

AFTER DEINDUSTRIALIZATION, IN THE MIDST OF URBAN
TRANSFORMATION:
THE CASE OF PAŞABAHÇE

AYŞE ALNIAÇIK

Boğaziçi University 2008

AFTER DEINDUSTRIALIZATION, IN THE MIDST OF URBAN
TRANSFORMATION:
THE CASE OF PAŞABAHÇE

Thesis submitted to the
Ataturk Institute for Modern Turkish History
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

by

Ayşe Almaçık

Boğaziçi University

2008

An abstract of the Thesis of Ayşe Alniaçık, for the degree of Master of Arts from the Ataturk Institute for Modern Turkish History of Boğaziçi University to be taken in September 2008

Title: After Deindustrialization, In the Midst of Urban Transformation: the Case of Paşabahçe

This study scrutinizes Paşabahçe borough which had witnessed deindustrialization as a prominent social change and came to be threatened with displacement due to the rise of neoliberal urbanism. The specific characteristic of the district has been that once it was a blue-collar worker basin where generations of factory workers were the main current in the production of a self-sufficient and integrated space in its social and economic life. However, in the realm of working life, deindustrialization meant the end of the specific occupation of being a factory worker and the appearance of multiple, fragmented, and even derogatory job positions. The people are kept in this working life by the pressure of unemployment. In this context, the stories of the factory workers were about decline, dispersal, and defeat of the community and place, since plant-closures were experienced as dissolution of place in economic, social, and cultural means. The place and its inhabitants have been left with the ruins of the factory buildings waiting their arrangement in the new urban politics, since the production of space in the district that dated back to the fordist phase of urbanization became superfluous with plant-closings. Concurrently, the urban fabric of Paşabahçe has been in the process of a complete transformation, as the gated communities have been developing at the higher elevations and urban transformation projects has been stepped in. In this context, this study concentrates on the experience of these prominent changes in which the inhabitants perceive dispossession. As the plight of the borough has been observed, people seem to gain a kind of critical awareness on the class strategies operating in this process. Correspondingly, this study also examines the response of people to this dislocating process and their means and limits of solidarity and resistance. The appearance of a rupture between generations according to age and migration is an important determining factor. The generation of migrant factory workers and their close community have different repertoire of events and different “sense of past.” Thus, their “appeal to past” under the constant threat of displacement should be considered with its potential contributive effect to a novel organization, yet, the process is open.

Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü'nde Yüksek Lisans derecesi için Ayşe Almaçık tarafından Eylül 2008'de teslim edilen tezin özeti

Başlık: Sanayisizleşme Sonrasında, Kentsel Dönüşüm Ortasında: Paşabahçe

Bu çalışma sanayisizleşmeye sarsıcı bir toplumsal değişim olarak tanıklık eden ve neoliberal kentleşmenin hız kazanması sonucu yerinden edilme tehdidiyle karşı karşıya kalan Paşabahçe semtini inceliyor. Semtin spesifik karakteristiği geçmişte bir mavi yakalı havzası olmasıydı, öyle ki bir zamanlar fabrika işçisi nesiller toplumsal ve ekonomik yaşamda kendine yeter ve bütünleşmiş bir mekanın üretimini omurgasını oluşturmuşlardı. Ancak sanayisizleşmenin çalışma hayatındaki anlamı spesifik bir uğraş olarak fabrika işçisi olma halinin sonlanması ve çoğul, parçalanmış, hatta aşağılayıcı iş pozisyonlarının yaygınlık kazanmasıydı. İnsanları bu iş ortamında çalışmak durumunda bırakan işsizlik baskısıydı. Bu bağlamda, fabrika işçilerinin hikayeleri topluluğun ve mekanın dağılması ve yenilgisi üzerineydi, zira fabrikaların kapatılması ekonomik, sosyal ve kültürel anlamda mekanın çözülüşü olarak deneyimlenmişti. Mekan ve sakinleri kendilerini, fabrika binalarının yıkıntıları ile baş başa kalmış, yeni kentsel siyasetin düzenlemelerinden kendi paylarına düşeni bekler bir halde buldular. Çünkü kentleşmenin artık geçmişte kalan fordist aşamasına uzanan bölgedeki mekanın üretimi fabrikaların kapanması ile füzuli hale geldi. Buna eşzamanlı olarak güvenli siteler bölgenin yüksek tepelerinde gelişmekte, kentsel dönüşüm projeleri devreye girmekte, yani Paşabahçe'nin kentsel dokusu bütünlüklü bir dönüşüm süreci içerisine sürüklenmekteydi. Bu bağlamda, bu çalışma bölge sakinlerinin mülksüzleşme olarak algıladıkları bu önemli dönüşümlerin nasıl deneyimlendiğine odaklanmaktadır. Semtin kötüleşen durumunu gözlemleyen sakinler, bu süreçte devreye giren sınıf stratejilerine dair bir tür eleştirel farkındalık kazanmış görünmekte. Bu durumdan hareketle çalışma, insanların bu yerinden etme sürecine verdikleri tepkileri, kullandıkları araçları ve ortaya koydukları direniş ile dayanışmanın sınırlarını da incelemektedir. Yaşa ve göçe dayalı farklı kuşaklar arasındaki yarıma önemli bir belirleyici etkidir. Göçmen fabrika işçileri kuşağı ve onların yakın topluluğu farklı bir repertuara ve farklı bir "geçmiş algısına" sahiptir. Bu sebeple sürekli bir yerinden edilme tehdidi altındayken "geçmiş çağırma"larının, yeni türden bir örgütlenmeye katkıda bulunma potansiyeli göz önünde bulundurulmalıdır; zira sürecin ucu acıktır.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank to those men and women who shared with me their stories, feelings, and thoughts. Their stories left me in ruins at various moments, yet these ruins were inspiring and encouraging to write this thesis. The contribution of Emrullah Kandemir, Erkan Atagün, Ferhat, and Gökhan was so important as their support in the fieldwork helped a lot and enabled me to observe a greater picture of Paşabahçe.

I am deeply grateful to my advisor, Prof. Ayşe Buğra who supported and guided me with great care throughout all stages of this study. Her guidance was so valuable as she supported me not only with the theoretical knowledge, but also about daily human matters in all bleak moments I have faced in Paşabahçe. I would like to thank Ass. Prof. Berna Yazıcı and Ass. Prof. Cengiz Kırılı for their presence on my jury and critical contribution on my thesis. The courses of Cengiz Kırılı were so inspiring not only to complete this thesis but also to continue to work on these matters. I would like to thank also Prof. Çağlar Keyder, Assoc. Prof. Nadir Özbek, Ass. Prof. Biray Kırılı, and Ass. Prof. Zeynep Çağlayan Gambetti with whom I have discussed some matters of this thesis.

I am thankful to Kathryn Kranzler for her editing this thesis and Tracy Deliismail for her energy to improve the thesis' language. I also would like to thank the staff of Atatürk Institute, Leyla Kılıç, Necla Turunç and Kadriye Tamyetkin for being helpful during my two years of graduate education.

I would like to thank my dear friends Haluk, Zehra, Burçak, İmge, Taylan, who have been with me throughout my years in Istanbul. This thesis would have been incomplete if the *tezkoop* had not existed: Gözde Orhan, Başak Deniz Özdoğan, Maral Jefroudi, Melih Yeşilbağ, and Selim Özgen. They were virtually with me, with their joys in the days and also the nights when I was writing this thesis. The contribution of Alpkan Birelma was invaluable in all senses. Any word would be insufficient to express my gratitude to him. I thank to Alpkan.

Finally, I would like to thank to my mother Hafize Alnıaçık for her spiritual support to me in whole life. I am very fortunate for being her daughter.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Two Scenes of Paşabahçe: Present and Past.....	1
The Issue of Working Class.....	5
The Literature on Deindustrialization and Neoliberal Urbanism.....	12
Return to the Scenes of Paşabahçe.....	21
CHAPTER II: HISTORY OF PLACE.....	27
Brief History of Industrialization and Urbanization in Paşabahçe.....	29
From Factories to the “Basin’s Strike”.....	39
Deindustrialization.....	44
Urban Restructuring.....	53
CHAPTER III: THE EXPERIENCES OF THE ACTUAL CONDITIONS OF EXISTENCE.....	59
Perceptions of the Working Life.....	60
Becoming Victim of Privatization.....	64
“Disease” for the Young: Informal Work in the Sweatshops.....	69
Serving the Rich.....	77
Youth under the Yoke of Unemployment.....	83
Interim Remarks.....	89
Perceptions of Changing Conditions of Inhabitation: “Psychology of Exile”.....	90
“Squatters” and Their Claim of “Roots”.....	95
“Planning for the Sake of the Rich”.....	102
Concluding Remarks.....	108
CHAPTER IV: SOLIDARITY, RESISTANCE, AND THEIR LIMITS.....	111
At the Level of Working Life.....	112
The Failure of Primary Resort: The Dislocation of the Unions.....	113
Leaving Work as a Form of Resistance.....	117
Urban Tension.....	122
Emergent Neighborhood Protection Associations.....	127
Limits.....	134
Concluding Remarks.....	139
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION.....	141
LIST OF INTERVIEWS AND MEETINGS.....	147
APPENDIX.....	150
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	153

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Two Scenes of Paşabahçe: Present and Past

On 13 March 2008, at about 17:00, the members of the *Herkese Sağlık Güvenli Gelecek Platformu* (the Platform for Health, a Secure Future for All) opened a stand in Paşabahçe square to collect signatures on a petition against the new social security reform bill¹ that threatened the right to retire. Three young student-like activists were shouting slogans like “We will not become retired in the grave!”² to attract the attention of the people, mainly the elderly, who passed by on the street or sat on the park benches. Two older activists, who seemed like remnants of the teachers from the days of the Village Institutes, were calling to their acquaintances from the passers-by to sign the petition. Two formally dressed, middle-aged activists who were working in the hospital as doctors were also there to collect signatures for the campaign. Then another activist came and asked me: “Do you want to sign?” I explained my purpose for being there, to study the contemporary existence of the working class and class relations in the borough after the joint process of deindustrialization and the development of gated communities and under the present threat of displacement. I used the language of class, since he seemed to be aware of this language. I had not erred. He had been one of the leftists hit by the 12 September coup d’état. As he was very interested in my study, our conversation continued.

¹ *Sosyal Sigortalar ve Genel Sağlık Sigortası (SSGSS)*: Social Insurances and General Health Insurance.

² “Mezarda emekli olmayacağız!”

He started a well-known long talk on the current state of the world and Turkey and how it had changed following the 1980s. He described the bad fate of the working class under “the effects of neoliberalism.” In his narrative, Paşabahçe was a place which had witnessed the plant shutdowns dramatically. Unionized, life-time, and formal jobs faded away with the factories and were unevenly replaced with flexible and informal ones. Correspondingly, the new working population of Paşabahçe was not direct respondents of this new bill as most of them worked informally. He talked about the worse conditions of the workers in textile sweatshops. When the “rich had come to the neighborhood,” the women had started to work in domestic service in Acarkent, the nearby gated community. He added the people who were working outside the neighborhood. The unemployed young and the retirees from factories were the residual population out of employment. These were the people of Paşabahçe, in whose ways of experiencing class I am interested, but who were not – and might be impossible to be – there at the petition stand, even around the square, due to their working conditions. The exception was the retirees; they were in the square, as they were the day time population of Paşabahçe.

The experiential scene is introductory to this thesis since it contrasts greatly, if we turn the clock back, to the days when factories were open. It is possible to imagine that again around 17:00 o’clock, the day shift ended in the factories and the day workers moved out, while others were waiting to go in. At least some of them would have meet at the petition stand; at most they would have gotten into touch with this petition as they became aware of it. The agenda of the stand would have been related to their conditions in the retirement years. They were the direct respondents of the new social security reform bill since they were the formally working population of Paşabahçe and they had the possibility to get retired in those

days of factories. Maybe my dialogue with the activist of that day would be based on, again, the issue of class, but whether the local unions would keep the union confederations' promises to hold a warning strike, the factory workers' accounts of the new social security reform bill, etc. Thus, he might have been explaining their political efforts in the factories to organize the workers.

If the date of this past scene is turned back to the 1970s, he would have insisted on the existence of “conscious” class since the district was remapped as *Küçük Moskova* (“Little Moscow”), when the left as political orientation had been hegemonic. But if we set the petition stand in the context of the 1990s, he would have mentioned that the factory workers persuaded to their conditions under capitalism due to their already affluence in the factories since the district was then called *Türkiye'nin Almanyası* (“Germany of Turkey”). However, in those two past eras, before 1980s and after 1990s, or to say it, before the closure of the factories, we would have talked about relatively homogeneous existence of working class people who were placed in the three factories and again relatively homogenous space of Paşabahçe related to the income level of the inhabitants. Concurrently, the threat of displacement would not be a matter.

These two – or two and a half – scenes of the square of Paşabahçe, the “imagined” for the past and the “experienced” in the present, can be compared from various dimensions, including the characteristics of the existing populations touching with the stand in the square, the agents in the stands, and the pattern and content of the dialogue between the activists and me. In this comparison, there appear certain themes which can be considered as separate issues. In Paşabahçe, the previous social formation was checked and questioned; first, by the changes in the organization of the working environment – from fordism to flexible production related to

deindustrialization; second, by the urban dynamic, the development of gated communities and rise of the threat of displacement related to urban transformation; and last, by the workers' attitudes towards their fate in this environment, the problem of class formation and consciousness.

The supposed history and transformation of the stand in the Paşabahçe square gathers together these separate themes in a specific manner. At the surface, it is a story of dislocation from the previous social formation that centered the factories and the corresponding class relations. The objective conditions of this formation were altered. There are no more blue-collar, life-long job positions. The time when the roads, parks, and coffeehouses were crowded has changed. The factories disappeared while they were composing lives for the industrial workers, for their families and communities, not only their material conditions but also their life-rhythms in a wide range from the everyday to the long term life cycle. Also, the subjective stance was displaced as the people became "matter out of place." Being an industrial worker or belonging in a tradition of industry was experienced as a claim-making device for a better livelihood in the past. There are no more unions that are locally effective. Whether the unions were successful in the past is another discussion, but in this new situation, the place of Paşabahçe has gotten rid of them too. On the other hand, the gated communities have developed at the higher elevations, neighboring the borough. This fact was the other dimension of the change which sowed the seeds of discord and contention among the people of Paşabahçe. They became beset by worries and apprehension of what was to follow in the district since it would mean also physical displacement due to the urban transformation. As the people of Paşabahçe witnessed this prominent social and structural change, they came to be dislocated between the past and the present.

To this contemporary picture of Paşabahçe, the first question, that will be asked is: “Given a definite structure of society, the class theory works; but what if that structure itself undergoes change?”³ This question is related to the relevance of class theory in the contemporary world. In this thesis, it merits consideration, since it is related to the scale and scope of class analysis in and after the moments of social change. Moreover, responding to this question will make clear the stance about the issue of working class in this thesis. Bearing in mind this question, I will survey mainly the literature of deindustrialization as representation of the experience of specific social change. Here, the approach to neoliberal urbanism will provide the framework for the development of gated communities and urban transformation. Then, I will be able to scrutinize the case of Paşabahçe, as a mirror that might reflect some images of the discussion.

The Issue of Working Class

The question above is related to the relevance of class analysis in and after the specific moments of social changes under capitalism, as at these moments the dispute over class always becomes heated. This question has been directed to the class thinkers; either to those who consider class to be an economic (and occupational) category or to the others who approach the issue of class from the standpoint of cultural formation. The embourgeoisement theory, the erosion of working class cultures, the advent of consumer society are all matters that emerge in the discussion about the issue of class. Even the “death of class” is voiced with

³ Ayşe Buğra refers to this question of Karl Polanyi in her essay “Bir Toplumsal Dönüşümü Anlama Çabalarına Katkı: Bugün Türkiye’de E. P. Thompson’ı Okumak, in *İngiliz İşçi Sınıfının Oluşumu*, trans. by Uygur Kocabaşoğlu (Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2004), pp. 11-38, p.13.

reference to these changes. Then, the critique of class theory is renovated within the so-called radical developments named “post” like post-industrial society, post-fordism, and lastly post-modernism.⁴ The rise of the service sector and correspondingly diverse positions in this sector has weight in this literature. The changing characteristic of work relations is another issue. Since race, gender, and ethnicity come to be important in the analysis of social change, the plurality and complexity of identities matters in the discussion about class. Then, the success of neoliberalism is described as either the defeat of class or the advent of the individual. These discussions have certain results on class analysis, as Mike Savage, an adherent of expanding class analysis, suggests that its horizon is narrowed, since after these changes, “only the specific kinds of empirical evidence are deemed to be relevant to the class analysis project.”⁵

These debates seem to be inflated from certain social-structural changes. However, they are also related to the relevance of class analysis in concerning the cultural and political attitudes of individuals who are considered to be summed up in different classes. The issue is about whether the individuals’ political and cultural postures are oriented towards their supposed location in the class diagram. In other words, the issue is the well-known problem of “class consciousness.” The conventional meaning of class and also consciousness seems to be unsecured within these debates. Under these pressures, the appeal to the use of quantitative survey methods is one of the ways to examine “the empirical relation between class structure and an attitudinal measure of class consciousness.”⁶ This analytic approach to the problem of consciousness has selected the conscious segment of the class

⁴ For a short overview of this literature in the case of Britain, see Mike Savage, *Class Analysis and Social Transformation* (Open University Press, 2000), pp. 3-22.

⁵ Ibid., p. ix.

⁶ E. O. Wright, *Classes* (London: Verso, 1985).

according to its own criteria of determination. However, some defenders of class analysis have responded to this problem of class consciousness in a different manner. They criticize this analytic approach since its criteria are considered to occlude more than they can represent. So, they turn to a qualitative understanding of class, based on more culturalist arguments. In this camp, either some reconfigure classes and consciousness in certain moments of “action” in certain camps of solidarity,⁷ or others reformulate the existent individualistic moments of differentiation as already incorporated in the making of class.⁸ The account of “history of everyday life” is another variant of renovating class analysis by rejecting “the old institutionally and politically bounded forms of labor history.”⁹ Like the other culturalist approaches, this school has defended a more qualitative understanding of class and turned the ethnographic gaze on the “inner world of popular experience” in the context of everyday life. All these distinct efforts are directed to reinvigorate class related conceptualizations in considering the socio-political atmosphere of late twentieth century.¹⁰

E. P. Thompson and Pierre Bourdieu’s approaches to the issue of class are championed in these culturalist approaches. Focusing on them, it can be said that, although these approaches consider the issue of working class in different scales and scopes, they share a common ground as embodying the changes in the social-

⁷ Rick Fantasia, *Cultures of Solidarity: Consciousness, Action, and Contemporary American Workers*, (Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1988).

⁸ Savage, pp. 101-121.

⁹ Alf Lüdtké (ed.), *The History of Everyday Life: Reconstructing Historical Experiences and Ways of Life*, trans. William Templer (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1995).

¹⁰ For a discussion on the issue of working class, see Scott G. McNall, Rhonda F. Levine, and Rick Fantasia (eds.), *Bringing Class Back in: Contemporary and Historical Perspectives* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1991); Pierre Bourdieu, “What Makes a Social Class? On the Theoretical and Practical Existence of Groups,” *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 32 (1987), pp. 1-17; E. O. Wright, “Reflection on Classes,” *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 32 (1987), pp. 19-49; Micheal Burawoy, The Limits of Wright’s Analytical Marxism and an Alternative, *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 32 (1987), pp.51-72; Geoff Eley and Keith Nield, “Scholarly Controversy: Farewell to the Working Class?” *International Labor and Working Class History*, 57 (Spring 2000), pp. 1-30.

structural level –or, in Bourdieu’s terms, the “objectivist moment,” in harmony with cultural and symbolic stance of class – the “subjectivist moment.”¹¹ As they do not divorce the agency of class from its social structural counterpart and as they focus on the class bias in these social changes, they are able to consider these changes from the standpoint point of class. This attribute of the issue of working class has its meaning in E. P. Thompson, as class is considered to be a dynamic “process” of making, unmaking, or remaking. Rick Fantasia mentions this fact as:

Classes are social configurations structured from without (in terms of the changing “bases and forms of interclass systems of material and symbolic relations”) and from within (“interclass relations” or what is often called “class formation”), but classes are also always *partial* social configurations to the extent that they are constantly in a process of organization, disorganization, and reorganization in relation to their conflicts with other classes.¹²

This statement points at four facts important for the scope of class analysis and its relevance considering specific social changes. First, rather than there being “ready-made” or “static” classes, there are multi-dimensional “relations.” Second, social structural changes are considered to be explicable with reference to this dynamic understanding of class as a “process.” Third, the context of the class analysis needs to be specified since they are not the “same” classes in all moments of this process, as classes are changing both from without and within in its own dialectic. Last, as conflicts with other classes matter in this process, class struggle is the very foundation of the making of classes.

