues with the method of “transformation through relocation.”

The Ankara Airport Highway *Gecekondu* Transformation Project

Ankara Municipality has initiated several urban regeneration projects that include *gecekondu* transformation in cooperation with the Mass Housing Administration after 2003. Currently the municipality and the administration are engaged in eight projects among which the Ankara Airport Highway project is one of the greatest and the closest to completion.²²⁹ A specific law was enacted by the Parliament as a legal basis of the urban transformation in Ankara.²³⁰ Although the issue can be considered within the responsibility of the local government, the law significant in terms of the importance attributed to urban transformation by the central government. The law has no specific references to the place and the procedure of the projects and it can be classified as a semi-protocol between Mass Housing Administration, local government and the Ankara municipality. It stipulates

²²⁹ "Ankara Büyükşehir Belediyesi Emlak İstimlak Daire Başkanlığı 2004 Faaliyet Raporu," (Ankara Büyükşehir Belediyesi Emlak İstimlak Daire Başkanlığı 2005), 3.

²³⁰ "Kuzey Ankara Girişi Kentsel Dönüşüm Projesi Kanunu " (4.3.2004).

the expropriation of the areas within the borders of North Ankara Urban Transformation Project. The law also mentions in its Article 5 the legal rights of the *gecekondu* residents in the area.

In addition to the law of the transformation project, a protocol also was signed between the parties, namely the Mass Housing Administration and Ankara Municipality in September 2004.²³¹ The area consists of the two parts at the sides of the highway connecting the city to the airport. The area was a well-known *gecekondu* area before the transformation attempt. The protocol stipulates that the area will be used for residential projects of the Mass Housing Administration from which a part will be devoted to the former residents of the *gecekondus*. The administration has committed to the building of a total of 2,400 houses both for the former residents of the *gecekondu* area as well as the other low and middle income groups. The units that are to be separated for the previous owners of the land are to be determined by the Mass Housing Administration.²³²

So far, the initial phase of evacuation and destruction has been completed in the area. According to the data available from the reports of the Ankara Municipality, more than half of the land that is subject to transformation is private property.²³³ In the first place the municipal authorities have planned to expropriation of 5,000 *gecekondus*. The application principles were stipulated by the local government

²³¹ *Kuzey Ankara Girişi Kentsel Dönüşüm Projesi Protokolüne İlişkin Bilgi Notu* ([cited 10.03 2006]); available from <http://www.toki.gov.tr/html/basin/protokol.htm>.

²³² *Ibid.*

²³³ The land under transformation is about 1600 hectares. The amount of land at the private property status is approximately 930 hectares. Remaining land is either public property to a greater extent and recreational areas to a lesser extent. The details of the composition of the land in terms of property status can be seen from "Ankara Büyükşehir Belediyesi Emlak İstimlak Daire Başkanlığı 2004 Faaliyet Raporu."

assembly decision in January 2005 and the expropriation was initiated in the first half of 2005.²³⁴

The process of evacuation and re-accommodation is carried out more or less in the same way though with little differences emerging as a result of the property status of the *gecekondus* in the area. The Ankara Municipality aims at signing a protocol with all of the *gecekondu* owners one by one to guarantee their accommodation after the reconstruction of the area. For each 150 square meters of land, 60 square meters, for each 200 square meters 80 square meters, for each 250 square meters 100 square meters and finally for each 300 square meter of land 120 square meters of house will be given to those who has a title deed of the land they live on.²³⁵

Those who have a title deed but whose land is not permitted to be reconstructed will get less square meters of house in return for the land expropriated. They will get 60 square meter house for 250 square meters of land. In addition the individuals who own less than 100 square meters of land with title deeds, and 167 square meters with title deed but without reconstruction permission will not be given houses; instead they will be paid in cash.²³⁶

Depending on the legal status of the *gecekondus*, meaning their date of construction, the *gecekondu* owners are entitled to different rights. For each 400 square meters *gecekondu* corresponds to 80 square meters house if the *gecekondu* is subject to Law No. 2981.²³⁷ The *gecekondus* that are not included either by the Law

²³⁴ Ibid., 1.

²³⁵ Ibid., 2.

²³⁶ Ibid.

²³⁷ Ibid., 3. Law number 2981 is reconstruction amnesty law for the *gecekondus* that have been built before 1984. It stipulates the registration of the existent *gecekondus* that do not have legal status and title deeds. The law regulates the status of the illegal buildings of all sorts, but especially the *gecekondu* type of buildings. After the adoption of the law the illegal status of the *gecekondus* has

No. 2981 or the complementary Laws No. 3290 and No. 3366 but can prove that the construction date was before 2000 are also entitled to the exchange regime mentioned above.²³⁸ This article is interesting because the *gecekondu*s that are not included by the reconstruction amnesties are those that are illegal according to the current laws. By also including them among the other *gecekondu* owners, the municipal authorities bypass the legal regulations to deal with the situation.