These arguments are found in a certain approach to the issue of working class that owes much to E. P. Thompson. Their meanings can be deepened with reference

¹¹ Bourdieu, “What Makes a Social Class? On the Theoretical and Practical Existence of Groups.”

¹² Rick Fantasia, “From Class Consciousness to Culture, Action, and Social Organization,” *Annual Review of Sociology*, 21 (1995), pp. 269-287, p. 275. See also L.J.D. Wacquant, “Making Class: Middle Class(es) in Social Theory and Social Structure,” in *Bringing Class Back in: Contemporary and Historical Perspectives*, eds. by Scott G. McNall, Rhonda F. Levine, and Rick Fantasia (Boulder: Westview Press, 1991), pp. 39-64.

to his writings, mainly *The Making of English Working Class* and *Class Struggle without Class*. In the *Making*, Thompson considers class “an historical phenomenon, unifying a number of disparate and seemingly unconnected events, both in the raw material of experience and in consciousness.” He means class to be, rather than “a ‘structure’, nor even as a ‘category’, but as something which in fact happens (and can be shown to have happened) in human relationships.”¹³ With this expression, he rejects the reification of class – the conceptualization of class as a “thing,” usually done by positivist sociology and Marxist structuralism.

In his further essay, *Class Struggle without Class*, he rearticulates his understanding of class with reference to their “false” considerations:

. . . there arises the alternative notion of class as a *static*, either sociological or heuristic, category. The two are different, but both employ categories of stasis. In one very popular (usually positivistic) sociological tradition, class can be reduced to literal quantitative measurement: so many people in this or that relation to means of production, or in more vulgar terms, so many wage-earners, white-collar workers, etc. or class is what class people say they *think* they belong to in response to a questionnaire . . .¹⁴

Thompson rejects the category of “class” deduced from an “employment aggregate.” On the contrary, he offers to focus class as a relation experienced by real people in a real context:

. . . we can not have two distinct classes, each with independent being, and then bring them *into* relation with each other . . . And class happens, when some men, as a result of common experiences (inherited or shared), feel and articulate the identity of their interests as between themselves, and against other men whose interests are different from (and usually opposed to) theirs. The class experience is largely determined by the productive relations into which men are born – or enter involuntarily.¹⁵

¹³ E. P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (New York: Vintage Books, 1966), p. 9.

¹⁴ Thompson, “Eighteenth Century English Society: Class Struggle without Class,” *Social Theory*, 3, no.2 (1978), pp.133-165, p. 148.

¹⁵ Thompson, *The Making*, p. 9.

This “experiential definition of class”¹⁶ enables Thompson to observe the “making” process of class beyond economic categories and the factory walls, in its social, political and cultural manifestations, and also in its spatial configurations. Moreover, he maintains this making process due to the fact that the attention is turned to the experiences of class relations in the process of the class struggle. In fact, as he writes:

. . . classes do not exist as separate entities, look around, find an enemy class, and then start to struggle. On the contrary, people find themselves in a society structured in determined ways (crucially, but not exclusively, in productive relations), they experience exploitation (or the need to maintain power over those whom they exploit), they identify points of antagonistic interest, they commence to struggle around these issues and in the process of struggling they discover themselves as classes, they come to know this discovery as class-consciousness. Class and class-consciousness are always the last, not the first stage in the real historical process.¹⁷

Thompson’s approach to the issue of class and class consciousness incorporated with the class struggle is credible in being concerned with the relevance of class analysis in considering certain social changes. He has presented his contribution to class analysis in the examination of a specific social change, namely industrialization. He proposes that rather than there has occurred a ready-made working class, there was a making process, as people has experienced dispossession and invited to know the “class strategy”¹⁸ directed against themselves.

Correspondingly, his contribution is credible because it enables us to observe “the

¹⁶ Geoff Eley, “Edward Thompson, Social History and Political Culture: The Making of a Working-class Public, 1780-1850,” in *E.P. Thompson, Critical Perspectives*, eds. by Harvey J. Kaye and Keith McClelland (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990), pp. 12-49, p.31.

¹⁷ Thompson, “Eighteenth Century English Society,” p. 149.

¹⁸ Henri Lefebvre, “Industrialization and Urbanization” in *The Writings on Cities*, eds. and trans. Eleonore Kofman and Elizabeth Lebas, (Cambridge, Mass, USA: Blackwell Publishers, 1996), pp. 65-85. He uses this term “class strategy” as for the ruling class, strategy is either planned or spontaneous, but converges to a final result, justified by an ideology, namely rationalism: “A typical class strategy, does that mean a series of concerted actions, planned with a single aim? No. Class character seems that much deeper than several concerted actions, centered around several objectives, has nevertheless converged towards a final result.”

tensions and conflicts within social processes,” rather than it “nudges one towards a view of society in terms of a self regulating sociological order.”¹⁹ Either these tensions are making class or unmaking certain class formations. In view of class processes, these social changes are not neutral or non-contradictory. In other words, the supposed social changes can be considered to be the very basis and object of class struggle, rather than the basis for the claim of “death of class,” since these changes has been realized by certain agencies that have class bias involving in these processes, in their own contexts.

In this thesis, I propose to focus deindustrialization and urban restructuring as a compact case of social change and as the basis of class struggle. The class bias of these changes is mentioned in the related literature, as I will survey below. I will focus more on the literature on deindustrialization related to this paradigm of working class, whether it is death or how it is living, since it can be found in this literature in a more observable and sharpened way. On the other hand, the literature on neoliberal urbanism will provide the framework of the logic of dispossession in which the workers’ communities are forced to live. Whether and how these changes are making, remaking or unmaking class will be, then, the issue examined throughout the thesis in the case of Paşabahçe.

The Literature on Deindustrialization and Neoliberal Urbanism

Factories may be closed for management-centered reasons, like economic constriction, to debilitate trade union activity and organized labor militancy, or the new mentality of urbanism and increasing rents in the place. These causes are not

¹⁹ Thompson, “Patricians and Plebs” in *Customs in Common*, E. P. Thompson, (London: Penguin, 1993), pp. 16-96, p. 19.

mutually exclusive, but the ones related to the built environment have a specific aspect in considering the conditions of class struggle. When the reasons for plant-closure involve the new orientations of the ruling class in the urban space, the place becomes politicized within urban restructuring projects. In these contexts, the processes of deindustrialization and urban transformation share a common ground as these issues are related to the fate of working class in urban setting. Both mean displacement for the working class from their old determinate conditions in the urban space.

While urban transformation is directed against the living conditions of workers, deindustrialization is related to the disappearance of old working conditions in the urban environment. So the class bias in these processes is apparent in the corresponding literatures. In this thesis, the literature on neoliberal urbanism will be deployed to provide the framework of analysis for the development of gated communities and urban transformation. Also, deindustrialization should be contextualized as a practice of neoliberal urbanism. Then, I will concentrate on the issue of deindustrialization and its own literature in detail, since this literature seems to be more appropriate for discussing the main paradigm of this thesis: the issue of working class.

The relation of neoliberal urbanism with deindustrialization is a good point to start. Neoliberalism, defined as a “utopia of unlimited exploitation,”²⁰ has been known for its destructive effects since the crisis of the Fordist-Keynesian development model of capitalism in the early 1970s. From a political economic perspective, Neil Brenner and Nik Theodore evaluate the process of

²⁰ This conceptualization belongs to Pierre Bourdieu. Quoted in Neil Brenner and Nik Theodore, “Cities and the Geographies of ‘Actually Existing Neoliberalism’”, in *Spaces of Neoliberalism*, eds. by Neil Brenner and Nik Theodore, (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), pp.2-32, p.2.

“neoliberalization”²¹ with its capacity of “production of space” compatible with the new accumulation strategy, “creative destruction.”²² They identify one of the premises of “actually existing neoliberalism” as “particularly during periods of systemic crisis, inherited frameworks of capitalist territorial organization may be destabilized as capital seeks to transcend socio-spatial infrastructures and systems of class relations that no longer provide a secure basis for sustained accumulation.”²³ When deindustrialization is considered from this perspective of capital accumulation, plant-closures correspond to the destructive face of this orientation of capital. It destroys the organized labor and life-space of settled population. For the side of capital, however, this destruction is utilized as a means to “undercut the constraints that tie it to particular set of geographical conditions” that are “costs,” like labor and land use, since it flows to places where it is able to deal with the “politics of work.”²⁴

In this pattern of neoliberal urbanism, the tendency of “creation” corresponds to the building of a new “infrastructure for market-oriented economic growth, commodification, and the rule of capital.”²⁵ The new mentality of urbanism steps in at this phase as plans are made to transform the previous industrial landscape with investments, yet, according to the rule of neoliberalism. Market-oriented strategy defines the “competitiveness” of the place according to the physical and social

²¹ Ibid., pp. 6-7.

²² Ibid., pp. 15-19. See also David Harvey “Neoliberalism as Creative Destruction,” *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 610 (2007), pp. 21-44. His similar term is “accumulation by dispossession” which characterized the neoliberal age of capitalism with “the continuation and proliferation of accumulation practices that Marx had treated of as ‘primitive’ or ‘original’ during the rise of capitalism. These practices includes the commodification and privatization of land, conversion of various forms of property rights (common, collective, state, etc.) into exclusive private property rights; suppression of rights to the commons.

²³ Brenner and Theodore, “Cities and the Geographies of ‘Actually Existing Neoliberalism’,” p. 7.

²⁴ Allen J. Scott, Industrial Organization and the Logic of Intra-Metropolitan Location: I. Theoretical Considerations, *Economic Geography*, 59, no. 3 (1983), pp. 233-250, p. 247.

²⁵ Brenner and Theodore, “Cities and the Geographies of ‘Actually Existing Neoliberalism’,” p. 15.

characteristics. Then, either these places are transformed into financial centers according to the model of “global city” or are built as luxury housing estates, like the process started in my case of Paşabahçe, or the heritage of industry is commodified for the interests of the tourism sector.²⁶ Brenner and Theodore mention that an inherent part of this “creation” is the establishment of new forms of social-spatial inequality, polarization, and displacement. Accompanying the devitalization of organized labor, employment relations become atomized, so that flexibility and informality are promoted.

The state and other forms of urban governance are also modified in this process as they take their role in neoliberal urbanism. In accordance with the demise of Keynesianism, “demand-side urbanization”²⁷ is dismantled, and as Neil Smith writes, “the neoliberal state becomes a consummate agent of –rather than the regulator of – the market”²⁸ due to the impetus of “supply-side urbanization.” In other words, the shift occurs “from an urban scale defined according to the conditions of social reproduction to one in which investment of productive capital holds definitive precedence.”²⁹ Smith’s actual case of evaluation is gentrification, which was conceptualized early in the 1960s by Ruth Glass as the flow of the upper and middle classes to the old working class districts by displacing them.³⁰ In a

²⁶ For this impetus see John Urry, *Consuming Places* (London; New York: Routledge, 1995), pp. 129-172. He analyzes the case of Lancashire after deindustrialization as reinterpretation of local culture for the creation of a consumable places.

²⁷ Neil Smith, “New Globalism, New Urbanism: Gentrification as Global Urban Strategy,” in *Spaces of Neoliberalism*, eds. by Neil Brenner and Nik Theodore, (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), pp. 80-103, p.89.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 80.

²⁹ Ibid., p.80.

³⁰ For a different account of gentrification see Chris Hamnett, “Gentrification, Postindustrialism, and Industrial and Occupational Restructuring in Global Cities” in *A Companion to the City*, eds. by Gary Bridge and Sophie Watson (Oxford, UK; Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2003), pp. 331-341, p. 335 and p. 337. In fact, Hamnett and Smith picture gentrification as a composite of a broad dynamics post-industrialism and neoliberalism. Correspondingly, they follow different lines of reasoning; the former points out the evidence of the growing earnings in global cities, whereas the

similar way, neoliberal urbanism identifies “urban development projects” other than the original cases of gentrification as “elite-playing fields, on which the stake is to shape an urban future in line with the aspirations of the most powerful segment(s) among the participants.”³¹ Based on this evidence, Swyngedouw et al. argue that one of the main characteristics of the present urban policy is its “selective ‘middle and upper-class’ democracy,” in search of economic growth and competitiveness.³² In fact, the present age of urbanism is identified as a process that changes the spatial concentration of classes in the urban environment at a certain cost for the working class as the “global strategy” of neoliberalism.³³ All in all, in the age of neoliberalism, working class becomes “the victim of segregation” either spontaneous, voluntary or programmed, which Henri Lefebvre once identified with the “class strategy” of urbanism.³⁴

Thus, the issues of this thesis are the experience and the response of the “victim,” which will be discussed within its limits. Certainly, this search needs to take into account the effects of deindustrialization on working class communities. Then its literature should be overviewed.

latter points out the reverse, the “gradual deskilling an expanded working class.” Hamnett bases his argument of post-industrialism on the idea that “changing industrial and occupational class and earning structures of capitalist cities combined with an understanding of changes in the education, gender, and cultural composition of the expanded urban middle class.” Indeed, the approach of post-industrial society emphasizes the rise of high-tech and service economy at the expense of manufacturing jobs and its theory expects that the expanding service economy will include the proportion of labor excluded from the manufacturing sector. In this thesis, I keep on about Smith’s approach to the issue as manifestation of neoliberal urbanism since the literature on deindustrialization seems to be about the disastrous effects of plant-closures on the workers’ communities.

³¹ Erik Swyngedouw, Frank Moulert, and Arantxa Rodirguez, “Neoliberal Urbanization in Europe: Large Scale Urban Development Projects and the New Urban Policy,” in *Spaces of Neoliberalism*, eds. by Brenner and Theodore, (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), pp. 195-229, p. 216.

³² Ibid., p.195.

³³ Neil Smith, “New Globalism, New Urbanism: Gentrification as Global Urban Strategy.”

³⁴ Henri Lefebvre, “Spectral Analysis” in *The Writings on Cities*, eds. and trans. by Eleonore Kofman and Elizabeth Lebas, (Cambridge, Mass, USA: Blackwell Publishers, 1996), pp. 139-146.

Focusing on the literature on deindustrialization, the issue of working class becomes apparent as the defeat of the male blue-collar working class and disorganization of a specific class formation in both economic and cultural terms. Correspondingly, the common themes that arise in this literature are the personal consequences of the involuntary termination of work and the trouble in inter-generational relations; the impacts of plant-closures on the community and the symbolic meaning of social space; and the erosion of class specific institutions and the difficulties in the new working life.

About the personal consequences of the end of work, in the edition *The Weight of the World*, Bourdieu mentions that “signs of individual decline” accompany “the collective decline of the industrial firms” in these locals.³⁵ Since work is experienced as a measure of “self-worth,” its involuntary termination is felt as subversion. They lose their future, the “continuation and justification of their past.”³⁶ Portelli expresses the common narrative of deindustrialization as workers’ “songs and the stories about plant closings are about silence, emptiness, defeat, disappointment – and anger.”³⁷ In Anderson’s book *Code of the Street*, the personal role challenged by deindustrialization is expressed as “decent daddy’s role of sponsorship” in both economic and moral terms, since it provides an important basis for the “integrity of the community.”³⁸ In fact, for the youth who did not personally experience being factory worker, but unemployed, deindustrialization is considered

³⁵ Bourdieu, *The Weight of the World: Social Suffering in Contemporary Society* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1999).

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

³⁷ Alessandro Portelli, “‘This Mill Won’t Run No More’: Oral History and Deindustrialization” in *New Working Class Studies*, eds. by John Russo and Sherry Lee Linkon (Ithaca [N.Y.]: ILR Press, 2005), pp. 54-59, p. 57.

³⁸ Cited in L. J. D. Wacquant, “Scrutinizing the Street: Poverty, Morality, and the pitfalls of Urban Ethnography,” *The American Journal of Sociology*, 107, no. 6 (May 2002), pp. 1468 – 1532. p. 1494.

to mean the loss of future which stresses them in the depth of despair. In the neighborhoods, which are shook with plant-closures, the extensiveness of drug-using is mentioned as a common circumstance fallen to the youth's share.³⁹

About community relations in deindustrialized places, the literature mentions "dispersal" as commonly experienced outcome.⁴⁰ Since factories were an important nerve center in the daily life of neighborhoods, the public order which had been maintaining inherently in the social space is broken. The residents perceive plant-closures as the trivialization of both their communities and places. This situation triggers the "loss of hinterland" that had been previously helping "cushion the blow of economic hardships."⁴¹ In these cases, neighborhoods could not absorb the costs of job flight with their communal ties. In his study on French working class banlieues and American underclass ghettos, Wacquant renames them as "neighborhoods of relegation" and "penalized spaces," where the change from "communal 'places' suffused with shared emotions, joint meanings and practices and institutions of mutuality" to "independent 'spaces' of mere survival and contest" occurs.⁴² Plant closures are the way on the experience of the "dissolution of places" since local habits, alliances, and also their resources seem to be dismantled.

About class specific institutions, namely trade unions, in his study *Folk Constructions of a Plant Closing*, Donald Tuski writes that they are considered to be the sources of the farewell of factories and blamed in contradictory ways in some

³⁹ See M. Fine and L. Weis, *The Unknown City: Lives of Poor and Working Class Young Adults* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1988); Elijah Anderson, *Code of the Street: Decency, Violence, and the Moral Life of the InnerCity* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1999).

⁴⁰ J. R. Cowie and J. Heathcott, *Beyond the Ruins: The Meanings of Deindustrialization* (Ithaca, ILR Press, 2003).

⁴¹ L. J. D. Wacquant, "The Rise of Advanced Marginality: Notes on its Nature and Implications," *Acta Sociologica*, 39, no.2 (1996), pp. 121-139, p. 127.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 126. He differentiates place from space, those accompany respectively fordism and post-fordism: "Places are 'full' and 'fixed,' stable arenas whereas 'spaces' are 'potential voids,' 'possible threats' arenas that have to be feared, secured or fled."

cases for demanding high wages, erroneously organized resistances or of having cooperated with the industrial management.⁴³ Indeed, trade unions suffer in the case of deindustrialization as they lose their base of agency in the local affairs. In addition, the post-fordist structure of the surviving jobs is part-time, flexible, diverse, and yet considered to be “privilege”⁴⁴ in the days of high unemployment. Wacquant argues that wage-labor relation does not offer any collective agency in concerning the issues about locals.⁴⁵ In his writings on the “neighborhoods of relegation,” he mentions that unemployment becomes a chronic problem rather than frictional. For this condition, he says “the pressure of deproletarianization” that is put on especially youth, who “lacks a *language*, a repertoire of shared representations and signs through which to conceive a collective destiny and to project possible alternative futures.” In addition to the “absence of common idiom,” due to the characteristics of the work-centered institutions, namely, trade-unions as “ill-suited to tackle issues that arise and spill beyond the conventional sphere of regulated wage work,” the working class communities are fragmented both socially and symbolically.⁴⁶ The places that witness plant-shutdowns seem to be not accorded with the new working-life and its own dynamics.

In these contexts of deindustrialization, the community, which is self-conscious, collective, and organized around the dynamics of class relations, seems to be remembered within painful flashbacks from the industry. As this overview of the

⁴³ Donald L. Tuski, “Folk Constructions of a Plant Closing” (Ph.d diss., Michigan State University, 1998), pp. 121-126.

⁴⁴ Bourdieu mentions that trade unions weaken in this new working environment “especially because of mobilizing workers who are disenchanted and end up felling lucky to have a job at all.” Bourdieu, *The Weight of the World*.

⁴⁵ Wacquant, “The Rise of Advanced Marginality,” p. 124.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 128.

literature suggests, the process of the disorganization of working class communities is at the very center of the narrative of deindustrialization.

However, in the literature on deindustrialization, a critique of this narrative also exists. There are some approaches that construct the process of deindustrialization from a different perspective than the disorganization of communities and dissolution of places. As Jefferson Cowie suggests, these studies aim “to widen the scope of the discussion beyond prototypical plant shutdowns, the immediate politics of employment policy, the tales of victimization, or the swell of industrial nostalgia.”⁴⁷ Following this path, in their study on Youngstown, a deindustrialized steel city, Russo and Linkon criticize this common representation of deindustrialized communities as “places of failure” and dispersed communities. They write that if these communities face the “loss of self-esteem,” the institutions in these locals and the media are also responsible for this perception, since “tales of corporate disinvestments and collective resistance to shutdowns are forgotten and images of individual and communal failure gain precedence.”⁴⁸

Furthering this line of thought, Weinbaum, in her ethnographic research in Appalachian Tennessee, argues that even the workers failed to be successful; they were “able to see their plight in a far broader international context, to use legislative forums to challenge corporate flight, and to create organized campaigns to fight.”⁴⁹ She renames these struggles “successful failures” because the plant-closures developed people’s critical awareness of their dependent situation in the global

⁴⁷ J. R. Cowie and J. Heathcott, p. 2.

⁴⁸ John Russo and Sherry Lee Linkon, “Collateral Damage: Deindustrialization and the Uses of Youngstown,” in *Beyond the Ruins*, p. 202 and p. 217.

⁴⁹ Eve S. Weinbaum, “From Plant Closing to Political Movement: Challenging the Logic of Economic Destruction in Tennessee,” in *New Poverty Studies: The Ethnography of Power, Politics, and Impoverished People in United States*, eds. by Judith Goode and Jeff Maskovsky (New York, New York University Press, 2001), pp. 399-401, p. 400.

economy.⁵⁰ The reorganization of workers' communities matters in her study; however, when the scope of analysis widens, the failure again intrudes in the picture of deindustrialization. Nevertheless, these attributes are trying to construct the fate of working class beyond the experienced disorganization in deindustrialized places.

In this thesis, I will follow the approach to the deindustrialization process beyond the ruins. This approach, on the one hand keeping that the disorganization of working class communities as the common experienced outcome after the plant-closures, on the other mentions that in this process is also a making pattern since these communities experience the new direction of class relations having their memory of the past. Similarly, I will focus on the deindustrialization process from such a perspective that grounds class analysis. At this point, it should be mentioned that this approach can easily fall into the pitfall of romanticism, due to the fact that not falling into the other pitfall; victimization. Acknowledging these "pitfalls of urban ethnography," my endeavor will do far then celebrating the goodness or heroizing the people of Paşabahçe beyond the ruins of factories.⁵¹ Rather, my endeavor will be to focus on the process as a "far reaching conflict; that the historical record is not a simple one of neutral and inevitable technological change, but is also one of exploitation and of resistance to exploitation; and that values stand to be lost as well as gained."⁵² Whether and how it is in the process of making or unmaking working class will be, then, the matter in Paşabahçe.

⁵⁰ Weinbaum, *Successful Failures: Local Democracy in a Global Economy* (Ph.d diss., Yale University, 1997).

⁵¹ Wacquant, "Scrutinizing the Street: Poverty, Morality, and the Pitfalls of Urban Ethnography."

⁵² Thompson, "Time, Work Discipline and Industrial Capitalism," in *Customs in Common* (London: Penguin, 1993), pp. 352-403, p. 399.

Return to the Scenes of Paşabahçe

Paşabahçe witnessed a specific “working class neighborhood” that had a special and, in some aspects, exceptional history in the Turkish case. It is a district on the Bosphorus shore, can be distinguished by the identity of its residents, who were mainly workers in the past, in factories such as Paşabahçe Glass-Bottle (1935-2002), Sümerbank Leather-Shoe (1812-2004), and Tekel Alcohol (1930-2006).⁵³ Although Glass-Bottle was not a state economic enterprise, it was associated with the other two factories since all of these factories were included and directed in the first industrial plan of 1933. So the place resembled a rooted industrial basin. And its fate was bounded to the fate of working class. Correspondingly, Paşabahçe became a blue-collar workers’ basin as after the factories were founded in the district and enlarged of their volume of production, they populated the district with workers, mainly migrants from rural areas. As they constructed their *gecekondus* (“built at night”), they established their neighborhoods. Since generations of workers worked in the same factories, they were named “factory families.” Even the hospital *Paşabahçe Devlet Hastanesi* (“State Hospital”) near the square and one of the schools *Ferit İnal Lycee* were constructed by the management of their unions and with workers’ direct contribution. Moreover, in local elections they selected their representatives *muhtars* (“neighborhood headmen”) from former factory workers. Since Paşabahçe’s space was reshaped like a working class district, the population came together at the moments of popular movements that centered on the interests of workers mainly

⁵³ The name of the Leather-Shoe Factory was Dabakhane-i Klevehane-i Amire in the days of Ottoman Empire. In 1933, the factory was renamed as *Sümerbank Deri ve Kundura Sanayii Müessesesi*, and transformed to be state economic enterprise. See Önder Küçükerman, *Geleneksel Türk Dericilik Sanayi ve Beykoz Fabrikası: Boğaziçi’nde Başlatılan Sanayi* (Ankara: Sümerbank, 1988). For a recent study on this factory including the closure moment, see Hikmek Burak Tolga, *Endüstriyel Alanların Dönüşümü, Kentsel Mekana Etkileri: Beykoz Deri ve Kundura Fabrikası İçin Bir Dönüşüm Senaryosu*, (master’s thesis, Yıldız Technical University, 2006).

those from Glass-Bottle factory. As I mentioned above, the behavior of the workers led to the place being called, “*Küçük Moskova*” (“Little Moscow”) when left as political orientation was hegemonic until the 1980s and later “*Türkiye’nin Almanyası*” (“Germany of Turkey”) when the factory workers seemed to be affluent in 1990s. In short, the workers’ “determinate position in this objective space”⁵⁴ and their corresponding experiences of factory work including political, social, and economic dimension identified the district as a working class neighborhood in the days of industry.

However, the composite of deindustrialization and urban restructuring is experienced as a definite structural change. Plant-closures meant the end of a specific occupation as factory worker and the appearance of multiple, fragmented, and even low-status job positions for the few, but unemployment for the ill-fated many. Moreover, as mentioned above, plant-closures were experienced not only as a change in occupation, but also as a certain dispossession from old habits. The dialogue with the activist with whom I had the conversation at the stand can be considered from this perspective. When I explained the subject of my study to him, he responded by complaining about the place’s fate after deindustrialization. He was adapted to the discourse of the neoliberalism and the description of the unwanted “state of world and Turkey” that signals the bad fate of working class. He was expecting to be relocated in the situation of the past, in the imaginary of the working class’s subjective stance. He wanted the certain “class tradition” of the past and its own observable way of agency against the experienced dispossessions and for the acquisitions of the day.

⁵⁴ Pierre Bourdieu, “What Makes a Social Class? On the Theoretical and Practical Existence of Groups.”

The rich appeared in our conversation as an agent different from that of the inhabitants of Paşabahçe. They experienced a new kind of work relation with these new rich in the gated communities by the mediation of workers, especially women, working in low paying and low status domestic service. The intrusion of wealthy people to the place of Paşabahçe meant providing maintenance for these women and their families. In other words, this sections' sustenance is bonded to the existence of the rich. However, some people of Paşabahçe have experienced this new relation came at a certain cost of dispossession due to the closure of factories. They did not appropriate this relation as a neutral "bond." Moreover, the process of urban restructuring did more than the happening of this new relation as it is only one side of the coin.

Having listened to another man from Paşabahçe, the son of a former glassworker Ferhat, the other side of the coin appears as the relation becomes double-sided. He said that "thus, we are living the *crisis of deindustrialization*. There is no job; even they want us to move out the houses."⁵⁵ In Ferhat's expressions, the crisis of deindustrialization conjoined with the menace of urban transformation, signifying the other side of the coin: the fear to be displaced from their gecekondu due to the intrusion of the rich. As in the present, they were constructed to be "squatter" in the place and the urban planning process had been stepped in.

All in all, deindustrialization impoverished the men and women of Paşabahçe and paved the way for the occurrence of a bonded relation with the new rich of the gated communities. Moreover, the coming of the rich also signaled the appearance of the threat of displacement in a sharpened way. The development of gated

⁵⁵ This was an informal interview with three young males done for a previous study in an office of one leftist political party in Paşabahçe neighborhood, in 25 December, 2006. "Şöyle ki, biz sanayisizleşmenin krizini yaşıyoruz. Burada iş yok, hatta evlerimizden de atmaya çalışıyorlar"

communities was seen as displacing them from the borough. Correspondingly, Paşabahçe has become a surface of transformation of class relations into a double-sided relation like between the “laboring poor” and the “gentry.” Here, both employment relations and use of space matter. For people who have the memory of the past formation of borough, the plight of the borough in this process is clear: it is now “the closure of factories and becoming the slave of the rich.” However, for the future, it means complete dislocation from the borough.

In this contemporary picture of Paşabahçe, my study aims to capture the dynamics of this process from a relationary outlook upon class. Considering class as a “partial social configuration” in a constant “process of organization, disorganization, and reorganization,” I will argue that while the pressure of deindustrialization is unmaking the past’s working class, since it is conjoined with urban transformation, a counter tendency of remaking could be observable in the case of Paşabahçe. Moreover, the base of this counter tendency is the use of the “past” to appropriate the present and the future, their own. The changing characteristics of class relations need to be incorporated in the contemporary analysis of class with reference to people’s experiences of their past. In other words, the story of Paşabahçe is that of “farewell to the factory,” farewell to the specific organization of class around the specific institution *factory* and occupation *factory worker*. Thus, how the old collectivities, their institutions, and languages are dismantled, while what survives and exists as common to all, and how class is being articulated as these new objective conditions of class relations is actualized and appropriated by social agents are the matters of this thesis. The answers are open, like this process is open, and not immune from tensions and conflict.

Then the format of this thesis can be introduced. In the second chapter, I will historicize the present of Paşabahçe in the wider context of Turkey. As Paşabahçe has been a specific borough in the Turkish experience of industrialization and urbanization, I will mention both its specificities and commonalities in the Turkish context. I will frame how the specificity of the borough marked the class formation in the 1960s and 1970s. Then, I will summarize the process of deindustrialization in periods from its first announcement in 1980s to last the moment of the closures of factories. This chapter will also include the beginnings of urban tension that arrived with the development of gated communities. In all, this chapter will end with taking Paşabahçe from past to present. The sources of this chapter will be secondary rather than the primary ones, my interviews in the field work in Paşabahçe.

In the third chapter, I will introduce the people of Paşabahçe and their partial views on their actual conditions of existence. I will represent them in the working life and under the threat of displacement. How they have perceived the trajectory of Paşabahçe's working environment towards informalization and feminization will be the first part in this chapter. Then, I will introduce their voices on their perception of being called "illegal occupants" according to the new urban regeneration plans. Their "town talks" on the dark future will illustrate the contested neighborhood space more explicitly. Here, my emphasis will be mainly on their use of past – the days of industry, in identification of their present situation.

The fourth chapter will discuss the original inhabitants of Paşabahçe in the struggle over these perceived conditions of existence. Their acts of resistance and means of solidarity should be represented here with their limits. As collective institutions based on the wage-labor relation, namely trade unions has fade away from the common terrain of Paşabahçe, whether and how they are appropriating this

new working environment will be the first. Then, their strategies against the application of the urban regeneration plans will be depicted, including the emergent neighborhood associations. Also, related to urban transformation the limits of collective organization and popular action will be mentioned.

CHAPTER II

HISTORY OF PLACE

This chapter will present the factual history of the industrial basin of Beykoz, Paşabahçe, around three factories, Paşabahçe Glass-Bottle, Sümerbank Leather-Shoe, and Tekel Alcohol Factory. The neighborhoods in which I conducted my fieldwork were Tokatköy and Yalıköy, which are located next to the Leather-Shoe factory; and Gümüşsuyu, İncirköy, Çiğdem, Soğuksu, and Paşabahçe, located nearby the Glass-Bottle and Tekel, which are close to each other around a 15 minutes walk. Although today Paşabahçe is only the name of one official neighborhood, I will take this basin as an entity named Paşabahçe, mostly for practical reasons, but also for some geographical/historical reasons.

The settlement characteristic in this basin can be argued as correlated to the development of the industrial sector, different from the overall settlement within the official borders of Beykoz. There were many cases of solidarity actions among the workers of the three factories, and thus among the inhabitants of those neighborhoods during industrial conflicts. Rather than Beykoz which is the official center of the district, Paşabahçe was known to be the heart of collective actions that focused mainly the interest of the glassworkers, but also the workers of the Leather-Shoe factory. But this fact did not mean that this basin had provided consistent community characteristics, since during 1970s the basin was also imprinted by the left-right conflict in line with the general political climate of the country, between the rightist neighborhoods around the Leather-Shoe factory and the leftist neighborhoods around the Glass-Bottle and Tekel factories. However, during the fieldwork I

observed that in those neighborhoods of the basin, workers from each of the three factories live together, although there are differences of density between neighborhoods. Moreover, my initial aim to separate the factories as different cases of deindustrialization failed during the fieldwork, since the fate of the factories and also the inhabitants in the mentioned neighborhoods were determined in unison, as apprehended by many. Thus, the history of the three factories and corresponding inhabitants in the basin Paşabahçe will be packaged together.

I will examine the case of Paşabahçe with references to its historical making that will include both its way of industrialization and urbanization within the Turkish context. The commonalities and peculiarities of the borough in consideration of the city of Istanbul will appear with reference to more factual affairs. Out of this historical evidence, the characteristics of the district will manifest themselves as a blue-collar worker basin where generations of factory workers have been the main current in the production of a self-sufficient and integrated space in its social and economic life. As the settlement in this place dates back to the fordist phase of urbanization, thus, in this thesis the approach to the space of Paşabahçe will constitute the “gecekondu” phenomenon, the peculiar informal mechanism of housing in Turkey, as merging formal employment and informal “labor housing.”

In addition, this chapter will shed light on the past experience of class formation in the district and its relation to working class mobilization in general Turkey. Especially the workers of the Glass-Bottle factory imprinted the Turkish case, since their strike lasted 85 days in 1966, functioned as a determining factor in the establishment of DİSK, the Confederation of Revolutionary Trade Unions of Turkey. The industrial conflict in the factory swelled into a “strike of the basin” with the support and incorporation of the workers and unions of other factories,

inhabitants, and the small-scale retailers of the district. Due to this collectivity that coexisted with the hegemony of leftist politics, the place between Glass-Bottle and Tekel factories was called “*Küçük Moskova*” (“Little Moscow”) in 1970s. In addition to this experience of the district during the 1960s and 1970s, the existence of trade unions which were appreciated with a rooted role in the local politics will be mentioned in this section.

What will follow are the factual experience of deindustrialization and urban restructuring in the place in parts. Since the closure of factories was realized in a process including the downsizing of the factories, the cutoff of the recruitment of new workers, and privatization, those will be packaged in the process of deindustrialization. In this process, the “surviving” factory workers eventuated as a relatively prosperous group in relation to other working population of Paşabahçe that called the factories and also district as “*Türkiye ’nin Almanyası*” (“Germany of Turkey”). This epithet will be conceptualized as a sign of the “dissolution of place” that is a characteristic of deindustrialization. Concomitant to deindustrialization, I will describe the flow of the rich into the neighborhood in line with the construction of gated communities as the other changing axis in the social fabric of the place. Becoming social and spatial segregation between these gated communities and the neighborhoods of Paşabahçe will be expressed by chronicling the events which will appear in following two chapters from the perspective of the inhabitants.

Brief History of Industrialization and Urbanization in Paşabahçe

The industrial setting of Beykoz was long in the making; as studying Turkish industrial heritage, Küçükerman has likened the place to the “industrial zone” of

Ottoman Empire in 1800s.⁵⁶ Especially the leather industry and glass manufacturing had a long tradition of about two hundred years in the borough. The selection of the place as an industrial setting was related to the facts that it was located outside the city of Istanbul in the days of Empire and close to the water resources on the Asian shore of the Bosphorus. With its multiethnic character, including the Armenians and Greeks habitants who were the craftsmen in these sectors, the industrial workers in Paşabahçe participated in the labor militancy of 1908 Strike Wave during the Ottoman period.⁵⁷ In those days, the place was reported as a hazardous and unsecured place that had a huge number of coffeehouses and lower-class inhabitants. This fact was mentioned as an obstacle to the development of the district as a place full of waterside mansions for the inhabitation of upper classes. Today the imprint of this historical setting is observable in the urban fabric as it is mentioned to be unique on the Bosphorus coast as it inhabits former workers or retirees who had worked in the factories.⁵⁸

However, the focus of this thesis is the industrial basin, which was composed of the three factories Paşabahçe Glass-Bottle, Sümerbank Leather-Shoe, and Tekel Alcohol Factory, was not simply the development and continuation of the industrial setting of the Ottoman Empire. Rather their development was reconfigured within the industrialization programs of the Turkish Republic. In 1930, the Istanbul Alcohol

⁵⁶ Önder Küçükerman, who studies Turkish industrial heritage, resembles Beykoz to the “industrial zone” of the Empire, due to the evidence of factories like, *Tuğla* (Brick), *İspermeçet Mumu* (Spermaceti), *Kağıt* (Paper), *Cam* (Glass), *Çini* (Faience), and *İspirto* (Spirits) in 1800s. Dabakhane-i Klevehane-i Amire survived in this century and it later renamed as *Sümerbank Deri ve Kundura Sanayii Müessesesi*, a state economic enterprise in 1933. See Önder Küçükerman, *Geleneksel Türk Dericilik Sanayi ve Beykoz Fabrikası: Boğaziçinde Başlatılan Sanayi* (Ankara: Sümerbank, 1988); Küçükerman, *Türk Cam Sanayi ve Şişe-Cam* (Istanbul: Türkiye Şişe ve Cam Fabrikaları A.Ş., 1998).

⁵⁷ Yavuz Selim Karakışla, “The Emergence of the Ottoman Industrial Working Class, 1893-1923,” in *Workers and Working Class in Ottoman Empire 1839-1950*, eds. by Donald Quataert and Erik Jan Zürcher (London; New York: I. B. Tauris, 1995), pp.19-34.

⁵⁸ Murat Güvenç and Oğuz Işık, “İstanbul’u Okumak II: Mahalle Düzeyinde Konut Mülkiyeti-Statü Farklılaşmasına İlişkin Bulgular Nasıl Genellenebilir?” *Toplum ve Bilim*, 72 (1997), pp. 153-164.

Factory was confiscated and institutionalized as a unit of Tekel, which was the monopoly of state in regard to the production of tobacco, alcohol drinks, gunpowder, and other explosives. Like the Alcohol Factory, Leather-Shoe Factory was also re-institutionalized in 1933 as a unit of Sümerbank, the icon of state-led industrialization in Turkey.⁵⁹ On the other hand, the establishment of the Glass-Bottle Factory was suggested in Five Year Industrial Plan of 1933 and built in 1935 by İş-Bankası.⁶⁰ Its establishment was directed by the state; the Glass-Bottle, however, was not a state economic enterprise like the other two factory, as it has been categorized as “‘anonymous’ capitalist enterprise.”⁶¹ But, historically, the status of the Glass-Bottle was misconceived because of this anonymous character of İş-Bankası and the correlation between the foundation of Glass-Bottle and the other factories.⁶² Due to this evidence, these factories can be considered as tenacious symbols of the state-led industrialization of Turkish Republic.