Those who are entitled to own a house in return for their *gecekondu*s will be accommodated in Karacaören district in 80 square meters houses. After the discounts made for the wreckage and surrounding land payments, the *gecekondu* owner will pay the installments for the houses in Karacaören in 10 years. The other *gecekondu*s that are entitled to own a house from among the houses built after the area has been transformed will be given monthly rent of 200 YTL for their accommodation in the period between.²³⁹

The estimated numbers that would have the right to buy a house from Mass Housing Administration is 6760. Since July 2005, 2,184 *gecekondu* owners have signed the contract to buy a house from the projects of Mass Housing Administration in various districts in Ankara in return for their *gecekondu*s. The Administration has also started to build the houses in Pursaklar and Karacaören neighborhoods.²⁴⁰ It has been announced by the Ankara Municipality that the area of transformation will be used for housing and other recreational areas. Mass Housing Administration will

been altered to a legal status through registration and the residents of these buildings have been provided with "title deed assignment" (*tapu tahsis belgesi*). For the full text of the law see "İmar ve Gecekondu Mevzuatına Aykırı Yapılara Uygulanacak Bazı İşlemler ve 6785 Sayılı İmar Kanununun Bir Maddesinin Değiştirilmesi Hakkında Kanun," (Resmi Gazete 18335, 1984).

²³⁸ These two laws are also known as *gecekondu* amnesty laws. Both laws expand the scope of the law 2981 and legalized the *gecekondu*s constructed after the adoption of the law in 1984. they can be considered as the legal legitimization of the existent situation of the *gecekondu*s at the time through registration.

²³⁹ "Ankara Büyükşehir Belediyesi Emlak İstimlak Daire Başkanlığı 2004 Faaliyet Raporu," 3.

²⁴⁰Ereke, "Şehirlerde Büyük Göç Başlıyor."

built 18,000 houses in the area targeted to the high to middle income groups. Also it has been announced that in the area a five-star hotel as well as a congress center will be built.²⁴¹

Although it is not clear whether the local government wants to transform the area into a high or middle income housing area or to use it for recreational purposes, the reasons behind the choice of the Airport Highway has been clarified to a large extent by the authorities. The mayor of Ankara, Melih Gökçek, has pointed out that one of the main aims of the transformation project is the construction of prestigious projects in the area which is strategically important because of its location. It is not only a *gecekondu* area in the center of the city, but also the first place seen after the airport.²⁴² Thus, it can be argued that the choice of Airport Highway has not been due to the concerns related to housing the low-income groups or betterment of the poor. To put it differently, as far as the mentality is concerned the local government's priority seems like visual betterment of the urban space rather than relating the visibility to its social dimensions.



Fig.4 Airport Highway before transformation²⁴³

²⁴¹ Ibid.

²⁴² Melih Gökçek, (paper presented at the Low Income Housing and Urban Transformation in Turkey, Lütfi Kırdar Convention and Exhibition Center, 8.5. 2006).

²⁴³ All pictures are taken from Bayraktar, *Gecekondu ve Kentsel Yenileme*, 256-57.



Fig.5 Airport Highway during transformation



Fig. 6 Airport Highway after transformation

Concluding Remarks

The most important aspect of the transformation process is the mechanisms through which two previously unconnected dimensions of intervention were put together within the framework of urban regeneration and housing. Previously, the issue of squatter settlements and housing are being thought separately, one as the responsibility of the local government and the other of the central. However, as the developments after 2000 demonstrate, local governments and central governments

have reached a consensus about the transformation of the areas through mass housing projects.

However, as far as the legal regulations are concerned, the mechanisms of transformation reveal several points that can be considered as problematic. First, the underlying assumption is about the housing of the poor by themselves. The *gecekondu* issue is not formulated around more structural factors like land issues and urban rent and seen as a problem to be solved by increasing the housing stock. The general characteristics of urban poverty related to the inequalities and social exclusion as well as the employment conditions are neglected and these factors are not considered as integral part of the livelihood of *gecekondu* residents.

The transformation is carried out within a framework that does not guarantee the decent housing of the *gecekondu* population. The choice of the areas subject to *gecekondu* transformation projects reinforces this conclusion. As the areas chosen in the first place are the areas that could generate more rent like Ayazma or areas that are not considered to be visually and functionally compatible with the more income generating and “prestigious” projects, the priority of the decision makers are the newly constructed urban spaces rather than the urban poverty or accommodation problems.

Second, and as complementary to the first argument, the mechanisms through which the accommodation part of the urban transformation is dealt with illustrates a basic tendency for the overall perception of the issue. The residents of the *gecekondu* area, the urban poor, are defined on the basis of their incapability of owning a house under free market conditions. However, the system of accommodation does not guarantee the home ownership of these individuals out of the market mechanism

either. As a result, as long as the spaces of urban poverty are invisible, the urban poor also are considered to be nonexistent.