In 1930s, as this chronicle of the events suggests, the development of the industrial setting was shaped within the early republics’ economic strategy, “etatism, which promoted the state as a leading producer and investor in the urban sector.”⁶³ However, it can be estimated that the development of this industrial setting had to wait until the 1950s, the years that marked a rise in rural-to-urban migration, and the

⁵⁹ Küçükerman, *Geleneksel Türk Dericilik Sanayi ve Beykoz Fabrikası*.

⁶⁰ For detailed history of the glass manufacturing, see Küçükerman, *Türk Cam Sanayi ve Şişe-Cam*; Fuat Bayramoğlu, *Turkish Glass Art and Beykoz-ware* (Tehran: RCD Cultural Institute, 1976), p. 83-90.

⁶¹ Aziz Çelik and Zafer Aydın, *Paşabahçe 1966: Gelenek Yaratan Grev* (İstanbul: TÜSTAV, 2006), p.16.

⁶² Çelik and Aydın mention this fact as a common fallacy, since Glass-Bottle was considered as public enterprise both in the official documents of Ministry of Labor and union documents. It should be mentioned that most of the workers, I interviewed, have acknowledged that Glass-Bottle was not a state economic enterprise, however they have given reference to this path of industrialization in Turkey and mentioned that these factories were “the factories of Republic.”

⁶³ Şevket Pamuk, “Economic Change in Twentieth Century: Is the Glass More Than Half Full?” in *Cambridge History of Modern Turkey* 4, ed. by Reşat Kasaba (2007), pp. 266-300, p. 277.

1960s, the years of implementation of import substitution industrialization. As the economic historian Pamuk expresses, only 1 percent of total employment in the country was in the state economic enterprises in 1938.⁶⁴ There were 200 workers in the Alcohol Factory in 1930.⁶⁵ In the Leather-Shoe Factory, there were 400 workers in 1942, 850 workers in 1944 in order to meet the needs of the military services, while it was increased to nearly 3000 in the end of 1970s.⁶⁶ Similarly, the number of workers rose from 400 to about 3000 between 1935 and 1960s in the Glass-Bottle Factory.⁶⁷ Correspondingly, for the industrial production in Paşabahçe, it can be argued that it reached its peak in the fordist phase of Turkish industrialization.

What should be added is that the industrial setting of Paşabahçe was not confined to these factories. Related to the leather-shoe industry there were workshops, mentioned as relying on child labor even in the 1990s.⁶⁸ But, the workshops related to the glass industry were numerous compatible with the characterization of the district with glass making. These were workshops that specialized in decorations and ornaments. They were tied up with the Glass-Bottle factory similar to the today's subcontracting works as they received unprocessed glassware from the factory and the factory collected the broken glass from these workshops. Also these workshops provided qualified workers to the factory, like many factory workers who were not trained in vocational high schools, entered into the glass sector through these workshops at around the age of 10. On the other hand, retired craftsmen continued their active working life in these workshops. Either there

⁶⁴ Pamuk, pp. 277-278. He mentions that 75 percent of total employment in manufacturing continued to be provided by small-scale private enterprises.

⁶⁵ *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, s.v. "Paşabahçe Tekel İçki Fabrikası."

⁶⁶ Burak Tolga, p. 89.

⁶⁷ Çelik and Aydın, *Paşabahçe 1966: Gelenek Yaratan Grev*.

⁶⁸ *Türkiye Sendikacılık Ansiklopedisi*, s.v. "Deri Sanayi İşkolu."

were employing family members and relatives in small workshops, or they were more institutionalized by the implementation of “labor market” objectives.⁶⁹ These latter types of workshops were large in size, as also their pool of recruitment was larger than the small workshops. The employment possibilities in these workshops constituted the informal work in the glass sectors that was an important part of the labor supply in the district.

In line with the industrialization of the district, the urban fabric of Paşabahçe also developed. In their study on “reading Istanbul” through an “analysis of status-property differentiation,” Güvenç and Işık mention that according to the 1990 census statistics the pattern of housing in Beykoz manifests the characteristics of settlement around fordist factories since there was a significant intensity in the categories of inhabitants who were waged-labor and retirees owning one house.⁷⁰ However, these houses have been mostly in the status of *gecekondu*, as they were illegal settlements acquired by the occupation of land of the state, the forest, or an unknown private owner. As a typical fact of this phase of industrialization in Turkey, the workers of factories were left to create their own means of settlement in the borough from barracks to *gecekondus* in the 1950s. For instance, the report on Leather-Shoe factory suggested that the factory had provided housing for only its administrative personnel, but mostly *bekar pavyonları* (“bachelor pavilions”) for other workers in 1946.⁷¹ Moreover, it should be estimated that the houses produced by worker’s cooperatives far from met the needs of the district as it accounted only 2.8 percent of

⁶⁹ See Chapter 3, for the common perception that these workshops pertain to the market rules. This perception has been related to the insight about the factories that they were state economic enterprises.

⁷⁰ Murat Güvenç and Oğuz Işık, İstanbul’u Okumak: Statü-Konut Mülkiyeti Farklılaşmasına İlişkin Bir Çözümleme Denemesi, *Toplum ve Bilim*, 71 (1996), pp. 6-60, p. 41 and p. 45.

⁷¹ *Sümerbank* (Ankara: Sümerbank, 1946), p. 32 and p. 68.

workers in the state economic enterprises benefitted in all over Turkey in 1963.⁷² In Paşabahçe, I observed that the houses of worker cooperatives are numerically marginal but closer to the factories and inhabited by the former white collar clerks retired from the factories.

Indeed, what produced the space of Paşabahçe as typical to the fordist phase of industrialization was the intensity of gecekondu rather than the formal houses in these cooperatives. These followed the constructions of formal cooperatives spatially. For the workers of the Glass-Bottle factory, Çelik and Aydın write that overnight around the factory had turned into gecekondu and later neighborhoods around the factory.⁷³ Especially related to this factory, the population increased from 3,600 in 1955 to 14,000 in 1985 in the close neighborhood İncirköy.⁷⁴ In “A Study of the Housing Conditions of Industrial Labor” Güvenç and Acar likened Paşabahçe to a settled “company town,” including the workshops in the glass sector.⁷⁵ They write that cooperatives were founded by the glassworkers who were organized to build their own gecekondu on plots with shared deeds from the early 1970s.

As Heide Wedel, in her case study on the “political participation of women in Istanbul gecekondu settlements,” writes that following the Zeytinburnu district, which first saw the appearance of gecekondu, Beykoz was the second district in the amount of settlement approximating 5100 in the 1960s.⁷⁶ In addition, Paşabahçe as a

⁷² Ruşen Keleş, *Türkiye’de Sosyal Konut Politikası* (Ankara: Sevinç Matbaası, 1966), p.200.

⁷³ Çelik and Aydın, pp. 15-16.

⁷⁴ *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, s.v. “Paşabahçe.” The rate of increase (3.89) was higher than the rate of increase in the population in the Beykoz district (2.79-total, 3.20-urban) and near to the overall rate of Istanbul (3.80) between these years.

⁷⁵ Erhan Acar and Murat Güvenç, “A Study on the Housing Conditions of Industrial Labor,” in *The Development of the Istanbul Metropolitan Area and Low Cost Housing*, eds. by İlhan Tekeli (et al.) (İstanbul: Belbim A.Ş., 1992), pp. 210-235, p. 221.

⁷⁶ Heide Wedel, *Siyaset ve Cinsiyet: İstanbul Gecekondularında Kadınların Siyasal Katılımı* (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2001), p.67. She mentions that new gecekondu, counted at 4,610, were built between the years 1976 and 1982 in Beykoz.

quarter of Beykoz was the first gecekondu settlement on the Anatolian side of Istanbul.⁷⁷ As the gecekondu settlement followed the typical “‘voyage’ of squatter housing in urban spatial ‘quadruped’” from barracks to gecekondu and then to multi-storey buildings, it should be expected that they were commercialized with a series of amnesty laws.⁷⁸ Factory families developed their gecekondu as, in time, most became “family apartments.” But as this development continued, tenants from later flows of migration moved in as typical in the occurrence of “cycles of poverty.”⁷⁹ Actually, the space of Paşabahçe reflects this development type as it constituted one of the pioneer flows of migration. In addition, in Beykoz, as Wedel writes, during her fieldwork in 1993, migration continued as co-occurring with new land invasions in the place.⁸⁰ For the neighborhoods included in this thesis, it should be mentioned that Tokatköy (close to Leather-Shoe) and Soğuksu (close to İncirköy and Glass-Bottle) had similar extension of construction but with a significant difference from the development of construction in Soğuksu which also included the gated communities that developed at the higher elevations and approached the gecekondu. In a similar way, the development of Tokatköy was detached from these specific industrial sectors; however, it was related to the continuing migration of the lower-classes. All in all, for the space of Paşabahçe, the gecekondu constituted the

⁷⁷ İlhan Tekeli, *Türkiye’de Yaşamda ve Yazında Konut Sorununun Gelişimi* (Ankara: T.C. Başbakanlık Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığı, 1996), p.45.

⁷⁸ Tansı Şenyapılı, “Charting the Voyage in the Urban Spatial ‘Quadruped’”, *European Journal of Turkish Studies*, 1 (2004).

⁷⁹ Oguz Isık and Melih Pınarcıoğlu, *Nöbetleşe Yoksulluk: Gecekondulaşma ve Kent Yoksulları Sultanbeyli Örneği* (İstanbul: İletişim, 2001).

⁸⁰ It should be mentioned that her study has been taken in a neighborhood at the higher elevations of Beykoz, in remote location from the factories. So it is not included in this thesis. In addition, the population of this neighborhood is not mentioned as being not recruited in the factories. For this neighborhood, she mentions that only one-third of population was born in Istanbul. According to 1990 census, this percentage was 45.5 in Beykoz and 38.3 in the average of Istanbul. The neighborhood seemed to be one of enduring pull areas for rural-to-urban migration after the 1980s. In the neighborhoods which were related more to the industrial development in Beykoz, it should be mentioned that Soğuksu and Tokatköy continued to this similar growth after the 1980s.

peculiar form of labor housing for factory generations who have a long lived settlement.

Needless to say, this identification of Paşabahçe's urban fabric with gecekondu settlements dates back to the development of industrial production that overlapped rural-to-urban migration. The 1950s marked a significant difference in the rise of population as the place replicated the specific trend of Turkey, which witnessed a dramatic rise in rural-to-urban migration.⁸¹ The district has received migrants especially from the Black Sea region and later from the Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia regions. There were also *Trakyalılar* ("people from Thrace") who migrated from the Balkans and Thrace. As a classic of rural-to-urban migration, the place-of-origin networks determined all aspects of settlement, including nearness to the factories and employment possibilities in this district. For instance, in the Glass-Bottle factory, many of the workers employed had come from Black Sea region.⁸² For some families, the recruitment in the factories dated back three generations, however, it was two generations for most. These migrants are considered to be the "factory families" of Paşabahçe. For those who were not recruited to work in the factories, it should be expected that they worked especially in the decoration workshops, headed by retired craftsmen.

About the characteristic of settlement, Wedel writes that the borough is shaped according to the place-of-origin of the migrants, even within the borders of

⁸¹ For a brief account of rural-to-urban migration in Turkey, see Ahmet İçduygu and İbrahim Sirkeci, "Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye'sinde Göç Hareketleri," *75 Yılda Köylerden Şehirlere*, ed. by Oya Baydar (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı, 1999), pp. 249-268. They say that for rural-to-urban migration in Turkey, the push factor, change in agricultural production in the 1950s was followed by the pull factor, the rising attraction of urban in 1960s. After 1980s, the migration Kurdish people from Eastern and Southeastern Regions has marked on the Turkish pattern of migration as in this period political unrest in these regions determined the urbanization.

⁸² For instance, the workers that got employment through acquaintances were accounted as 63 percent in Glass-Bottle Factory in 1990. The workers within the context of this research were accounted as working for ten and a half year at average. Kristal-İş, *Cam İşçisi Temmuz 1990 Anket Sonuçları* (İstanbul: Çiftay Matbaacılık, 1991), p. 27.

neighborhoods.⁸³ For instance, there is a *Karşlılar* (“people from Kars”) neighborhood within the official borders of Soğuksu neighborhood and Bingöl Street in Tokatköy. According to the change in the acceleration of the populations of neighborhoods between 1985 and 2000, Soğuksu and Tokatköy were accounted as remarkable pull areas, in tune with this characteristic of the neighborhoods.⁸⁴ Actually, there are extreme amounts of place-of-origin’ associations, which mushroomed in the beginning of the 1990s. However, most of them are inactive and only survive as coffeehouse to be lowly-taxed. Since the foundation of these associations was not taxed heavily like coffeehouses, the coffeehouses were considered to appear like place-of-origin associations.

As this brief history of industrialization and urbanization suggests, the production of space in Paşabahçe is typical in the characteristic of “labor housing” dated back to the first drive of industrialization of Turkey. Accompanying the “formal” employment in the factories, which was trotted out by the state, “informality” was the main current in the creation of urban fabric.⁸⁵ Indeed, as Acar mentions, gecekondü settlements corresponded to “labor housing” that should be identified with the relation between and within classes in the peculiar social formation of Turkey.⁸⁶ They functioned either like “company towns” where the recruitment possibilities had been bonded to a special company that might provide all of the elements of settlement or like “neighborhoods of misery” that should bond

⁸³ Wedel, p. 71.

⁸⁴ This evidence should sign that the place have imitated the pattern of Turkish rural-to-urban migration on which the migration Kurdish people from Eastern and Southeastern Regions marked after 1980s.

⁸⁵ For the manifestations of “informality” see Çağlar Keyder, “Liberalization from above and the future of the informal sector: land, shelter, and informality in the periphery”, in *Informalization: Process and Structure*, eds. by Faruk Tabak and Michaeline A. Crichlow (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000), pp. 119-132.

⁸⁶ Erhan Acar, “İşçi Konutu Olarak Gecekondü”, in *Türkiye Birinci Şehircilik Kongresi*, ed. by Yiğit Gülöksüz (Ankara: ODTÜ, Şehir ve Bölge Planlama Bölümü, 1982), pp. 253-265.

workers to low-cost life styles and availability of daily occupations.⁸⁷ It was the source of decreasing costs of social reproduction and the provision of a cheap labor force. It made employees available around the factories, for untimed calls out of the normal work day. Despite it has been based on the full functioning of informality; once, it has manifested like the “social policy” of housing peculiar to Turkey.⁸⁸ On the other hand, in the urban setting, gecekondu has been a way of sustaining a specific custom that has dated from the Ottoman Empire: the solid “right of a peasant family to claim possession of an amount of land considered adequate for its survival.”⁸⁹

As the history of Paşabahçe shows with rural-to-urban migration, the gecekondu neighborhoods appeared through the activation of familial and place-of-origin networks that were also a major source of solidarity and employment possibilities for survival in the urban environment. However, as Buğra mentions, in the course of time, this “legitimate need of shelter has been subverted” though “commercialization irregular settlements and changing configurations of economic interest in the urban land” which eroded the moral basis of this custom.⁹⁰ Although, the gecekondu settlements in Beykoz followed a similar path; especially for the migrant generation of factory workers, who located nearer to the factories, this

⁸⁷ Ibid., pp. 256-258. See also İlhan Tekeli, *Türkiye’de Yaşamda ve Yazında Konut Sorunun Gelişimi*, Ankara: T.C. Başbakanlık Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığı, 1996, p. 63. According to a survey in 1960s, he writes that 75 percent of labor recruitment in industrial sector has been located near gecekondu settlements, while only 1 percent of gecekondu inhabitants have been kept off industrial hoardings.

⁸⁸ Ayşe Buğra, “Immoral Economy of Housing in Turkey,” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 22 (1998), pp. 303–17, p. 306. Buğra considers this housing mechanism of Turkey as “formal redistributive measures are replaced by informal reciprocity networks mobilized in the development of irregular settlement-which had come to be accepted as the common way of providing shelter for the urban poor.” Keyder mentions this fact as gecekondu was inseparable part of the “inclusion strategy of industrialization” in Turkey. Çağlar Keyder, *Türkiye’de Devlet ve Sınıflar* (İstanbul: İletişim, 2003), p. 223.

⁸⁹ Keyder, “Liberalization from above,” p. 125.

⁹⁰ Buğra, “Immoral Economy,” p. 336.

situation might be actualized with certain nuance that the place constituted a higher amount of one house-owners than expected.⁹¹ All in all, with this co-development of industrial sector and urban fabric, Paşabahçe hold to be the place that belongs to fordist phase of urbanization.

From Factories to the “Basin’s Strike”

This peculiar urbanization of the borough resulted in a distinct experience of socialization among inhabitants, signifying an integrated and self-sufficient space that centered the factories. Thus, class formation in Paşabahçe replicated the pattern observed in the cities that merged the locale of work with the place of residence, especially in nineteenth century England. For this pattern, Katznelson writes that “English working-class community-based organizations were integral parts of a network of values and organizations that, in stark contrast to the American pattern, reflected and promoted the view that class pervades all social relationships, not just those at the workplace.”⁹² This urban form provided militant movements and solidarity actions among working-class neighborhoods, which are conceptualized as “high-classness” by Eric Hobsbawm.⁹³ Since Paşabahçe was an isolated setting populated by the factories, the history of Paşabahçe provides some bias, reflecting this urban pattern of class formation.

⁹¹ Güvenç and Işık, “İstanbul’u Okumak.” What needs to be added is that the percentage of population who has been born in Istanbul is lower than the average of Istanbul. That is related to the date of settlement of *gecekondus*.

⁹² Ira Katznelson, *Marxism and the City* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), p. 234.

⁹³ Katznelson refers to Hobsbawm conception of “high-classness” that originated in E. J. Hobsbawm, “From Social History to the History of Society,” *Daedalus*, 100 (Winter 1971), pp. 20–45.

As the place is located on the north end of the Anatolian shore of Bosphorus, its viability was strictly tied to the existence of factories until the second bridge was built in 1988. The workers appropriated the place in their own way and they permeated many aspects of life in the borough. Besides gecekondu and later the neighborhoods there were instances when schools, hospitals, sport centers, other entertainment places were constructed by the coalition of these factories and corresponding unions.⁹⁴ It is not an exaggeration to argue that the everyday of the borough was mostly determined by these workers also in the free-time activities. Moreover, the trade unions were refashioned as important actors in the local politics rather than their activities were limited to the scope of industrial relations. In the local newspapers, the news about their representatives' attendance at local meetings was transmitted as a routine fact, incorporating other recognized people in the borough. They took accountable roles, including the formation of several local associations. This distinctive formation of the borough was also observable in the days after the closure of factories. Still, some of the heads of the neighborhoods, whom I interviewed, are former workers and trade-unionists in the factories. Indeed, this fact is important for their celebration in the district, as they continue to refer to their past in the factories, including the strikes and the resistance events that they attended and organized.⁹⁵

⁹⁴ For this evolution of the space of Paşabahçe, see "workers' memories" and the news about cultural and sports facilities published in *Şişe-Cam* periodical, which was published by the employer to sustain work-peace. Some internet sources are available in www.ekenek.gen.tr as "Paşabahçe İşçi Hareketleri Dosyası" and "Cam-Köy Gazetesi." See also Lütfü Ak, *Şişecam'da Otuz Yıl*, (İstanbul, 1975).

⁹⁵ The *muhtars*, Ahmet Soylu in Gümüşsuyu neighborhood, Hüseyin Karababa in Çiğdem neighborhood were trade-unionist in the Glass-Bottle Factory. Ahmet Soylu was the last representative of the union in the workplace. Still they define themselves by their past experience in the factories. In Ahmet Soylu's office, the curio of Kristal-İş is on the table representing his sign of status with reference to his former work. Also in a local newspaper Dost Beykoz, two resistances he attended was mentioned as an important reference of his character. "Hizmette Paylaşım, Yönetimde Adalet." 26 August 2006. Available [online]: http://www.dostbeykoz.com.tr/haber_detay.asp?tur=382&id=1589 [15 March 2008]. On the other

Since the borough was fashioned within the close relations among the inhabitants and the factories, the scope of industrial conflicts was extended from the factories to the inhabitants in definite moments. Especially the glassworkers' strike in 1966 was significant as it also put a stamp on the history of working class mobilization in Turkey. For Çelik and Aydın, the experts of Kristal-İş trade union, the strike created a "tradition" that was handed down to the next generation.⁹⁶ First and foremost, it became "basin strike" that was kept alive until the closure of factory in 2002. Not only nearly 2500 workers struck for better working conditions but also the locality had involved in the solidarity action. For instances on the fifth day, the workers of the Sümerbank Leather-Shoe Factory marched to support glassworkers, even in a not very friendly atmosphere, since nine workers were taken into custody. The workers of the Tekel Alcohol Factory made a donation of their three days of pay to the glassworkers. The local small-scale retailers started to sell on credit and postponed their receivables, like the chauffeurs of *dolmuş* ("shared taxi") gave the glassworkers with their daily income.⁹⁷ As the strike permeated the borough, it was prolonged to 85 days, which corresponded to nearly half of the total days lost in 42 strikes of the year 1966.⁹⁸ It was ended with the decision of the government that postponed the action. In fact, the incorporation of the workers and unions of the other factories, local small-scale retailers, and the inhabitants to the strike of the glassworkers was so effective for the workers' claim of power and resoluteness as

hand, in the office of Hüseyin Karababa, who is the head of the neighborhood since 1994, he represents his photos and newspapers reportages done during the resistance events in the clipboard. He is a well-known figure of the resistances as he organized solidarity actions in the neighborhood. See Kristal-İş Sendikası, *Paşabahçe Direnişi* (İstanbul: Kristal-İş Sendikası, 1992) and Aziz Çelik and Zafer Aydın (eds), *14. Genel Kurul: Olağanüstü Bir Dönemden Haberler-Yorumlar 2000-2004*, *Kristal-İş* (İstanbul: Kristal-İş Sendikası, 2004).

⁹⁶ Çelik and Aydın, *Paşabahçe 1966*. This strike started in January 01, 1966 and ended in May 25, 1966.

⁹⁷ Ibid., pp. 58-62.

⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 12.

one of their placards was “We do starve to death because we are on strike!”⁹⁹ The experience of the social space in Paşabahçe invigorated the strike of workers, while it became the basin strike.

Another feature of this strike was its significant role in the history of working class mobilization in Turkey. It was mentioned as the peak of the resolution in TÜRK-İŞ (Confederation of Turkish Trade Unions), which resulted in the birth of DİSK (Confederation of Revolutionary Trade Unions of Turkey). Since, the strike had continued despite TÜRK-İŞ pulling the rug out from under Kristal-İş the local union in the Glass-Bottle factory; with the other unions that continued to support the strike, Kristal-İş was expelled from TÜRK-İŞ. Çelik and Aydın mentions the firmness of these unions to continue the strike was interpreted by TÜRK-İŞ as they were “leftist” who wanted to separate the confederation.¹⁰⁰ Later, the expelled unions established DİSK in 1967, except for Kristal-İş and Petrol-İş, which returned to TÜRK-İŞ.¹⁰¹ However, as Çelik and Aydın mention reports these unions formed a different union praxis in TÜRK-İŞ. Even the praxis of Kristal-İş union approximated that of DİSK until 1980, as the adherents of “class and mass unionism” were selected to be representatives of the union in 1979.¹⁰² However, the coming of the 12 September coup d’état ended this collaboration as the trade unions in this basin continued their organization in the confederation TÜRK-İŞ, which have gathered the unions of workers in the state economic enterprises. In all, with the

⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 86. “*Grev yapıyoruz diye açlıktan ölmüyoruz.*” This placard was displayed in the march of workers to Taksim Square.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., p.111. To some extent, this interpretation fitted the political picture of the day since these unions were also the defenders of TIP (Workers Party of Turkey), which was the first socialist party, represented in the parliament.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., pp. 134-144. The unions which were expelled from Türk-İş and later gave birth to DİSK were Maden-İş, Lastik-İş, and Basın-İş. They judged Türk-İş for not defending the rights of workers militantly.

¹⁰² *Türkiye Sendikacılık Ansiklopedisi*, s.v. “Kristal-İş.”

strike of 1966, the district fashioned a critical phase in the working class mobilization in Turkey, under the leadership of the glassworkers.

To some extent this peculiar history of the militancy of the glassworkers could be considered as it marked the political atmosphere of borough. When leftist politics were considered to be relatively effective in the daily life, the neighborhoods surrounding the Glass-Bottle and Tekel Alcohol factories were referred to as “Küçük Moskova” (“Little Moscow”) in the 1970s. However, those around the Leather-Shoe factory were known for the hegemony of rightists, this fact did not mean a lack of solidarity actions between the factory workers even in the 1970s. During the nearly 60 days of strike at the Shoe-Leather factory in 1975¹⁰³ the factory workers were recorded as marching to Paşabahçe square, although, today, the stories about the conflicts between right and left in these years have been narrated like they could not enter each others’ “place.” In addition, as there have been no clear studies on the suggested political antinomy between the neighborhoods and on how this was experienced inside the factories, this thesis should limit itself to the solidarity relations among the factory workers and the inhabitants of the borough. Needless to say, the authentic experience of the glassworkers should not become lost in this wider picture of this basin. Besides the 1966 strike, there were also strikes of glassworkers that lasted for 58 days in 1971, and 107 days in 1980. The latter strike was too effective, decreasing production in the glass sector in half. However, it was ended with the military coup of 12 September.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰³ For this strike see *Türkiye Sendikacılık Ansiklopedisi*, s.v. “Beykoz Deri ve Kundura Fabrikası Grev ve Eylemleri, 1975.” This mobilization wave in the factory was between 23 October and 19 January. It ended because the union agreed with the employer. This agreement was mentioned as resulting in protests against the union among the workers.

¹⁰⁴ Baha Kuban, “Cam sektörü ve Şişe Cam,” in *75 Yılda Çarklardan Çip'lere*, ed. by Oya Baydar (İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 1999), pp. 217- 227, p. 223.

In brief, this distinct phase in the history of the borough was marked with the mobilization of workers, who incorporated their socialization experience in the basin into their struggle for better working conditions. This culture of action and solidarity was transformed between generations as glassworkers generated two similar resistances in the process of deindustrialization, 21 days in 1991 and 16 days in 2002. While the 1991 resistance was actualized as potently as the strike of 1966, the resistance of 2002, which was the last resistance in the closure of factories failed to meet the same cohesion in the basin. Why it failed will be examined below, but now it should be mentioned that as though workers had continued to provide strong social ties in the daily livelihood of the basin, they were enabled to stimulate the community in solidarity actions. The influential strike of 1966 reflects this pattern of class formation that was fashioned out of the experience of social space merging the place of work and residence.

Deindustrialization

The deindustrialization process in Paşabahçe was shaped within the economic and urban policies in the period following the 1980 military coup. In this period, Turkey became involved in the global pattern of neoliberalization. On the one hand, the economic liberalization and structural adjustment were put into practice that paved the way for the contraction of the state sector and openness to global markets. While the Leather-Shoe and Alcohol factories were privatized and closed down, the Glass sector adapted the strategy of the export-oriented growth, nevertheless, as relocated in different cities and also in foreign countries. In time, the fordist industry that characterized the basin was eliminated by the flight of stable and secured jobs as

flexible and workshop level manufacturing and the rise of service sector became the rule of the day. On the other hand, the urban axis of deindustrialization was modified starting from the “Bosphorus Law,”¹⁰⁵ announced in 1983, to the rise in the projects of urban transformation in the early 2000s. In Istanbul, the low road to the “global city,” which has been characterized by the formation of the city as a node in the global finance, trade, and tourism sector, was experienced till 2000s, while recently it has gained importance and “urgency” under the single-party government of Justice and Development Party (AKP).¹⁰⁶ For the space of Paşabahçe, it meant the recreation of land, as a cultural setting oriented towards tourism sector. While the initial law defined the “public interest” as both the regeneration of gecekondü areas and the removal of industrial settings even in the following two years. It has to wait until the conditions would become proper for its application, as the recent closure of factories has been one step.

The economic axis of the change can be summarized following the factual developments in the borough. Compatible with the contraction of the state sector, these factories became downsized by terminating the new recruitments. Further, lack of investment resulted in economic loss as these followed the common trend in the state economic enterprises.¹⁰⁷ The discourse of privatization spread, since a shift

¹⁰⁵ “Boğaziçi Kanunu,” (*Resmî Gazete* 18229, 1983). Before this law in 1977, an “Arrangement Plan” was announced by the Ministry of Culture. This plan rejected any new industrial development and proposed the closure of established ones which have negative effects on the environment. However, as revisions were made in the following years, this preservation plan was withdrawn. For a brief account, see C. Baytın, et al., “Istanbul-Bosphorus as our Cultural Heritage: the Process of Change over Time,” paper presented in CIPA 2003 XIXth International Symposium, 30 September – 04 October, 2003, Antalya, Turkey.

¹⁰⁶ Turkey, being slow on the uptake of the formation of global city, has been described by Keyder as there having been political restraints like the continuation of populist politics and the reluctance to develop a liberal environment. However, the AKP government has seemed to enact the project for globalizing Istanbul, as its economic and urban policies have been expedited in the claim of urgency. See Çağlar Keyder (ed.), *İstanbul: Küresel ile Yerel Arasında* (Istanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2000).

¹⁰⁷ For instance, the last year, when new workers were hired in the Leather-Shoe factory, was 1984. In addition, the first economic loss of the factory happened in 1986. See Burak Tolga, p.84.

occurred in the naming of the state employees from the “veteran workers” of the Republic to the idle and aristocratic workers that were exploiting the resources of the country.¹⁰⁸

When the conditions for privatization became ready, the Leather-Shoe was privatized and closed in 2003, while the Alcohol factory was privatized in 2004 and closed in 2006. However, the path the Glass Bottle factory followed was different; since it was not a state economic enterprise. The production in this sector was enlarged, while new factories were built in diverse cities of Turkey, according to the decentralization of industry in Istanbul. From the beginning of the 1990s to the closure in 2002, it relocated the departments in these new plants and cut down the recruitment of workers in Paşabahçe from nearly 3000 to 900. The conditions of the glassworkers were considered to improve during this contraction as it bought time for the final closure of factory. Having adapted to the export-oriented growth strategy, the Glass-Bottle enterprise was turned into a “global company,” as at the turn of the 2000s, it also began to produce abroad in Russia and Bulgaria.¹⁰⁹

For the urban axis, it should be mentioned that the reason for the location of industry in Paşabahçe became void in time, since the place lost its suburban characteristic within the development of Istanbul metropolitan area. This process was concurrent to the increasing urban rent of the Bosphorus shoreline. Then, the Glass-Bottle factory was closed in 2002 due to claims like a decrease in productivity and the expansion of urban settlement in Istanbul. In fact, the company accommodated the industrial restructuring policy of the flexible period, as it warned to “undercut

¹⁰⁸ Surhan Çam, “Trade Unions, Wages, Job Security and Privatization: The Case of the Turkish Cement Industry,” *Sociological Review* 47, no. 4 (1999), pp. 695-715. Also see Korkut Boratav, “Özelleştirme, Kaynak Transferleri ve Yozlaşma,” in *75 Yılda Çarklardan Çip'lere*, ed. by Oya Baydar (İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 1999), pp.279-292.

¹⁰⁹ Baha Kuban, “Cam sektörü ve Şişe Cam,” p.222.

constraints that tie[d] it to particular set of geographical conditions” including the cost of labor and land use.¹¹⁰ On the other hand, accompanying the global impetus of urban planning, which has discovered “industrial heritage” as a commodity, the “past” and the “culture of the local” became consumable.¹¹¹ In this way, the establishment of an ecomuseum was proposed in the 2007 land use plan.¹¹² As the economic path was followed in the closure of state economic enterprises, in 2003 the Leather-Shoe factory was sold to a private company that planned to establish a holiday village on the site. Although there have been same prospect for the land of this factory like the Glass-Bottle,¹¹³ the factory land was remained in ruins and has become a studio for television series. In the Alcohol factory, after privatization the closure was in 2006; however, the land has continued to be state property since only usufruct rights for buildings and machines were sold to the private company. During the fieldwork, Beykoz Foundation organized a campaign to elicit the establishment of a private university on the site.

Beyond this factual history of plant closures on both the economic and urban axis, the popular experience of deindustrialization should be considered. After the announcement of Bosphorus Law, the closures of plants were always on the agenda of the district. Accompanying the general outcome of the military coup in Turkey, working class mobilization was obstructed as there did not occur any action in these factories in 1980s. Especially the slowdown of new hires in the Leather-Shoe factory

¹¹⁰ Allen J. Scott, “Industrial Organization and the Logic of Intra-Metropolitan Location: I. Theoretical Considerations,” *Economic Geography* 59, no. 3 (July, 1983), pp. 233-250, p. 247.

¹¹¹ For this impetus, see John Urry, *Consuming Places* (London; New York: Routledge, 1995), pp. 129-172. He analyzes the case of Lancashire after deindustrialization as a reinterpretation of local culture for the creation of consumable places.

¹¹² In 2007 Land Use Plan, for the place of the factory, the establishment of an ecomuseum, was proposed for the representation of industrial heritage in the district. However, the Glass-Bottle Company had put the land on sale in March, 2008, it postponed sale in July, 2008

¹¹³ For the study which proposes to establish an industrial heritage museum on the site of the Leather-Shoe factory see Burak Tolga, *Endüstriyel Alanların Dönüşümü*.

marked the shrinkage of the factory employment since it had declined to 1300 in 1993 while it had been nearly 3000 till 1980.¹¹⁴ However, the people, in collective action against this process, appeared in the documents when serious steps were taken in the Glass-Bottle factory. In the Leather Shoe and Alcohol factories since this process was extended over a period of time, there did not appear milestones despite the step of privatization. However, the lay-off of 584 workers in the Glass Bottle factory in 1991 was a turning point as it gave birth to an influential resistance of 21 days in the factory in solidarity with the borough. The reason given by the company was rising economic losses and increasing costs due to the Gulf War and the stagnation in the global markets. Also the company expressed its aim to continue production in the district like a social responsibility, despite these bad economic conditions as:

This action was taken to prevent the workers of Paşabahçe and the people around, *dekorçus, teyzinatçısı*, molders, contractors and tradesmen who can earn a living thanks to Paşabahçe to become totally unemployed. Because it is obvious that a factory, the sale of which has dropped, the costs of which has increased, which is therefore constantly suffering deficits can not survive in this region... Let's work! Let's not risk the future of our factory, the biggest economic power and source of wealth in Paşabahçe-Beykoz, in which our children will be able to work someday.¹¹⁵

The company emphasized its close relations with the borough as provision of its viability. However, the workers said "The glassworker does want to work, but he wants to work together with all of his friends. The glassworkers do not want half of

¹¹⁴ *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, s.v. "Beykoz Deri ve Kundura Fabrikası."

¹¹⁵ Kristal-İş Sendikası, *Paşabahçe Direnişi*, p. 27. "Bu uygulamada Paşabahçe çalışanları ve çevresinde, ancak Paşabahçe'nin varlığıyla yaşamını sürdüren dekorçusu, teyzinatçısı, kalıpcısı, müteahhidi ve esnafı ile binlerce insanın tümünün işsiz güçsüz kalmaması için yapılmıştır. Zira, satışları düşmüş, maliyetleri yükselmiş, bu nedenle devamlı zarar eden bir fabrikanın artık bu muhitte yaşatılmasının mümkün olmayacağı açıktır... Geliniz çalışalım! İleride çocuklarımızın çalışabileceği tüm Paşabahçe-Beykoz çevresinin en büyük ekonomik gücü ve gelir kaynağı olan fabrikamızın geleceğini tehlikeye sokmayalım."

them to live hungry, while other half are full.”¹¹⁶ Like the 1966 strike, the inhabitants in the surrounding neighborhoods, the workers of the Leather-Shoe and Alcohol factories, small-scale retailers, and local associations got involved in the action. The families of workers settled around the factory, while others organized daily marches from the neighborhoods to the factory. Also small-scale retailers struck, closing up their shops and supporting the workers with food. So again the industrial conflict pervaded the borough as it replicated the characteristics of class formation observed in the places where residences and workplaces were closely intertwined. With this popular support, the resistance met its aim; however, it was the peak in the formation of borough centering the interest of the factory workers.

It was the peak as it was also the start of the dissolution of the borough in the following ten years. In 1991 there were nearly 3000 workers in the Glass-Bottle factory. They decreased to 873 workers by the closure time in 2002. This factory actualized the pattern observed in the state economic enterprise and became downsized in time without any collective resistance. During this period, the decrease of the number of workers in the Leather-Shoe and Alcohol factories also continued. In the former, there were nearly 650 workers left in 2002. In the latter, there were 500 employees in 2002 while it continued to decline to 100 while the privatization occurred in 2004. Nearly 10,000 jobs, available in the full-functioning of three factories until the 1980s, decreased to the level of 2,000 when the Glass-Bottle factory was closed.

This policy of recruitment resulted in the declining role of the factories as the primary source of employment in the borough. Concurrently, the employment possibilities for the rest of the population were situated in the growing informal

¹¹⁶ Ibid., p. 30. “*Cam işçisi çalışmak istiyor ama bütün arkadaşlarıyla birlikte çalışmak istiyor. Cam işçisi yarısı aç, yarısı tok yaşamak istemiyor.*”

sector characterized by temporary and low-paying jobs, especially in textile workshops. Also the jobs created in the service sector related to the development of the gated communities were another source of employment in the district. The gated communities arose as the primary source of employment in the borough, however, it would be expected that these also did not meet the standards in the factories, since jobs were located in the low-skilled service sector. In fact, the rest of the inhabitants had impoverished in time, rather than the factory workers; as unemployment appeared to be an important problem, aggregated at the rate of 16.4 in 2000.¹¹⁷

In this picture of the working environment, the factory workers were the affluent faction with relatively high job security and eminent wages, which were the source of intra-class stratification in the district. Especially stratification loomed large in generational differences, since the young lost their opportunity to work in the factories. On the other hand, the glassworkers signed the agreement which provided a zero percent wage increase to enable the company to survive in the last two years. However, this fact seemed not to change the decision about the factory workers. Indeed, for the workers I interviewed, the place had been remapped to be “*Türkiye’nin Almanyası*” (“Germany of Turkey”) which signified their gratifying conditions of livelihood in those days. The different consumption habits of the workers, like owning a car, were references of many of the workers, other inhabitants, and also the representative of Glass-Bottle Company in the closure of the factories.¹¹⁸ Possibly, the free-time activities of the workers spread out of the district,

¹¹⁷ Beykoz Municipality, *5 Yıllık Stratejik Plan*, (Istanbul: Beykoz Belediyesi, February 2006), p. 26.

¹¹⁸ Yakup, interview by author, tape recording, in his workplace in Istanbul University, 26 December 2006. Yakup a former glassworker mentioned that in the last day of the resistance against the closure of the Glass-Bottle factory, the representative of the employer shouted like “*Peki siz işçiyseñiz, bu arabalar kimin?*” (“If you are worker, whose cars are these?”) He considered that the cars of workers were not only an object of distinction between the factory workers and other

as the accessibility of the place on the road map of Istanbul was developed, especially after the building of the second bridge and the connection of roads along the Bosphorus. Adding to the relative economic decentralization of the borough, the isolated characteristic of the basin was transformed. The effect of these changes on the everyday life of the borough can be imagined. It can be supposed that the daily close relations in the borough became dissolved. Therefore, the factory workers lost their ground in the 1990s.

Accordingly, the glassworkers lost the support of the borough during the closure in comparison to the 1991 resistance. This fact was pointed out by a shop keeper in 2002 in explaining the reasons why he did not attain the resistance of the glassworkers against the closure of factory:

Doğuş Haber: Can you compare the current resistance with the 1991 resistance?