The third point is related to the structure of the *gecekondu* areas themselves. The areas are not homogeneous in terms of the composition of its residents, their economic status or life standards. Nevertheless, the urban authorities define the common ground of the *gecekondu* areas on the basis of illegal occupation of the land. That is why only a wreckage payment is given rather than the full value of the house during the expropriation process. And it is the result of this definition that the system does not compensate all the rights that would be born out of owning the land that is subject to transformation. That can be considered legally appropriate when *gecekondu* issue is only considered as a land invasion problem. However, it is more than that when related dimensions like social inequalities and social exclusion factors are taken into consideration. It is seen the mass housing projects of the Mass Housing Administration and local government neglect these dimensions.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This study analyses the housing policy of Turkey with a specific emphasis on the employment of low-income housing policies for the elimination of the *gecekondu* in the 2000s. Although irregular settlements have been on the agenda since the 1950s in terms of their relation with poverty, property relations and urbanization, in the 2000s a more systematic approach for the control of the *gecekondu*s has been institutionalized. Both the contextualization of the change in the approach and the historicisation of the dynamics leading to the emergence of such a policy change are the main aims of this thesis.

Housing is not an isolated policy area that can be reduced and understood without analyzing its dynamic relation with the general economic and social variables. At the same time, the implementation of housing policy necessitates taking its potential to alter the structure of spatial differentiation pattern into account. Low-income housing policies in particular add another dimension to the debate, which is the regulation of the urban poor through housing measures. In this context, the theoretical discussion has been conducted on the basis of the relation of housing policies with urbanization, economic order and social dynamics on the one hand and approaches to poverty and efforts for its containment and regulation through social policy measures on the other.

Low-income housing policies constitute an important component of the social policy regulations in any country. For Turkey the emergence of *gecekondu* has been

a determinant factor for the level of involvement of the state with the low-income housing policies since the 1960s. *Gecekondu* emerged as an urban phenomenon in the aftermath of World War 2 as a type of shelter with which the poor provided themselves. Mostly built on the outskirts of the city in the form of single storey shacks without any infrastructural services, *gecekondu*s formed neighborhoods in time as a result of the increasing immigration to the urban areas. In the very first years of their formation when they were limited in number and scattered around the city, the authorities were strictly opposed to their presence in the urban areas. The demolition of *gecekondu*s and sending away of their inhabitants was a common practice. The name *gecekondu*, literally meaning ‘built overnight,’ was given in this period encapsulating the attitudes of the authorities towards the irregular settlements and the solution of the poor.

In the 1960s their presence was widely accepted by the authorities and their illegal property position was legalized as the adoption of the *Gecekondu Law* demonstrates. The economic model of the period was influential in the legitimization of the *gecekondu*s as their potential contribution to the labor market was significant in number. The immigrants living in the *gecekondu* areas supplied cheap labor for the industries producing consumer goods for the domestic market and ensured a certain level of demand as well. Apart from their role in the economic order the legitimacy of *gecekondu* was derived from the particular notion of justice prevalent in the period towards the urban poor. Especially in the first years of the 1960s the *gecekondu*s were discussed not in terms of their relation with urban property relations and illegality but in terms of the need to shelter the urban poor. It was also in the 1960s that the *gecekondu* phenomenon was accepted as an integral part of the

urban social and economic order undermining the considerations regarding it as a transitory category that was supposed to be absorbed in the urban area.

The low-income housing policies of the state were quite limited in the period. As housing was not considered a productive sector for economic growth and as the *gecekondu* filled the gap of social housing the state did not get involved in social housing projects for the *gecekondu* residents. The rationality of the state derived from taking advantage of the already-built houses for absorbing the urban poor population without much cost to the budget. The state's housing policies were limited to the housing of middle-income groups and the civil servants.

The roots of a particular pattern of relationship between the state and the *gecekondus* can be found in this period. Although it was determined by the state in the very first years of the emergence of the *gecekondu* phenomenon, the following years were marked by a mutual abuse. The role of the *gecekondus* in the labor market was reinforced through their discovery as voters both by themselves and the politicians. While the state controlled the power to distribute resources and grant legality to the *gecekondus*, the *gecekondus* had the power of huge voter potential. Together with the effect of the local dynamics, this relationship set the terms of the bargaining for a long period. As the state wanted to control the *gecekondus* by constantly reminding their inhabitants of its power by granting reconstruction amnesties or supplying services to the poor neighborhoods, the *gecekondus* grew in number and acquired a stronger position on the urban land controlling a significant amount of the rent. Both sides took advantage of the position of the other and a certain level of tension persisted.

In the 1980s, the housing policy of Turkey underwent transformation along with the change in the economic order from import substitution to export-orientation.

What was important in the period was also the measures for the institutionalization of the free-market. The neo-liberal economic model required the organization of the urban centers around commercial and financial activity. With the establishment of the Mass Housing Fund and the Mass Housing Administration as the central institutions responsible for the implementation of a national housing policy, the state started to channel a significant amount of funds to the private housing sector, which led to an increase in the housing stock targeted to the middle and high-income groups.

The *gecekondus* in the 1980s also adapted to the opportunities of the free-market through commercialization. As a process that can be dated back to the 1970s, the single storey shacks started to be replaced by multi-storey apartment blocs bought, sold and rented within the framework of urban informal economy. As more people could not afford owning a house from the formal market, *gecekondus* became stronger alternatives as a form of housing. However, *gecekondus* lost their justification as a form of housing for providing shelter to the poor. They started to be considered as sources of illegal and unjust urban rent gained by those who did not really deserve it. Although whoever had a claim to the urban land acted with the concern of deriving more rent, *gecekondus* were to be distrusted. The state's position vis-à-vis the *gecekondu* neighborhoods took the form of regulation through forced demolitions and dislocations as a result of changing attitudes towards the urban poor and the magnitude of the urban rent at stake.

The 2000s can be considered both as continuity and a rupture at the same time with respect to the practices of the state towards the *gecekondus*. It can be considered as continuity with respect to the attitudes towards the urban poor and the *gecekondu* neighborhoods. As a continuation of the outlook in the 1980s, the

gecekondus continue to be regarded as sources of urban rent and their residents to be labeled as either group of people making easy money by taking the advantage of the populist political decisions or dangerous groups threatening the security of the others. The rupture stems from, however, the means through which this attitude has been transformed into practical consequences in the form of legally binding rules. The Mass Housing Administration has been authorized to act within a larger scope of housing activities. For the first time the *gecekondus* issue has been thought of together with low-income housing by the authorities.

As has been indicated, measures towards the regulation and control of the *gecekondus* have not been through employing a housing policy and transformation of the *gecekondus* through relocation to the social housing areas of the state like the practice of the other states dealing with a similar type of irregular housing. It has also been mentioned that the reason was the specific place occupied by the *gecekondus* in Turkey's social policy through supplying a significant level of housing to the urban poor and its original position as a supplier of cheap labor to the domestic industry. With the changes made in the legal framework of the Mass Housing Administration, however, a systematic policy change towards elimination of the *gecekondus* through relocation of its residents to social houses in cooperation with the local authorities has been initiated by the current government. This change is significant in terms of the potential it carries for changing the spatial organization of the city along with the redefinition of the urban space in a neo-liberal free market economy. Although the policy change under examination is an ongoing process, the direction of change opens up new discussions for thinking low-income housing and *gecekondus* issue together within the framework of their historical backgrounds.

With the new scope of authority of the Mass Housing Administration, the power of the Administration was broadened from urban planning to expropriation, from engaging in luxurious housing projects to *gecekondu* transformation. It has gained a significant authority within the urban space as a central authority although it has to cooperate with the municipalities. Although it is a part of the public administration body, its financial structure resembles to that of a private housing firm. The main income of the Administration is generated from sales of the units constructed. Thus, the more units sold, more income is gained for the sustainment of the institution. This institutional set-up, thus, requires the ensurement of a certain level of profit that would be derived from the housing projects. The drive for profit-making is perpetuated by another authority given to the Administration that is establishment of housing firms or holding shares in already established ones.

However, the Mass Housing Administration is different from a private institution in many respects. It has a certain level of state subsidies, has the right to expropriate when it deems necessary and has the right to influence urban planning directly and formally. Also, within the framework of the amendments made in several laws the land owned by the treasury has been transferred to the Administration to be used in the mass housing projects. In this context, the Administration as a public authority is able to take advantage of the public privileges while at the same time being able to act with profit concern like any other firm in the housing market. Thus, the principles of public and private interest intermingle within the institutional body of the Mass Housing Administration.

The way that the private and public sector cooperates could have been undermined if the legal changes and the ongoing projects of the Administration had not been presented as the fulfillment of a public duty. Especially the *Gecekondu*

Transformation Projects are presented within the context of state's benevolence towards the urban poor who otherwise would not be able to own a house under the normal free-market conditions. The Administration's projects are presented both as an ultimate and rational solution for the improvement of the residential conditions of the urban poor and elimination of *gecekondu*. However, as the locations as well as the payment requirements of the *Gecekondu* Transformation Projects are taken into account, it is seen that the priority given to the improvement of the *gecekondu*s goes together with the priority attributed to the transformation of the rentable urban land occupied by the *gecekondu*s into areas that would bring more income both to the municipalities and contribute to the global position of the city as a center.

In this context, it can be argued that the *Gecekondu* Transformation Projects carried out by the Mass Housing Administration after 20000 are components of larger urban renewal programs aiming at the transformation of the city center in line with the requirements of the global capitalism. The urban transformation and construction of financial and commercial centers as well as the encouragement of the services sectors is part and parcel of a new understanding that has been started to be institutionalized after 1980 along with the free-market economy. The new approach necessitates the construction of "global cities" as centers of the financial and commercial activity in a competitive environment. The competition brought the marketing of the services supplied in the city together with marketing the city itself. The importance of the visual dimension of the cities stems from the preoccupation with attracting more capital or people that would be ensured by creating urban areas for these purposes. This, in turn, obviously creates a demand for the "cleaning" of the urban centers from the visually unpleasant elements like the *gecekondu*s.

The two *Gecekondu* Transformation Projects that have been evaluated in the last chapter aims at taking these points into account for understanding the ongoing urban transformation projects. The analysis of these projects clearly proves that the criteria for conducting a *gecekondu* transformation project in a particular area is founded upon the future concerns for the use of the land cleaned from the *gecekondus* rather than the improvement of the current conditions of the urban poor. Taking the expropriation rules and the relocation procedures into account, it can also be argued that the *gecekondu* residents are by no means guaranteed a new shelter or property. The mechanism provided ensures their disappearance from a particular area but unless they can fulfill the requirements of home ownership in the free market, though severe conditions of ownership is softened by the social housing projects of the Mass Housing Administration to a certain extent, the improvement of their living standards is not guaranteed. The rhetoric used by the authorities with respect to these projects proves the same point with respect to the intentions and mentality embedded in the implementation of the *gecekondu* transformation as well as the in institutional and legal changes.