İ Karakaya: As far as I can observe there is not such a support today. In the first place, the number of people working in Paşabahçe has decreased tremendously. Nearly 3000 people have quitted the work. If you multiply 3000 by 4, it makes 12000. 12000 people are missing there. And plus, there is no such big support from tradesmen either. We supported them back in 1991, all of us, all of the tradesmen. We did not even open the bazaar; we did not open our shops. But as a result of the success of that protests, workers' wages increased tremendously. Afterwards, they jumped in their cars and did not shop in this area as much as they could.¹¹⁹

However this expression might seem to be unique, it was the typical concern, as I heard also from the expelled glassworkers. In addition, Zafer Aydın, an expert of Kristal-İş, explained that *Beykoz Demokrasi Platformu* (the Democracy Platform of

inhabitants, but also the basis of the neglect of the employer that the viability of the borough was tied to the existence of the factories.

¹¹⁹ "Beykoz esnafı konuştu," *Doğuş Haber* 1, no. 12 (September 2002), p. 4

"Doğuş Haber: 1991 direnişi ile bugünkü direnişi karşılaştırabilir misiniz?"

İ. Karakaya: Benim gözlemlediğim kadarı ile bu sefer öyle destek yok. En azından Şişe-Cam'da bugün çalışan insanlar çok azaldı. 3000 kişiye yakın insan çıktı. 3000 kişi 4'erle çarparsak 12000 kişi yapar. 12000 kişi orada yok. Artı esnaftan da büyük destek yok. Çünkü benim gördüğüm kadarı ile o zaman biz onlara destek verdik, bütün esnaf olarak. Hatta pazarı açmadık, dükkânlarımızı açmadık. Fakat o günkü gelişmeyle, Şişe Cam'ın kazanımıyla insanların gelir düzeyi çok yükseldi. Arabalarını aldılar ve mümkün olduğunca bu bölgeden alışveriş yapmadılar."

Beykoz) that was uniting the *muhtars*, local associations, and political parties failed to support the resistance effectively in 2002, despite their participations in the 1991 resistance.¹²⁰ The local involvement in the resistance was not to the degree as it had been at the peak in 1991. Moreover, the roles in the action turned upside down, as in 2002 the glassworkers struggled to continue working rather than quit their jobs as in 1991. As Çelik mentions, their power “facilitated by production” became worthless, since at this time, the company was quitting the work.¹²¹ In addition to this difficulty, the factory was blockaded by the police, who also determined the spread of the resistance among the public of Paşabahçe. Correspondingly, the workers’ struggle against the closure of factory failed.

Inevitably, the closure of the Leather-Shoe and Alcohol factories followed that of the Glass-Bottle factory. The privatization and the closure decision of Leather-Shoe factory were announced lastly in 1999, were put into action in 2003. Then, the Alcohol factory was privatized in 2004 and closed in 2006. In this period, however, there occurred resistance activities, those were so isolated in comparison to even the last resistance of the glassworkers. Possibly, the defeat of the glassworkers was the defeat of all.

All in all, the plant-closures turned the page in the history book of the borough. The industrialization attempt that had been shaped in the statist and fordist policies of Turkey was dismantled in this process of deindustrialization. While the state economic enterprises were privatized and closed, the Glass-Bottle factory was decentralized, producing in diverse cities of Turkey and also abroad. In this process, the factory-based relations in the borough were dispersed, as the surviving factory

¹²⁰ Zafer Aydın, “Direnişin Ardından Paşabahçe,” *Birikim* 162 (2002), pp. 125-128.

¹²¹ Aziz Çelik, “Cambazların Vedası,” *Radikal İki*, 18 August 2002.

workers were considered to be privileged, despite the fact that the rest became increasingly bonded to the worsening work environment.

When the factories were closed, the remaining jobs in the industrial sector were scaled down especially in the textile workshops clustered around the borough. However, not only the employment possibilities in the factories were unequally replaced by this small-size manufacturing, but also these were mentioned to be closed in the near future accorded to the implications of the new urban planning. The place and its inhabitants were left with the ruins of factory buildings, waiting for their arrangement in the new urban politics, since the production of space in the district that dated back to the fordist phase of urbanization became superfluous with plant-closings. Either the heritage of these industries was planned to be commodified or their lands would become holiday resorts, marinas, or a university. But for sure, this transformation of the urban fabric would try to comprise the removal of the gecekondü settlement, which started from the higher elevations of the district due to the development of the gated communities.

Urban Restructuring

The process of deindustrialization evolved concurrent to the urban restructuring that the borough underwent. As mentioned above, the project of urban restructuring dated back to the Bosphorus Law, which proposed both plant-closures and the rehabilitation of gecekondü areas. The aim of this arrangement was stated as preservation of the existent population density for the sake of “public interest” as the

law also gave the right of expropriation to the related institutions.¹²² However, in time, the initial aims failed related to both the development of lower-class housing and the newly flourishing upper-class housing estates. For the former, various amnesty laws were enacted by the government as the existent *gecekondus* had turned into multi-story buildings while new ones had been built in the terminal areas of the borough, in the neighborhoods of Soğuksu and Tokatköy. Moreover, these new generation of *gecekondus* were extrinsic to the industrial formation. As many scholars states the “discovery of urban populism” by the Motherland Party (ANAP) elected after the military regime was the very source of this development of the *gecekondu* area.¹²³

On the other hand, however, the upper-class housing units, gated communities, started to be developed adjacent to the Soğuksu neighborhood, again in the cacophony of the same legal procedures. With the new law, which opened private forests to residential use in 1986, then Acarkent with 1453 villas and Beykoz Konakları with 401 villas were built in the following years. At the time, the fieldwork was conducted for this study, another gated community, namely Acaristanbul, was in the process of construction. However, the development of these gated communities was litigated at various moments since these abused the limits of the construction sites proposed in the law.¹²⁴ Correspondingly, fragmentation and duality occurred in the housing geography of Paşabahçe, as the place included both

¹²² Bosphorus Law, Article 1. – “The aim of this law is to protect and develop the cultural and historical assets of the Region of Istanbul Bosphorus by considering the public interest and to determine and to compose the construction legislation which will be executed to limit the construction which would increase the population density in this region.” *“Bu Kanunun amacı; İstanbul Boğaziçi Alanının kültürel ve tarihi değerlerini ve doğal güzelliklerini kamu yararı gözetilerek korumak ve geliştirmek ve bu alandaki nüfus yoğunluğunu artıracak yapılanmayı sınırlamak için uygulanacak imar mevzuatını belirlemek ve düzenlemektir.”*

¹²³ Çağlar Keyder and Ayşe Öncü, “Globalization of a Third World Metropolis: Istanbul in the 1980s,” *Review* 17, no. 3 (1994), pp. 383-421.

¹²⁴ Correspondingly, the title deeds assigned to their habitants also became questionable in time.

apartment block gecekondus with their lower-class owners and tenants and gated housing estates with their upper and middle-class owners and inhabitants. The gecekondu had come to neighbor the “villakondu” (“villa, which is illegally built like gecekondu”) adjacent in their land, however segregated.

In fact, Paşabahçe received its share of the development of Istanbul in the era of neoliberal urbanism. Focusing on the changing urban fabric of Istanbul, Keyder mentions that the city was included in the pattern of globalizing cities in its peculiar way.¹²⁵ The decentralization of industry was only one segment of this pattern. Beyond the physical change, the social topography was also transformed with gentrification and urban rehabilitation projects.¹²⁶ The gated communities became increasingly visible at the end of 1990s as the new middle and upper classes, who did not want to adapt to the “turmoil” of city life, estranged themselves with walls, private security, and surveillance systems.¹²⁷ Within these transformations, the urban fabric became fragmented both socially and spatially. The upper-class housing estates came approached the gecekondu areas, most of which were at the threshold of

¹²⁵ Keyder (ed.), *İstanbul: Küresel ile Yerel Arasında*. For Keyder’s recent account, see Keyder, Globalization and Social Exclusion in Istanbul, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 29, no.1 (2005), pp. 124–34.

¹²⁶ For some examples of the literature see Keyder (ed.), *İstanbul: Küresel ile Yerel Arasında*; David Behar and Tolga İslam (eds.), *İstanbul’da “Soyulaştırma”* (İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2006); Ruşen Keleş, “Urban Regeneration in İstanbul,” paper presented to Priority Action Programme, Regional Activity Center (May 2003), Split; Nil Uzun, “The Impact of Urban Renewal and Gentrification on Urban Fabric: Three Cases in Turkey,” *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 94, no.3 (2003), pp. 363-375; Ayfer Bartu-Candan and Biray Kolluoglu-Kirli, “Neoliberalizm ve Yerel Yönetimler Bağlamında Kentsel Dönüşüme Nasıl Karşı Durulabilir?,” *İstanbul* 60 (2007), pp. 68-71.

¹²⁷ For the literature, see Ayfer Bartu, “Kentsel Ayr(ış)ım: İstanbul’daki Yeni Yerleşimler ve Kemer Country Örneği,” in *21. Yüzyıl Karşısında Kent ve İnsan*, ed. by Firdevs Gümüşoğlu (İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları, 2001); Hatice Kurtuluş (ed.), *İstanbul’da Kentsel Ayrışma*, (İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları, 2005); Evrim Özkan and Senem Kozaman, “Gated Communities: as an Efficient Force in the Fragmentation Process of İstanbul,” *42nd ISOCaRP Congress* (2006); Serife Genis, “Producing Elite Localities: The Rise of Gated Communities in İstanbul,” *Urban Studies* 44, no. 4 (April 2007), pp. 771–798; Jean-François Pérouse and Didem Danış, “Zenginliğin Mekanda Yeni Yansımaları: İstanbul’da Güvenlikli Siteler”, *Toplum ve Bilim* 104 (2005), pp. 92-123.

“exile.”¹²⁸ The Marmara earthquake in 1999 and the selection of the city as European Capital of Culture forthcoming in 2010 functioned as an urgent wake-up call that sped up the process. Since the announcement of Urban Transformation Law in 2005, for the lower-class “living in Istanbul meant surviving in it,”¹²⁹ including the “right to the city” at an accelerating pace. On the other hand, the inhabitants of these gecekondu were inclined to be the labor pool in the serving their new “neighbors.” Correspondingly, significant changes occurred in the organization of the urban space, which also characterized the class relations with multi-layered complexity, as class tensions became diffused.

Returning to the space of Paşabahçe, a similar pattern can be observed, however within the limits of the past formation of the borough in the first wave of industrialization. As mentioned above, the settlement characteristics in the borough traces the pattern of the fordist stage of urbanization. While the factories became things of the past, the original inhabitants of the borough faced the urban condition that the gated communities were developing at the terminal points of the borough. These transformations reverberated with the question of “What’s happening in Beykoz?” in the local newspapers of the time, surveyed for this study.¹³⁰ The appearance of this question shows that plant-closures in line with the development of the gated communities sowed the seeds of discord and contention among the public of Paşabahçe. However, in the process of deindustrialization, they bonded with the

¹²⁸ The well-known cases of social and spacial segregation in Istanbul were Ayazma next to the Olympiad Stadium, Armutlu next to Etiler, Esenyurt next to Bahçeşehir and Paşabahçe next to Beykoz Konakları and Acarkent. For the case of Paşabahçe-Beykoz Konakları, see Hatice Kurtuluş, “İstanbul’da Kapalı Yerleşmeler: Beykoz Konakları Örneği,” in *İstanbul’da Kentsel Ayrışma*, ed. by Hatice Kurtuluş (Istanbul: Bağlam Yayınları, 2005), pp. 161-186. For the case of Esenyurt-Bahçeşehir, see Asu Aksoy and Kevin Robins, “Modernism and the Millennium: Trial by Space in Istanbul,” *City* 8, no.2 (1997), pp. 21-36.

¹²⁹ Aksoy and Robins, “Istanbul Rising: Returning the Repressed to Urban Culture,” *European Urban and Regional Studies* 2 (1995), pp. 223-235.

¹³⁰ “Beykoz’da Neler Oluyor?” *Camköy Gazetesi*, 1998 and *Doğuş Haber*, 2002.

recruitment created in the gated communities as the job flight in these factories continued in a progressive manner. Meanwhile, the contractor of Acarkent interpreted the plant-closures as follows:

Unemployment is an important problem in Beykoz. ... We provide Beykoz nearly 3.500 employment opportunities. When the Acarkent Project is accomplished, this employment will increase 4-5 times. According to news we hear from the press, we read that Tekel, Leather-Shoe and Glass-Bottle factories will be either closed down, or the number of their workers will be lowered. We don't know whether this is right or wrong! But even if this is right, I want to speak to these workers here. Do not become upset! 90 percent of our investments, as Acarlar Group, are in Beykoz.¹³¹

This statement was an excerpt from an article published in the local newspaper, *Kent Kültürü* (City Culture) "introducing a well-known but not really known man," İsmet Acar. It should be considered as an example showing the manner the gated communities partook in the public space of Paşabahçe. Possibly, its aim was to appease the discomfort that arose during these transformations, since Acar was calling for the attention of factory workers in the name of Beykoz. His self-presentation proposed the replacement of the figure of employer in the factories. As Acar stated, the gated communities provided an important number of jobs in the district, especially in the absence of factories.¹³²

This meant a structural change occurred in the state of employment. Besides this recruitment policy, İsmet Acar also became known for his charitable donations in the district, as the *muhtar* of İncirköy neighborhood, adjacent to Glass-Bottle and

¹³¹ *Kent Kültürü* 1, February 2001. "Beykoz da işsizlik önemli bir sorundur . . . Beykoz'da dönemlere göre ortalama 3,500 istihdam sağlamaktayız. Acarkent projesi tamamlandığında bu istihdam 4-5 kat oranında artacaktır. Basından edindiğimiz bilgilere göre Beykoz'da Tekel, Kundura ve Şisecam fabrikalarının kapatılacağı ya da işçi çıkaracağını okuyoruz. Bu ne derece doğrudur, bilemiyoruz.! Ancak böyle olsa bile bu fabrikalarda çalışan işçilere sesleniyorum. Morallerinizi bozmayın. Biz Acarlar gurubu olarak yatırımlarımızın %90'ı Beykoz'dadır."

¹³² During the fieldwork, many people including the *muhtars* estimated 4000-5000 people were recruited in the gated communities. However, there has been not a clear statistic, according to the Five Year Strategic Plan of Beykoz Municipality, especially women work informally in domestic work and babysitting in the gated communities. Beykoz Municipality, *5 Yıllık Stratejik Plan*.

some interviewees mentioned.¹³³ On the other hand, this excerpt should also show that the development of the gated communities was not frictionless in the borough, as Acar also mentioned that “We have not bought any piece of land from our citizens so far! Lets’ buy Beykoz?”¹³⁴ What he needed to calm down was the public belief that these gated communities would replace the gecekondu areas and displace the original inhabitants, since they were concerned about him seeking the appropriation of rent.

Obviously, this position of uncertainty for the future had an objective basis. Inside the borders of Beykoz Municipality, 86 percent of the total 44,386 buildings were described as “gecekondu, buildings whose quality is uncertain and violating the laws,” according to 2005 statistics.¹³⁵ Most of the existing settlement violates zoning regulations either as being located in green-field sites, forest, or public domain. With the step up of urban planning and the rising of rent the owners of title deeds dating back to the Ottoman period appeared. Either the owners decided to sell the lands to the settled gecekondu owners or they litigated and accused the existing population of trespassing.¹³⁶ When the connection roads were built, especially related to the development of the gated communities, some gecekondu were torn down.¹³⁷ Correspondingly, there was turmoil among the lower-class Paşabahçe residents about the future of the borough and whether they would continue to live there or not.

¹³³ Similarly, the aid companies of the inhabitants of Beykoz Konakları have been published in some local newspapers. However, these news have been relatively less in comparison to the news about Acarkent, since Acarkent was the main current in the discussion about the changing urban fabric. Kurtuluş, “İstanbul’da Kapalı Yerleşmeler.”

¹³⁴ “*Beykoz’da vatandaşın şu ana kadar hiçbir yer satın almadık ki, Beykoz’u satın alalım.*”

¹³⁵ Beykoz Municipality, *5 Yıllık Stratejik Plan*.

¹³⁶ During the fieldwork, 358 gecekondu owners had bought their title deeds in Soğuksu and İncirköy neighborhoods. “İncirköy ve Soğuksu’da Tapu Sevinci Sürüyor.” 21 July 2008. Available [online]: http://www.beykoz.bel.tr/g_haber_detay.asp?tur=313&id=2301 [22 July 2008]. For the news about the accusing suit see “Osmanlı, Beykoz Yenimahalleyi Fethetmeye Kararlı.” 21 November 2007. Available [online]: <http://www.bilgibeykoz.net/default.aspx?pid=33591&nid=38706> [22 July 2008].

¹³⁷ Until 2004, the inhabitants of the gated communities used the roads passing through the gecekondu areas.

CHAPTER III

THE EXPERIENCES OF THE ACTUAL CONDITIONS OF EXISTENCE

This chapter depicts Paşabahçe's inhabitants' perception of their actual conditions of existence on two different axes. First, their view of their trajectory in the new working life within the synchronized changes of deindustrialization and the development of the gated communities will be discussed. How they experience employment and unemployment and the workers' position in this new employment environment will be examined. Then, the manner in which they conceive the challenges to their living conditions in the gecekondu will be the focus of the discussion. As "psychology of exile" has been the case for many, their town talks on the dark futures will be described in this section. Since these conditions of working and housing will represent them with reference to certain troubles in the neighborhood, this chapter will be concluded with the question of how these factors determine the public mood in Paşabahçe. Their experience of their ways of sustenance in a degraded position after deindustrialization and in the midst of urban transformation will be reflected.

The sources of this chapter are mainly interviews conducted in Paşabahçe and partially my observations during the field work. I tend to focus on the common and conflicting statements that appeared about these axes within the different contexts of the interviews. Needless to say, the people I interviewed narrated their life-stories and their own experiences based not on the "real" statistics of Paşabahçe about working or housing, but on their beliefs about "what is going on in the district." Correspondingly, this chapter will "tell us less about events than about their

meaning” in Paşabahçe.¹³⁸ I will mainly express these issues in the way in which they became apparent in the interviews. To what extent the people have a common language on these matters on the surface and their uses of metaphors for explaining the people’s fate in a broader picture will be examined. Their perceptions are important, since these are their appropriation of the events, which determine, more or less, what they will do or not, and so what will happen or not. Indeed, in this way, their experiences become facts.