The social and economic consequences of the ongoing projects are yet to be seen. This thesis is limited to the legal and institutional changes made in the social housing policy of Turkey in the context of its relation with *gecekondu* under the light of the economic and social changes of the periods concerned. However, the social and economic consequences of the *gecekondu* transformation projects both in the conditions of the urban poor as well as the re-organization of the urban area is as important as the legal framework in order to contextualize the new urban setting and the attitudes of the actors in the urban space. This thesis would fulfill its mission if it

has a modest contribution to the future debates on the consequences of the current projects.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Laws and Regulations

- "65 Yaşını Doldurmuş, Muhtaç, Gücsüz ve Kimsesiz Türk Vatandaşlarına Aylık Bağlanması Hakkında Kanun ": Resmi Gazete 15642, 1976.
- "Bazı Kanun ve Kanun Hükmünde Kararnamelerde Değişiklik Yapılmasına Dair Kanun." Resmi Gazete 24451, 2001.
- "Bazı Kanunlarda ve Bayındırlık ve İskan Bakanlığı'nın Teşkilat ve Görevleri Hakkında Kanun Hükmünde Kararnamede Değişiklik Yapılmasına Dair Kanun ": Resmi Gazete 25192, 2003.
- "Gecekondu Kanunu." Resmi Gazete 12362, 1966.
- "İmar ve Gecekondu Mevzuatına Aykırı Yapılara Uygulanacak Bazı İşlemler ve 6785 Sayılı İmar Kanununun Bir Maddesinin Değiştirilmesi Hakkında Kanun." Resmi Gazete 18335, 1984.
- "Kamulaştırma Kanunu." Resmi Gazete 18215, 1983.
- "Kamulaştırma Kanununda Değişiklik Yapılması Hakkında Kanun." Resmi Gazete 24393, 2001.
- Kentsel Dönüşüm ve Gelişim Kanunu Tasarısı. 2005. In, <http://www2.tbmm.gov.tr/d22/1/1-0984.pdf>. (accessed 08.07.2006).
- "Kuzey Ankara Girişi Kentsel Dönüşüm Projesi Kanunu ", 4.3.2004.
- "Sosyal Yardımlaşma ve Dayanışmayı Teşvik Kanunu." Resmi Gazete 19134, 1986.
- "Toplu Konut Kanunu." Resmi Gazete 18344, 02/03/1984.
- "Toplu Konut Kanununda ve Genel Kadro ve Usulü Hakkında Kanun Hükmünde Kararnamenin Eki Cetvellerin Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığına Ait Bölümünde Değişiklik Yapılması Hakkında Kanun ": Resmi Gazete 25460, 2004.

"Yıpranan Tarihi ve Kültürel Taşınmaz Varlıkların Yenilenerek Korunması ve Yaşatılarak Kullanılması Hakkında Kanun." Resmi Gazete 25866, 2005.

Books and Articles

Mimarlık 3, no. 56 (1978).

Acar, Erhan, and Mehmet Adam. "Kapitalistleşme Sürecinde *Gecekondu*." *Mimarlık* 16, no. 156 (1978).

Altaban, Özcan. *Toplu Konut Alanlarında Örgütlenme ve İşletme*. Ankara: TC Başbakanlık Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığı, 1996.

Ankara-Çiğirtebağları Gecekondu Araştırması. Ankara İmar ve İskan Bakanlığı, 1965.

"Ankara Büyükşehir Belediyesi Emlak İstimlak Daire Başkanlığı 2004 Faaliyet Raporu." Ankara Büyükşehir Belediyesi Emlak İstimlak Daire Başkanlığı 2005.

Apeldoorn, Bastiaan van. "The Struggle over European Order: Transnational Class Agency in the Making of 'Embedded Neo-Liberalism' " In *Social Forces in the Making of the New Europe: The Restructuring of European Social Relations in the Global Economy*, edited by Andreas Bieler and Adam David Morton, 70-89. London: Palgrave, 2001.

Bayındırlık, İmar, Ulaştırma ve Turizm; Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonları "Toplu Konut Kanun Tasarısı ve Bayındırlık, İmar, Ulaştırma ve Turizm; Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonları Raporları ": TBMM, 1/452,1984.

Bayraktar, Erdoğan. *Gecekondu ve Kentsel Yenileme*. Ankara: Ekonomik Araştırmalar Merkezi Yayınları, 2006.

Bozdoğan, Sibel. *Modernizm ve Ulusun İnşası: Erken Cumhuriyet Türkiye'sinde Mimari Kültür*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2001.