Perceptions of the Working Life

I am Mustafa Olcay. I am 17 years old. I am a worker in the glass factory in the *goble* department. My dad was also retired from the glass factory. We are five siblings; all of us are glass workers. Mostly, our workbenches, our shifts are different. Therefore there is always someone sleeping in our house. And there is always cooking. When I was a child, I dreamed of becoming a pilot. But it did not turn out to be real. I could not attend school after the primary level. The fact that the university graduates could not become anything bothered me. Most of them were unemployed. Then I decided to be a glassworker. When I first started to work here, I felt a great joy, I liked it a lot. It was really fantastic. Glass is a really beautiful thing ... If people could see how it becomes so, how hard its formation is ... To shape the glass is a weird thing, you even feel dizzy. We do not have breaks, no tea breaks or anything. When one person takes a break, the whole work on the workbench may stop. Therefore we ourselves arrange our breaks for toilet or for tea. We all are running around for one glass, for one vase. We are standing for eight hours. ... Not everyone can endure glass work. You start to work at 15, and stop at 55. You became half dead at that time. How will you wander, travel, have fun after that age? Our job is hard; our job is tough, tiring. And the heat! You can’t joke with glass and fire, when the mineral pours out, you can not stop it. ... Our oldest is brother İsmail, the second journeyman. People like my brother a lot. He is quiet, he is serene. If he has a grief, he never makes anyone aware of it. He always tries to help me. My fourth brother is also in glass work. But he is in the market. He is working in a private workshop. His job is not secure. He doesn’t have insurance. He always gets his money with delay. The place we work in is much better than

¹³⁸ Alessandro Portelli, *The Death of Luigi Trastulli and Other Stories: Form and Meaning in Oral History* (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1991), p. 50.

the market. ... After the military service, things will change for me. I will get in married with a person I like, who is adaptive to society, whose soul is beautiful. I want to school my children so that they will not experience great suffering.¹³⁹

In 1985, when Mustafa described his experience of glasswork in the factory, he was only 17 years old. Having followed the footsteps of his father and elder brother he started to work in the factory at 15. His family was one of the “factory families” that experienced being factory worker for generations in Paşabahçe. His story is typical in the perception of schooling for the generations of workers. On the one hand, he failed to foresee any achievable future through the attendance in the formal education institutions for himself; on the other hand he wanted his children to be educated so they will not suffer like he has. He expected to retire at 55 as the routine in the factory work enabled him to envision himself in his retirement years.¹⁴⁰ Since he had observed the “linear time” in the fordist industry, he believed that he would retire when he had filled the number of necessary work years. He complained about the life-cycle of the glassworkers from 15 to 55 years old; nevertheless, in those days he was one of the “privileged” who was enabled to

¹³⁹ *Camın Teri*, a documentary of Suha Arin (1985). “Ben Mustafa Olcam. 17 yaşındayım. Cam fabrikasında goble servisinde işçiyim. Babam da Paşabahçe Cam fabrikasından emekli. Beş kardeşiz, hepimiz camcıyız. Çoğu zaman tezgahlarımız ayrı, vardiyalarımız ayrı. Onun için bizim evde sürekli uyuyan vardır. Sürekli yemek pişer. Küçükken hep pilot olmayı hayal ederdim. Olmadı işte. İlkokuldan sonra okuyamadım. Üniversite öğrencileri okuyup da birşey olamıyor hesabına kafam takıldı. Çoğu boшта geziyordu. Sonra camcı olmaya karar verdim. Buraya ilk girdiğimde büyük bir sevinç hissettim çok hoşuma gitti. Çok bir acayip oldum. Cam gerçekten güzel birşey. ... Ama nasıl meydana geldiğini bir görseler, ne zorluklarla çıktığını bir bilseler... Cama bir şekil vermek bir tuhaf oluyor insanın başı bile dönüyor. İhtiyaç molamız, çay paydosumuz yoktur. Bir kişi işi aksatınca tezgahta işler durabilir. Ona göre ihtiyacımızı çayımızı kendimiz ayarlarız. Bir bardak için vazo için hepimiz koşuyoruz. Sekiz saat devamlı ayaktayız. ... Cam işine herkes dayanamaz kalk 15 yaşında fabrikaya gir. 55 yaşında doldur. Bir ayağın çukurdadır. Artık gezecen mi, tozacan mı? İşimiz zor, işimiz ağır, yorucu. Birde sıcak. Ateşle camla şaka olmaz maden aktı mı, durduramazsın. En büyüğümüz İsmail abi, ikinci kalfa. Abimi çok severler, beğenirler. Sesizdir, ağır başlıdır. Bir derdi olsun kimseye belli etmez. Bana hep yardımcı olmaya çalışır. Dördüncü abim de, yine cam işinde. Ama o piyasada. Bir özel atölyede çalışıyor. Onun işi sağlam değil. Sigortası yok. Parasını da hep gecikmeli alır. Bizim çalıştığımız yer piyasaya göre çok iyidir. . . . Askerden sonra başka olur. Kafama göre topluma uyan, ruhu güzel biriyle evlenirim. Çocuklarımı da büyük eziyetler çekmesin diye okutmak istiyorum.”

¹⁴⁰ For the consequences of “routine” work on the life-narratives of workers see Richard Sennett, *The Corrosion of Character* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1998), p.43. Sennett argues that the routine which “decomposes labor,” on the other hand composes “life” and its coherent narrative.

discuss a possible future in retirement. In fact, in 1985, retirement was only improbable for Mustafa's brother who was working informally, but both could not retire since the factory was closed in 2002 before Mustafa had filled his retirement years. The expectations for the future became void, as the happening of this narrative was made impossible with the closure of factories. As his life narrative was broken by deindustrialization, the "market" started to seal Mustafa's fate, like his brother's. If he was going to continue to work after the closure of the factories, most probably, his job would be like his brother's. That is what he evaluated as worse, since it was in the "market," as unsecured, temporary, and less paying job in a sweatshop.¹⁴¹

In this section on the trajectory of the people of Paşabahçe in the new working life, Mustafa's story is introductory since it locates the future pattern of the working life in the days of fordist industry. His story proposes some typical perceptions of new working life in comparison with the characteristics of jobs in the factories that were considered to be state economic enterprises.¹⁴² First, it evaluates the unsecure and informal work in the "market" due to the experience of work in the fordist industry. His brother's job was located in the market, in contrast to his own occupation in the Glass-Bottle Factory. So Mustafa's critical evaluation of his brother's job in the sweatshop signals the first point I will make about the perceptions of new working life. That is the institutional change experienced with the closure of factories by the disappearance of secure and high paying jobs in the state

¹⁴¹ When Glass-Bottle factory was open, related to this industry, there were small decoration sweatshops where production was made by hand. However, in these days, they were not called subcontracting work, maybe due to the reason that their product were not labeled with the trade mark of Paşabahçe. Nonetheless, these sweatshops had a mutual relation with the factory, since they got the raw product glass in crude form from this factory, while the factory hired trained workers from these sweatshops.

¹⁴² Although Glass-Bottle factory is not a state economic enterprise, it was associated with other two factories Tekel and Leather-Shoe, for the historical reason that these factories were conjoined together in the first industrial plan of the Turkish Republic. See Chapter 2 for further information on this perception of Glass-Bottle Factory.

economic enterprises. How this change is perceived in Paşabahçe will be expressed through one of my informant's stories, Beytullah, who is called "the victim of privatization" in the new working life. Beytullah can be expected to be critical of both state economic institutions and market, since unlike Mustafa, the state left him in the lurch with privatization.

Second, from Mustafa's story, the perception of the informal work appears as unsecure since this type of work is mostly available for only short-term. As Richard Sennett mentions in *The Corrosion of Character*, this is the main pattern of flexible production, since there are "no long-term" occupations in the new capitalism.¹⁴³ Moreover, Mustafa acknowledged his brother's job as paying money less and not on time. The deterioration of wages levels was experienced as a widespread issue after the closure of the factories. From Mustafa's story, the second perception of new working life, which will be dealt in this chapter, appears as being "informal" which is typically coupled with "temporary" and "irregular and low paying." However, these characteristics of working life are themselves different issues, in the interviews these issues always appeared as linked. Correspondingly, I will represent them in one subsection of this chapter.

However, these two perceptions are not all about their experience of new working conditions. In 1985, since Mustafa did not foresee the closure of factories and the coming of the rich to the neighborhood, his story did not incorporate the occurrence of new forms of labor in the service sector and the exclusion of numerous youth from the labor market. Also, the position of women in the new working life cannot be deduced from his narrative. As Standing mentions, the characteristics of the new working life are that it is flexible and informal, so that temporary and low

¹⁴³ Sennett, *The Corrosion of Character*.

paying is compatible with the women's participation in working life.¹⁴⁴ This process is conceptualized as the feminization of working life through flexible and informal labor. As the working environment of Paşabahçe followed this similar path, women participated in work life from the lower ranks as textile workers in the sweatshops and domestic workers in Acarkent. In this section, the perception of these women working in the textile sector will be covered under the heading of "informal work." However, the views about the domestic work will be discussed in a different subsection, since the stories I heard in the interviews diverged from the experiences of those in the textile sector. By and large, my informants (either they experience this occupation themselves or by the mediation of their acquaintance) evaluated domestic work, according to the individual characteristics of employee, like being "good" or "bad." In this section, the fourth issue I will mention, is how the young perceive being excluded from working life. Then, this section will end with the common perception about existing jobs as "the lesser evil" that is available in all cases, because these people is experiencing the deterioration of working conditions as being kept on the tenterhooks of unemployment.

Becoming Victim of Privatization

They did it as if we did not have any jobs, and as if they were us presents. Thus they separated us. When the factory was privatized, we were left only 100 workers or so. But before the privatization we were 500 people. ... They left us as *norm kadro* ("norm cadre"). ... They said that "we will leave 100 people, and place 400 of you in the jobs of state-owned institutions." But none of us wanted to stay here with their own will. They chose who was to stay. People who had connections arranged good positions for themselves in other state institutions and left. People who knew how to arrange these kinds of things left. The managers had thought with whom they could make the factory continue

¹⁴⁴ Guy Standing, "Global Feminization through Flexible Labor: A Theme Revisited," *World Development* 27, no. 3 (March 1999), pp. 583-602.

to work and made a list by themselves. My name was also on that list. They made me stay, they did not send me. The buyer company Mey and the state agreed on “five plus five.” The state kept the land, but the factory became to be owned by Mey. Mey rented it in a sense. ... State let Mey to rent it for five years, but also gave Mey the right to rent for another period of five years if it wanted to do so. But Mey had us work only for two years. They closed the factory down, and fired us. When we were fired, the state, as I said before, there is a law called “victim of privatization.” It is called 4-C. You become a state worker formally according to this law, but you are subjected to 657. So you became a contractual worker. But you do not have any rights consequently. You work as a 4-C worker. You have a certain standard wage, which is low. You can not unionize. Also it is not clear whether we are workers or civil servants. When someone asks us whether we are worker or civil servant, we can not answer; neither can they answer when we ask them. So we are working anyway. They placed 50 of us in the National Education Ministry, and the other 50 in the Health Ministry. I am working now in a hospital. Our situation is basically this.¹⁴⁵

Following his grandfather and two uncles, Beytullah started to work in the Tekel Alcohol Factory in 1992. When he was 37 years old, the decline in his working life started with the privatization and sale of the factory to the *Mey İçki Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş* (Alcoholic Beverages Industry and Trade Ltd.) in 2004. The workers’ resistance against privatization failed. Then, Beytullah did not want to continue to work for the private company. The “job in the private” sector seemed unsecure to him. Like the other workers, he wanted to be transferred to another state institution. However, the “state” left them in the factory “forcibly,” to continue working for the

¹⁴⁵ Beytullah, interview by author, tape recording, in the security office of Glass-Bottle Factory, 15 March 2008. “*Sanki işimiz yokmuş da size hak vermişiz dermişcesine bize birşeyde bulundular. Dağıttılar bizi işte. Biz yaklaşık 100 kişi kaldık fabrika özelleştiği zaman. Özelleşmeden evvel 500 kişiydik. .. Bizi norm kadro diye bıraktılar. . . . 100 kişiyi bırakıcaz, 400 kişiyi de devletin diğer yerlerine vericez dediler. Ama biz kendi isteğimizle hiçbirimiz kalmadık. Yani bizi zorla bıraktılar. ‘Siz kalacaksınız’ dediler bize. İşte adamı olanlar işini ayarladı gitti. Bizi de 100 kişi norm kadro diye bıraktılar, işi bilenleri bıraktılar daha doğrusu. Yani fabrikayı kimlerle döndürebiliriz diye düşünmüşler kendi kafalarına göre. Liste yapmışlar. Bizim de ismimiz varmış onların içinde. Bizi bıraktılar, yollamadılar. 5+5 diye anlaştılar. Arsa olarak devletin ama fabrika olarak Mey’in oldu. Mey kiraladı yani. ... yani 5 sene kiralık olarak verdi. Ama istersen 5 sene daha kullanabilirsin opsiyonlu olarak Mey’e hak tanıdı. Ama Mey de bizi 2 sene çalıştırdı. Fabrikayı kapattılar, bizi de işten çıkardılar işte. İşten çıkartınca da devlet de işte bize, diyorum ya, özelleştirme mağduru diye bir yasa var. O 4C yasası. İşçi olarak gözüktüyorsunuz ama 657’e tabisiniz. Sözleşmeli. Ama hiç bir hakkınız yok sonuçta. 4C’li olarak çalışıyorsunuz. Belli bir standart maaşınız var. Düşük miktarda. Sendikalı olamıyoruz. İşçi miyiz, memur muyuz o da belli değil. Yani bize sorsalar işçi misin memur musun diye, ne biz cevap verebiliyoruz, ne de biz sorduğumuzda onlar cevap verebiliyorlar. Çalışıyoruz işte. 50 kişi milli eğitim bakanlığı, 50 kişi sağlık bakanlığına dağıttılar. Ben şimdi hastanede çalışıyorum. Durumumuz bundan ibaret.”*

private company. He was considered to be permanent staff in the factory, since he was one of the qualified workers who had graduated from a vocational high school.

He was told to feel self-worth with this decision. To some extent, he felt this.

However, he was working more “in the private” sector:

As you know the performance becomes better after privatization. This is generally so. If the production is 10 tons in a state factory, 20 tons should be produced in the private, because they squeeze the people. That person wants to make more profit then it was made in the days of the state ownership. While I used to have one job to do under state ownership, in the private they gave me three.¹⁴⁶

The private had “put pressure” on him in order to obtain more profit. When privatization occurred, he expected to work in the factory for at least five years.

However in his second year, 2006, the factory was sold to another private firm,

American Texas Pacific, and closed with the reason of economic constriction. His

observation about the “jobs in the private” sector being unsecure seemed to be

realized in his life. After the strikes against the closure of factories, their only gain

was to be transferred to another state institution according to the law on Civil

Servants No. 675, article 4/C.¹⁴⁷ Beytullah returned to working in a state institution.

However, now he was contractual personnel of the state with very few rights. His

status is unclear, whether he is worker or civil servant. Even his wage has been cut in

half,¹⁴⁸ compatible with his new status: a “victim of privatization.” Beytullah’s

experience of privatization and closure of factories altered his decision about the “job

in the state” as follows:

¹⁴⁶ “Hani özelleştiği zaman daha bir performans artar ya. Öyledir genelde. Öyledir yani. Devlette 10 ton çıkıyorsa, özelde 20 ton çıkması gerekir. Çünkü insanı sıkırlar. O şahıs devletkinden daha çok kar yapmasını ister. Benim devletteyken bir işim varken, özelde üç iş bindirdiler bana.”

¹⁴⁷ This law gives chance to be employed in state institutions to workers who could not retire and dismissed from privatized state economic enterprises.

¹⁴⁸ He mentioned that if he continued to work in the factory, his wage would be at least 1,250 YTL. However, in the hospital his wage is nearly 600 YTL.

Beytullah: The state job is so. They smile at your face, but then you see that they kicked you from your behind. You are pushed to one side, then to the other. It is always so when you work for the state. Actually you should not trust anyone.

Ayşe: What about the work in the private sector?

Beytullah: When you work in the private, at least the man respects you according to your work. You are respected to a certain extent. I was working very hard for the state. There was no job I did not do.¹⁴⁹

He experienced self-worth when he worked in the private sector. The conversation above continued as Beytullah expressed how his work ethic was better than that of other workers who were transferred to other state institutions in 2004 with privatization.¹⁵⁰ Then, again, he became angry with the state: Why had it left him to the private firm? The state had disappointed Beytullah. It had violated his trust. However, he was obliged to accept this new working condition in the state institution. When the factory was closed, he was 39 years old and he could not foresee any better occupation in the market. His experience of self-worth through the jobs in the private was limited with his age.¹⁵¹ Correspondingly, he was persuaded to take a degraded position drawn by the Law No. 657, Article 4/C. In 2006, the implementation of this law was expressed as “having workers persuaded by disease, pointing out the death”¹⁵² by Abdullah Çolak, the former representative of the union.¹⁵³ For Abdullah, the job in the market meant “death,” while the job in state meant “disease.”

¹⁴⁹ “Beytullah: Bu devlet işi böyle. Yüzünüze gülerler, sonra bakarsınız arkanızdan tekme vurmuş. Bir bakmışınız bir tarafa yuvarlanmışsınız. Bu devlette çalışırken hep böyle. Aslında hiç kimseye güvenmeyeceksiniz.

Ayşe: Peki özelde çalışırken?

Beytullah: Özelde çalışırken adam hiç değilse çalıştığına göre değer veriyor sana. Bir değer in oluyor. Ben devlette kendimi parçalıyordum. Yapmadığım iş yoktu.”

¹⁵⁰ He considered that they had gotten better positions in other state institutions.

¹⁵¹ Sennett argues that the demand for “flexible” –young, adaptable, and risk-taker – individuals results in the rise of the sense of “uselessness” for the aging population in contemporary capitalism. Sennett, *The Culture of the New Capitalism* (Yale University Press, 2005), p. 94.

¹⁵² “İşçilere ölümü gösterip, sıtmaya razı etmek.”

¹⁵³ “Tekel işçisi oyunu düşünerek kullanacak.” 06 June 2007. Available [online]: <http://www.bilgibeykoz.net/default.aspx?pid=16793&nid=29957> [15 March 2008].

As is clear above, Beytullah was usually changing his decisions about “the job in the market” and “the job in the state” in the interview. At first glance, Beytullah’s perceptions of working conditions in the state factory and in the market seemed contradictory. Mustafa Olcay was certain that the market was worse than the factory because he had not experienced the closure of the factories. However, Beytullah experienced the closure of the factories, which left him in trouble. Moreover, he also witnessed the implementation of Article 4/C, which degraded him in working life. When Beytullah’s experience with both is evaluated together, the changes in his decisions about the jobs in the state can be considered as coherent. He had experienced many faces of the state: the permanent job in the factory, the unforeseen termination of this job, and contractual and degraded position subordinated to 4/C. His perception of the jobs in the market was also ambiguous. On the one hand, he felt self-worth in the private firm; on the other hand, he could not foresee any existing occupation that would assign him value in the market.

In this section, Beytullah’s evaluations illustrate the fate of workers who were expelled from factories. His story is distinctive in the sense that a relatively small number of workers experienced this same trajectory in working life. However, his story is still meaningful because it give us clues about the perception of the institutional change that occurred in the working life. In the interview, this is revealed from the comparison of “jobs in the state” and “jobs in the market.” For Paşabahçe, jobs in the factories meant being state personnel, even for the workers that were in the Glass-Bottle Factory, which was not a state economic enterprise. So the closure of factories resulted in the men becoming critical about the jobs in the state institutions. In comparison with Mustafa’s evaluations on the jobs in the market vs. in the state, Beytullah’s evaluations can be considered a novelty experienced after

the plant-closures. However he became critical about the job in the state factory, he was still working in a state institution as he had to accept the “disease” at age 35.

“Disease” for the Young: Informal Work in the Sweatshops

In this section, diverging from Beytullah’s story, I will propose another feature of new working life which is experienced as informal work, which usually accords with temporary and irregular and low paying occupation. For young, different than Beytullah’s story, the availability of this type of occupation was “valued” like a “disease” under the pressure of unemployment, which was “death.” Paşabahçe faced these working conditions through the textile sector that has clustered around the borough.¹⁵⁴ In the fieldwork, informality is observed as a major obstacle in contacting these workers in their workplaces. The workplaces are hidden from the public eyes, like they have become a part of an underground economy with no visible sign on the door and no signs of life in the windows since they blocked out with newsprint-shutters from inside. Even when I visited one of these sweatshops by means of the muhtar of İncirköy, the woman I met at the door did not welcome me in the workplace. Like the muhtar had forewarned me, she was suspicious about my aim for being there.¹⁵⁵ The informality in the sweatshop and probably, the fear to lose her job were the reasons for her refusal to talk with me.

¹⁵⁴ For a brief account of textile sector in Turkey see Joint Initiative on Corporate Accountability and Workers’ Rights. July 2004. “*Basic Information on Labor Conditions and Social Auditing in the Turkish Garment Industry.*” Available [online]: <http://www.jo-in.org/pub/docs/JoIn-turkBackgndStudy-2004-07.pdf> [March 2008]. In 2004, it was approximated that 2,040,000 of 3,000,000 workers were employed in the unregistered/informal workplaces (“sweatshops”).

¹⁵⁵ I started regular visits to the neighborhood after an explosion occurred in an informal workplace in Istanbul’s Davutpaşa neighborhood on January 30. In Davutpaşa, 22 people were died and more than 100 people were injured. Correspondingly, the Labor Ministry tightened the inspections of such workplaces in Istanbul. In the course of time, the one I had visited was closed. For this fact, people mentioned that after these inspections the closed sweatshops were relocated in the back streets and the basements of apartments. In addition, an informal interview conducted with one

In this section, this obstacle will be passed over by interpreting the published interview with four young workers, Onur Örs, Faysal Bali, Tekin Çağlan, and Ufuk, in the local newspaper in September 2004¹⁵⁶ and by presenting the views of my informant, Ahmet, a former glassworker, whose son and daughter-in-law are working in textile sweatshops. Ahmet's views about these sweatshops can be considered as representative of the perception of these working conditions within the memories of factory work. Then, I will conclude this subsection with my observations on the typical perception of these sweatshops in the neighborhood.