- Bölen, Fulin. "A Comparative Study of Formal and Informal Housing Markets in Istanbul." Paper presented at the European Network for Housing Research International Symposium, ITU Building and Earthquake Research and Application Centre 1991.
- Brett, E. A. "American Deficits, Global Boom and Crisis." In *The World Economy Since the War: The Politics of Uneven Development*, 105-31. Basingstoke: MacMillan, 1990.
- Bryne, David *Social Exclusion*. Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open University Press, 1999.
- Buğra, Ayşe. "The Immoral Economy of Housing in Turkey." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 22 (1998).
- Buğra, Ayşe, and Çağlar Keyder. "New Poverty and the Changing Welfare Regime of Turkey." Report prepared for the United Nations Development Program, 2003.
- . "Önsöz." In *Sosyal Politika Yazıları*, edited by Ayşe Buğra and Çağlar Keyder, 7-17. İstanbul: İletişim, 2006.
- . "Poverty and Social Policy in Contemporary Turkey." Boğaziçi University Social Policy Forum 2005.
- Burnett, John. *A Social History of Housing: 1815-1985*. London and New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Castells, Manuel. *City, Class and Power*. London: Macmillan Press, 1978.
- . "What Happened: The Roots and the Development of the Economic Crisis in the United States." In *The Economic Crisis and American Society*, 78-136. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.
- The Challenge of Slums: Global Report on Human Settlements 2003*. Edited by United Nations Human Settlements Programme. London, Sterling: Earthscan, 2003.
- Clapham, David, Peter Kemp, and Susan J. Smith. *Housing and Social Policy*. London: Macmillan, 1990.

- Çelik, Aliye Pekin "Gecekondu'dan Sosyal Konuta Geçiş Üzerine Araştırma." *Mimarlık* 8, no. 82 (1970).
- Erdem, Selim Efe. "40 Gün 40 Gece İstanbul." *Radikal*, 13/04/2006.
- Erder, Sema. *İstanbul'a Bir Kent Kondu: Ümraniye*. İstanbul: İletişim, 1996.
- . *Kentsel Gerilim : Enformel İlişki Ağları Alan Araştırması*. Ankara: um:ag, 1997.
- Ereke, Ünsal. "Şehirlerde Büyük Göç Başlıyor." *Milliyet*, 24.01.2006.
- Erman, Tahire. "The Politics of Squatter (*Gecekondu*) Studies in Turkey: The Changing Representations of Rural Migrants in the Academic Discourse." *Urban Studies* 38, no. 7 (2001).
- Esping-Andersen, Gosta. *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990.
- Ferrera, Maurizio. "Welfare States and Social Safety Nets in Southern Europe: An Introduction " In *Welfare State Reform in Southern Europe: Fighting Poverty and Social Exclusion in Italy, Spain, Portugal and Greece*, edited by Maurizio Ferrera. London, New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Foucault, Michel. "Governmentality." In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Geremek, Bronislaw. *Poverty: A History*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.
- Gilbert, Alan. "Introduction." In *Cities, Poverty and Development: Urbanization in the Third World* edited by Alan Gilbert and Josef Gugler. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- . "Urban Development in a World System." In *Cities, Poverty and Development: Urbanization in the Third World*, edited by Alan Gilbert and Josef Gugler. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Gordon, Colin. "Governmental Rationality: An Introduction." In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Gough, Ian. "Güney Avrupa'da Sosyal Yardım." In *Sosyal Politika Yazıları*, edited by Ayşe Buğra and Çağlar Keyder. İstanbul: İletişim, 2006.

Gökçeer, Fikri. "Sosyal Konut Sorunu ve Belediyeler." *İller ve Belediyeler Dergisi* 33, no. 378 (1977).

Gökçek, Melih. Paper presented at the Low Income Housing and Urban Transformation in Turkey, Lütfi Kırdar Convention and Exhibition Center, 8.5. 2006.

Güvenç, Murat. "İstanbul'da İşyeri-Statü Temelinde Segregasyon; 1990 Sayımı Üzerinde İlişkisel Çözümler." In *Yoksulluk: Bölgesel Gelişme ve Kırsal Yoksulluk, Kent Yoksulluğu*, edited by Murat Güvenç and Halis Akder. İstanbul: TESEV, 2000.

Harrington, Michael. *The Other America : Poverty in the United States*. New York: Macmillan, 1962.

Hart, Charles William Merton. *Zeytinburnu Gecekondu Bölgesi* İstanbul: İstanbul Ticaret Odası, 1969.

Heper, Metin. *Gecekondu Policy in Turkey: An Evaluation with a Case Study of Rumelihisarüstü Squatter Area in İstanbul*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Press, 1978.

Hobsbawm, Eric. *Kısa 20. Yüzyıl: 1914-1991, Aşırıliklar Çağı*. İstanbul: Sarmal Yayınları, 2003.

İnkaya, Yılmaz. "Türkiye'de Cumhuriyet Devrinin Başından Günümüze Kadar Konut Sorunu." *Mimarlık* 107 (1972).

İnşaatları Tamamlanan ve Devam Eden Uygulamalar. In, <http://www.toki.gov.tr/programlar/uygulamatakip/ilharita.asp>. (accessed 03.04, 2006).

"İstanbul-İkitelli (Ayazma ve Tepeüstü)- Halkalı Bölgeleri Kentsel Yenileme (Gecekondu Dönüşüm) Projesine İlişkin Protokol." June 2004.

Işık, Oğuz, and M. Melih Pınarcıoğlu. *Nöbetleşe Yoksulluk: Gecekondu ve Kent Yoksulları, Sultanbeyli Örneği*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2005.

- Karpat, Kemal. *The Gecekondu: Rural Migration and Urbanization*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Keleş, Ruşen. "Housing Policy in Turkey." In *Housing Policy in Developing Countries*, edited by Gil Shidlo. London: Routledge, 1990.
- . *Kentleşme Politikası*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 1990.
- Kemeny, Jim. *Housing and Social Theory*. London and New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Keyder, Çağlar, and Ayşe Öncü. *Istanbul and the Concept of the World Cities*. Istanbul: Friedrich Ebert Foundation, 1993.
- Kırıkkanat, Mine G. "Halkımız Eğleniyor." *Radikal*, 27/07/2005.
- Kurtuluş, Hatice. 2005. Kentsel Dönüşüm: Toplumsal Dışlanma, Yok Sayma. In, <http://www.bianet.org/2005/08/19/65506.htm>. (accessed 20/06/2006).
- Kuzey Ankara Girişi Kentsel Dönüşüm Projesi Protokolüne İlişkin Bilgi Notu. In, <http://www.toki.gov.tr/html/basin/protokol.htm>. (accessed 10.03, 2006).
- Kwon, Huck-ju. "Transforming the Developmental Welfare State in East Asia." *Development and Change* 36, no. 3 (2005).
- Lewis, Oscar. *La Vida: A Puerto Rican Family in the Culture of Poverty, San Juan and New York*. New York: Random House, 1966.
- Marshall, Thomas Humprey. "Yurttaşlık ve Sosyal Sınıf." In *Sosyal Politika Yazıları*, edited by Ayşe Buğra and Çağlar Keyder. İstanbul: İletişim, 2006.
- Öğretmen, İbrahim. *Ankara'da 158 Gecekondu Hakkında Monografi*. Ankara: Ajans-Türk Matbaası, 1957.
- Öktem, Binnur. "Küresel Kent Söyleminin Kentsel Mekanı Dönüştürmedeki Rolü: Büyükdere-Maslak Aksı." In *İstanbul'da Kentsel Ayrışma*, edited by Hatice Kurtuluş. İstanbul: Bağlam, 2005.
- Öncü, Ayşe. "The Politics of the Urban Land Market in Turkey: 1950-1980." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 12, no. 1 (1988).

- Öniş, Ziya. "Political Economy of Turkey in the 1980s: Anatomy of Unorthodox Liberalism." In *Strong State and Economic Interest Groups: The Post-1980 Turkish Experience*, edited by Metin Heper. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1991.
- . "Turgut Özal and His Economic Legacy: Turkish Neo-liberalism in Critical Perspective." *Middle Eastern Studies* 40, no. 4 (2004).
- Özbek, Nadir. *Cumhuriyet Türkiyesi'nde Sosyal Güvenlik ve Sosyal Politikalar*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı, 2006.
- . "Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Türkiye'de Sosyal Devlet." *Toplum ve Bilim* Spring, no. 92 (2002): 7-33.
- Özdemir, Dilek A., Pınar P. Özden, and Sırma R. Turgut, eds. *İstanbul 2004 International Urban Regeneration Symposium: Workshop of Küçükçekmece District*. İstanbul: Küçükçekmece Municipality Publication, 2004.
- Piven, Frances Fox , and Richard A. Cloward. *Regulating the Poor : The Functions of Public Welfare*: Vintage, 1993.
- Portes, Alejandro. "Housing Policy, Urban Poverty, and the State: The Favelas of Rio de Janeiro, 1972-1976." *Latin American Research Review* 14, no. 2 (1979).
- Pulat, Gülçin. *Dar Gelirli Kentlilerin Konut Sorunu ve Soruna Sosyal İçerikli Mekansal Çözüm Arayışları*. Ankara: Batıkent Konut Üretim Yapı Kooperatifleri Yayını, 1992.
- Room, Graham. *'New Poverty' in the European Community*. London: Macmillan Press, 1990.
- Rupert, Mark. "Fordism." In *The Cold War: An Encyclopedia* edited by Stephen Burwood. New York: Garland Publishers, forthcoming.
- Sewell, Granville H. *Squatter Settlements in Turkey : Analysis of a Social, Political, and Economic Problem* Cambridge, 1964.
- Skidelsky, Robert. "The Decline of Keynesian Politics." In *State and Economy in Contemporary Capitalism*, edited by Colin Crouch, 55-87. London: Croom Helm, 1979.

"Sosyal Konut Standartları Üzerine Mimarlar Odasının Görüşleri." *Mimarlık*, no. 3 (1964).

Şenyapılı, Tansı. "Charting the 'Voyage' of Squatter Housing in Urban Spatial 'Quadruped'." *European Journal of Turkish Studies* Thematic Issue, *Gecekondü* (2004).

———. "Enformel Sektör: Durağanlıktan Devingenliğe/ *Gecekondulaşmadan Apartmanlaşmaya*." In *Yoksulluk: Bölgesel Gelişme ve Kırsal Yoksulluk, Kent Yoksulluğu*, edited by Halis Akder and Murat Güvenç. İstanbul: TESEV, 2000.

Tekeli, İlhan. *Türkiye'de Yaşamda ve Yazında Konut Sorununun Gelişimi*. Ankara: T.C. Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığı, 1996.

Thorns, David C. *Kentlerin Dönüşümü: Kent Teorisi ve Kentsel Yaşam* İstanbul: Soyak Yayınları, 2004.

"Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığının 2002, 2003 ve 2004 Yılları Eylem ve İşlemlerinin Araştırılıp Denetlenmesine İlişkin Rapor Özeti." T.C. Cumhurbaşkanlığı Devlet Denetleme Kurulu, 2004.

Tuna, Numan, Baykan Günay, Levent Topraktaş, and Zeki Kamil Ülkenli. *Türkiye'de Toplu Konut Uygulamalarının Kentsel Gelişmeye Etkileri*. Ankara: TC Başbakanlık Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığı, 1996.

Tümertekin, Erol. *İstanbul: İnsan ve Mekan*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları 1997.

"Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Tutanak Dergisi." 17. Dönem 40. Birleşim (1984).

Türkün, Asuman, and Hatice Kurtuluş. "Giriş." In *İstanbul'da Kentsel Ayrışma*, edited by Hatice Kurtuluş. İstanbul: Bağlam 2005.

Zürcher, Erik J. *Turkey: A Modern History*. London, New York: I. B. Tauris, 2004.

APPENDIX

Table 1. *Gecekondu* Transformation Projects of Mass Housing Administration¹

<i>Project Name/Location</i>	<i>Number of Units</i>
Ankara Protocol Highway Project	2.500
Ankara Mamak Yatıkmusluk Project	308
Ankara Altındağ Doğantepe and Old	
Altındağ/Aktaş Project	718
Balıkesir Edremit Project	400
Bayburt Project	168
Bursa Yıldırım Project	240
Bursa Osmangazi Project	1.400
Denizli Project	448
Erzurum Kazım Karabekir- Yakutiye	
Yıldızkent Project	700
Erzurum Yakutiye Project	522
Erzurum Yakutiye project (2)	340
Erzurum Ilıca Project	500
Erzincan Çarşı Project	880
Eskişehir Odunpazarı Büyükvadi Project	1.000
Gaziantep Şehitkamil Beylerbeyi Project	1.144
Gaziantep Şahinbey Airport Highway	
Project	800
Gaziantep Şehitkamil Çıksorut Project	3.000

¹ *İnşaatları Tamamlanan ve Devam Eden Uygulamalar* ([cited 03.04 2006]); available from <http://www.toki.gov.tr/programlar/uygulamatakip/ilharita.asp>.

Gümüşhane Center Project	200
İstanbul Küçükçekmece Halkalı Project	2.640
İstanbul Tuzla Project	4.600
İstanbul Kadıköy Project	500
İstanbul Şişli Kuştepe Project	150
İstanbul Kartal Project	500
İstanbul Fatih Project	400
İstanbul Avcılar Project	1.000
İstanbul Maltepe Project	2.000
Izmir Karşıyaka Project	808
Izmir Konak Project	3.080
Karabük Project	816
Kars Yenimahalle Project	752
Kırıkkale Bağlarbaşı Project	250
Konya Selçuklu Project	900
Kütahya Project	500
Manisa Project	800
Mersin Erdemli Project	648
Samsun Çay District Project	672
Samsun Çay District Project (2)	250
Siirt Algül District Project	384
Şanlıurfa Yeşildirek Project	1.000
Trabzon Zağnos Valley Project	1.000
Total	34.778

FIGURES²



Fig. 7 Denizli *Gecekondu* Transformation Area before transformation



Fig. 8 Denizli *Gecekondu* Transformation Area during transformation



Fig. 9 Denizli *Gecekondu* Transformation Area after transformation

² All figures are taken from Erdoğan Bayraktar, *Gecekondu ve Kentsel Yenileme* (Ankara: Ekonomik Araştırmalar Merkezi Yayınları, 2006).



Fig. 10 Erzincan Çarşı *Gecekondu* Transformation Area before transformation



Fig. 10 Erzincan Çarşı *Gecekondu* Transformation Area during transformation



Fig. 11 Erzincan Çarşı *Gecekondu* Transformation Area after transformation



Fig. 12 Karabük Cevizli *Gecekondu* Transformation Area before transformation



Fig. 13 Karabük Cevizli *Gecekondu* Transformation Area during transformation



Fig. 14 Örnekköy *Gecekondu* Transformation Area after transformation



Fig. 15 Palu Elazığ *Gecekondu* Transformation Area after transformation



Fig. 16 Rize Çamlıhemşin *Gecekondu* Transformation Area after transformation



Fig. 17 Tatvan Bitlis *Gecekondu* Transformation Area after transformation