These four workers, Ufuk, Tekin, Faysal, and Onur had been working in the relatively large-size workshop than I visited in the neighborhood. For them, the prominent features of working in the textile sector were the extremeness and irregularity of working time in exchange for low wages:

Ufuk: The most distinctive feature of our job is that you start to work at 8:30, and keep working until 8 in the evening. So we are talking about a 11.5-hours-long workday, and that is the case if there is no over-time work. Work law requires 8 hours or so, but it doesn't matter, and this does not change. If work lasts longer than 8:30 in the evening, it counts as overtime work. The settled system of the textile workshops in Beykoz is this. ... There may be some exceptions. But the general work-hours are these. ... The time left to the worker is only enough to go to work and to eat, and also to sleep. In our job, workers have no time to live. In return for a wage, which mostly can not ever cover your basic needs, living becomes equal to breathing only. There is no time left to do anything but work.

Tekin: The time you enter is certain, but the time you leave is not. You work like an animal. At 7 o'clock the man comes in and shouts "overtime!" If you do not work overtime, they do not like it at all.

of the families that were running a sweatshop in their basement, was narrow to tackle the issues related to this type of occupation. They wanted to talk with me more on their depressing family problems than on their sweatshop. These facts caused an obstacle for my study. I could not access the workers in these sweatshops, in the time assigned to the fieldwork. For the news of explosion and tightened inspections, see "Deep Darkness on Night Shift." 13 March 2008. Available [online]: <http://www.turkishdailynews.com.tr/article.php?newsid=98856>. [15 March 2008].

¹⁵⁶ This interview was published in *Bilgi Beykoz* in September 2004. Nurettin Çarpık and Önder Koç are the local journalists, who enabled me to use this source.

Onur: If there is anyone who works in the garment sector and claims that “I have an orderly life,” I tell you, this is a lie.¹⁵⁷
In the expressions of Ufuk, the “normal” daily working time is 11.5 hours.

Since they were working informally in the textile workshops that have clustered around Beykoz, their working conditions are not subjected to any labor law. For him, this condition meant the “absence of time for life.” He had been able get only a one day-break in the previous two months. So he was not “optimistic” like Onur, who mentioned that “regular life” is impossible in the textile sweatshops. For these workers, the irregularity experienced in this working environment starts with short-term considerations like elusiveness of the finish of work in one day. Then, it continues in the working life as they began many of their sentences like “for instance, in my old workplace.” The irregularity was not expected to have an end in the near future. As Tekin and Faysal said:

Tekin: In textile [sector] an aged or middle-aged person can not work, the job is very tiring. After an age a person’s hand and waist don’t work. For example I am now ironer, right? The age I can do this job is maximum 35. After 35 you can’t do ironing. You breathe steam all day. . . . *Söylemesi ayıptır*, (“It is a shame to say”) it is said that the steam kills the person’s manhood [sexual potency].

Faysal: Another thing, after a certain age, person’s labor is not worth much in this job. A 50 years old acquaintance of mine works in Bayrampaşa. He earns a 250 million wage. He had been working in this job for 30 years, they lay him for years that they had made his insurance payments. He made his insurance be calculated; it came out to be that his insurance payments had been invested for only 6.5 years.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁷ “Ufuk: Bizim işte çalışmanın en belirgin özelliği, işe sabah 8:30’da başlayıp akşam 8’e kadar çalışmaktır. Yani mesai yoksa, en az 11,5 saatlik bir işgünü söz konusudur. İsteddiği kadar iş yasında 8 saat falan yazsın, bu değişmez. İş akşam 8 buçuktan sonra devam ederse, o mesai sayılır. Beykoz’daki tekstil atölyelerinde yerleşik olan düzen budur. Bazı işyerlerinde istisnalar söz konusu olabilir. Ama genelinde çalışma saatleri budur . . . İşçiye evine gidip yemek yiyecek kadar vakit kalır. Bir de uyuyacak kadar. Bizim işte işçinin yaşamaya vakti yoktur. Çoğu zaman boğaz tokluğunu bile sağlamayan bir ücret karşılığında, yaşamının anlamı nefes alıp vermekten ibarettir. Bunun dışında hiçbir şey yapmaya vakit kalmaz.

Tekin: Giriş saati belli, çıkış saati belli değil. Hayvan gibi çalışırsın. Saat 7’de herif gelir ‘mesai’ diye bağırır. Çalışmazsan kötü gözle bakarlar.

Onur: Konfeksiyonda çalışıp da kim ‘düzenli bir hayatım var’ diyorsa palavra atıyordur.”

¹⁵⁸ “Tekin: Tekstilde yaşlı, orta-yaş insan çalışamaz, iş çok yorucudur. Belli bir yaştan sonra insanın eli-beli tutmaz olur. Mesela ben şimdi ütücüyüm di mi, bu işi yapabileceğim en fazla 35 yaşıdır. 35’ten

For the future after 35, Tekin foresaw “occupational diseases” which he explained as the effects of hard work on their body functions. Old age meant uselessness. As Faysal explained, it would not be worth money, since in the textile sector the labor of youth was valued. On the other hand, as one of my informants, Gökhan, explained, since the jobs in these sweatshops were uninsured, they were not preferable for the aging population. Indeed, he was 24 years old, which is enough for him to claim that “at my age, does a person work in textile sector? ... Generally people work in the textile before they do their military service.”¹⁵⁹ He worked in a small-size textile factory between 15 and 19 years old. Gökhan was uninsured because the employer said it lost too much. When the employer insured his relative who had been recruited newly, Gökhan left the work. Like Gökhan’s experience exemplifies, partial unregistered work is rule for these sweatshops and mostly only the qualified staff has been insured.¹⁶⁰ The workers in these workshops are unequally treated, as Tekin had been *ütücü* (ironer) for seven years and was never insured.

They evaluated their working conditions in the workshops negatively. However they also mentioned that these workplaces were the lesser of two evils. In accordance with the decrease of the size of workshop, the working conditions

sonra ütücülük yapılamaz. Bütün gün buhar soluyorsun . . . Söylemesi ayıptır buhar insanın erkekliğini öldürüyor derler.

Faysal: Sonra, belli bir yaşını geçtin mi insanın emeği para da etmiyor bu işte. Bayrampaşa’da çalışan 50 yaşında bir tanıdık var. 250 milyon ücret alıyor. 30 yıldan beri çalışmış bu işlerde, hep ‘sigortamı yaptık’ diye kandırmışlar yıllardır. Geçenlerde sigortasını hesaplattı, toplam 6,5 yıl çıktı.”

¹⁵⁹ Gökhan and Ayça, interview by author, tape recording, in the park of Soğuksu neighborhood, 11 June 2008. “*Şimdi benim yaşımdaki insan tekstilde çalışır mı? . . . Tekstilde genelde askerliği yapmadan önce çalışılır.*” Gökhan started to work in a sweatshop on decoration of glassware at ten years old. After five year passed working in the glass sector, this sweatshop was closed related to the deindustrialization. Then, between 15 and 19 years old, he had worked in the textile factory where he was uninsured. When we interviewed, he was working in an insured job out of the district, in Sarıgazi.

¹⁶⁰ Onur explained this fact as “Generally, the insurances of only first class mechanics, *romayözcü*, plain mechanics and etc. are being paid. But the beginners’ or *ortacı*’ insurances are not paid.” “*Mesela 1. sınıf makineciye, romayözcüye, düz makineciye falan genelde sigorta yatırılır. Ama acemiye ya da ortacıya yapılmaz.*”

deteriorated. They evaluated these workshops in response to a question about the age restriction:

Ufuk: Who says that in our job there is a minimum age-limit, is lying.
Onur: Especially in the small work places there is no limit. I think that small work places should be closed down. They kill the workers off. Children, women, even the pregnant ones. They do not care at all. You can say that “if these small workplaces are closed down, the unemployment will grow even more,” but I think if the small ones are closed, out of necessity they will have to open big workplaces.
Faysal: Do not ever think that the big ones are much better. There you also live so and so. But the conditions in the small factories are like murder.

Ufuk: To expect them to become closed down is very difficult. See, in garment [sector] also women are working. If she is married, her husband won't let her go to a far workplace. He lets her go to the workshop right across from the house out of necessity. The small workshops are fed in this way. Also *hemşerilik* [being from the same place of origin], kinship, *hatır gönül* (“respect and sake-related”) relationships are still powerful. The man makes his own child, his nephew, work like a donkey. Then he gives him a small amount of pocket money. And this is called a favor.

...

Interviewer: What is the proportion of women workers?

Faysal: The number of women workers is increasingly rising. The reason for this is that they can dominate them easier. The cases of women workers rising against the boss and to seek their right are much rare compared to men. Generally they do whatever the boss tells them. And also if her age is low, that is all. The situation is completely a disaster then. They make the 13-14 years old girls do the worst jobs.¹⁶¹

These work places are named as sweatshops, where women are employed in general. These women's participation in working life is related to the availability of

¹⁶¹ “Ufuk: *Bizim işte yaş sınırı var diyen yalan söyler.*

Onur: Özellikle küçük işyerlerinde yoktur. Bence küçük işyerlerinin kapanması lazım. İşçinin canına okuyorlar. Çoluk-çocuk, kadın, hamile dinlemezler. Şimdi, ‘bunlar kapansa işsizlik daha da artar’ diyenler olabilir. Ama bence küçükler kapansa, mecburen büyükleri açacaklar.

Faysal: Sakın büyüğü de çok iyi sanmayın. Orada da anca şöyle böyle yaşıyorsun işte. Ama küçük fabrikalardaki koşullar, çalışma değil cinayet.

Ufuk: Nasıl kapanacak ki? Bu konfeksiyon dediğinde kadınlar da çalışıyor bir kere. Mesela evliyse, kocası uzağa yollamaz. Hemen karşısındaki küçük atölyeye yolluyor mecbur. Küçük atölyeler ondan besleniyor. Bir de hemşerilik, akrabalık, hatır gönül ilişkileri falan hala geçer akçe. Adam kendi çocuğunu, yeğenini afedersin eşek gibi çalıştırıyor. Cebine de üç kuruş sıkıştırıyor harçlık diye. Onun da adı ‘kiyak’ oluyor.

Interviewer: Kadın işçi oranı nedir?

Faysal: Kadın işçiler giderek artıyor. Bunun nedeni de kadınlara daha kolay hükmedebiliyorlar. Kadın işçinin patronun karşısına çıkıp kavga etmesi, hakkını araması, erkeklerden çok daha azdır. Genelde patron ne derse yaparlar. Bir de yaşı küçükse tamam işte. O zaman durum tam bir felaket. 13-14 yaşındaki kızlar her türlü işte çalıştırıyorlar.”

these sweatshops around the borough. Due to the moral and familial values, there is a spatial restriction for women to look for jobs outside the borough. Correspondingly, they were mentioned as being bonded to the occupations in the local labor market. These women and their families are considered to be at the low ebb, so they are dependent to the availability of this worst job in the sweatshops. Like Onur mentioned, during the fieldwork, the people with whom I talked in the neighborhood expressed that the closure of these sweatshops would deteriorate the living conditions in the neighborhood.

Observing the feminization of working environment in the textile sector, Faysal also mentioned that the employers preferred women because they were seen as docile people.¹⁶² The attitudes of employers to these women were expressed as different. Moreover, these sweatshops were mentioned as relying on kinship and familial ties.¹⁶³ According to Onur, school children were working there as “seasonal employees” in the summer holidays. They receive the worst of pays, nearly 150 YTL per month. These children were considered to be out of the typical wage-labor relation since their pay was conceptualized as a “favor,” rather than wage.

The interview with these workers continued, as they responded to the questions about whether and how they tried to change these conditions. Their responses will be included in the following chapter, but now it should be mentioned

¹⁶² For employers' preference of women see Erdem Yörük, *Social Relations of Production within the Workshop System in Istanbul's Apparel Industry*, (master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2006). Yörük also examines the uneven distribution of wage level in Istanbul workshops, and points out the low level in the Anatolian side of the city. According to his study, in Beykoz the average wage level is 550 YTL, while its average is nearly 770 YTL in the European side of the city.

¹⁶³ I was able to talk one of employers of this type of sweatshops. With his wife, sister, daughter, and son, he has been running a sweatshop in the basement of their houses. His wife mentioned that one of the workers, who newly quitted, was the woman living in the lower floor of their old house. She was complaining about this woman because of quitting work, even without notice. For a detailed ethnographic study on the participation of women in the sweatshop level production in the setting of Istanbul, see Jenny B. White, *Money Makes Us Relatives: Women's Labor in Urban Turkey* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1994).

that they expressed the failure of unionization attempts of their friends in different workshops. These four workers expected even the continuation of this deterioration of working conditions, if workers would not do anything for themselves.

This interview with four male textile workers is significant in the issues it raises about the working environment in the textile workshops. These young men found themselves in a deteriorated working environment after the closure of the factories. For them, this meant either the “absence of time to live” or the “lack of a regular life.” Irregularity is the leading characteristic of their occupation from the life in one working day to the life-long working years. According to their evaluations of wage levels, the children and old-age workers receive worst wages. These four workers acknowledged the unequal treatment of workers in these workshops. The conditions of the children were pictured as the inferior of all workers. As the women were considered less spatially mobile and more docile in the working life in comparison to men, they seemed to be more bonded to these inferior working conditions. All in all, the interview’s heading “shackled workers” summarizes their experience of working in these workshops. The absence of any other choice qualifies the metaphor of “shackles” under the pressure of unemployment.

What was lacking this interview is the literal evaluation of these working conditions within the memories of the past. This generation had not directly experienced unionized and permanent factory work like the previous generation in the borough. Listening to Ahmet’s descriptions about these working conditions, the view of a former factory worker appears as:

Say that you are working in Acarlar. What can you afford with the minimum wage? No job, there is no job. Or there are workshops. But there you can work for 3 months, 5 months, afterwards there is no work. My son was working in textiles. He quit last week. Say that you work there for 2-3 years; therefore your wage should be increased. The man says “Leave the work! May God be with you! Bye!” Naturally the

person who started to work for 500, takes 800 three years later. Therefore they do not keep workers for long. There is no law. The government does not do anything. Besides, there is no union. How can a worker have job security without being unionized? He can't. Never and ever. The man comes and makes you sign a paper, which says that you do not have any rights. My son worked in Kağıthane. But the ones here are also bad. All of the textile workshops in Istanbul are bad. There is no textile workshop here. You can't call them workshop. They all work *fason* (producing for bigger factories in a highly flexible way). They do not produce for themselves. No insurance. Very rare. In a workshop with 30 workers, 10 of them would be insured at most. Only one week ago there was a raid of state inspectors in Çiğdem neighborhood. They closed a couple shops down. My daughter-in-law was working there in a workshop. The inspectors closed it. The boss now makes workers start to work in 4 in the evening. And lets' them go at 12 at night. He hides from the inspectors in this way. We are living in Turkey.¹⁶⁴

These are the explanations of a former glassworker, Ahmet, whose son and daughter-in-law were working in the textile sweatshops. For him, no other job was available than those temporary ones in the sweatshops and domestic work in the gated community Acarkent. The focus of his evaluations was the lack of job security, which he witnessed newly through his son. His definite reference to the absence of unions as a conditioning factor of the job insecurity is meaningful, considering his past at the Glass-Bottle factory.¹⁶⁵ For the four young workers, the lack of unions was not a clear reference point as it was for Ahmet. They remembered unions when the interviewer asked about whether they were trying to change these conditions.

¹⁶⁴ Ahmet, interview by author, in one of the coffeehouses in the Soğuksu neighborhood, 17 March 2008. “*Şimdi Acarlarda çalışıyosun. Asgari ücret neyi kurtarır? Yok, hiçbir şey yok. Ya da atölyeler var. Ama onlarda 3 ay çalışıyon 5 ay çalışıyon sonra iş yok. Oğlum tekstildeydi. Geçen hafta çıktı. 2-3 yıl orada çalışmışsın. Aldığın maaş artacak tabi. Adam diyo ki ‘Sen çık, Allahın selameti başına olsun. Güle güle.’ Tabii 500 e giren insan 3 sene sonra 800 alıyor. Ondan fazla tutmuyorlar. Yasa da yok ki. Hükümet birşey yapmıyor. Zaten sendikasız. Sendikasız olan bir işçinin güvencesi nasıl olur? Hiç olmaz. Adam geliyor sana bir kağıt imzalattıyor: ‘hiç bir hakkın yok’ diye. Oğlum Kağıthane’de çalışıyordu. Ama buradaki de kötü. İstanbul’daki tekstillerin hepsi kötü. Burada tekstil atölyesi yok. Onlara atölye denmez. Hepsi fason çalışıyor. Kendi imatları yok. Sigorta yok. Çok nadir. Bir atölyede 30 kişi çalışıyorsa, 10 tane sigortalı olan yoktur. Daha bir hafta önce Çiğdem mahallesine baskın yaptılar. Bir kaç atölyeyi kapattılar. Şu anda benim gelinim var. Orada atölyede çalışıyordu. Maliye kapattı. Patron da şimdi akşam saat 4’te işe alıyor. Gece saat 12’de bırakıyor. Maliyeden kaçıyor yani. Türkiye’de yaşıyoruz.*”

¹⁶⁵ In the interview, although he criticized his former union Kristal-İş, he also mentioned that unions should make important contribution to the well-being of workers in the working life.

Ahmet and the four young workers remembered unions at different moments of their talk. Here, this difference can be proposed as an issue for further research. Ahmet's different remembrance moment can be hypothesized as conditioned by his memory of the unionized occupation in the Glass-Bottle factory.

Ahmet's description of his daughter-in-law's workplace is an example. During my field work, the Labor Ministry's inspections were tightened in the borough. However these unregistered sweatshops continued their production in deflected working hours, in the back streets, and in basements, I witnessed many town-talks on these sweatshops, that these would be closed in the near future. The current high unemployment is considered to become boomed with the closure of these sweatshops. They have been expecting this fact, since they are considering the place to be organized around the tourism sector and planned to be "the rich's place" that excludes both these workplaces and their *gecekondus*. Correspondingly, Ahmet's and the four young workers' evaluations of these working conditions depict these sweatshops as the lesser evil for the maintenance of livelihood in the borough. After deindustrialization and in the midst of urban transformation, they have accepted working conditions in these sweatshops like Beytullah. He was the victim of privatization, who had to accept the deteriorated employment opportunity in the state institution.

Serving the Rich

In the midst of urban transformation, the inhabitants of Paşabahçe are experiencing another facet of the contemporary work environment through the mediation of domestic workers who are employed in the gated community Acarkent

build in the higher elevations of the district. During the fieldwork, this section of population was observed to be a distinctive reference group in the borough. Including the domestic workers, the people I talked with in the neighborhood classified them like “the employed in Acarlar.” On the one hand, these workers and their acquaintances described the existence of this occupational possibility as a positive issue, since the existence of the gated communities sustained the livelihood of the district after deindustrialization.¹⁶⁶ On the other hand, the others interpreted the maid’s position in the gated communities as slave-like. In this section, I will represent these two distinct perceptions of domestic work.

My first encounter with these workers (many women and two private security staff) was when we were waiting for the departure of a dolmus from Acarkent. As it happened at the end of their working day, they were leaving Acarkent to return to their gecekondus at a distance at most ten minutes. In twos or threes, they talked about what they had done in that working day and whispered sentences like; “We left work late once again.” “The washing machine broke down, they came to repair it.” “They fired her. Whereas she kept saying that this woman was very good.”¹⁶⁷ During the fieldwork, then, I heard “good” and “bad” adjectives in many instances when the issue was about being employed in Acarlar. To a great extent, the personal characteristics of the employer as “good” or “bad” seemed to determine the domestic

¹⁶⁶ One of the home-workers, I talked with in short in the dolmus mentioned this fact as “for people, who are working here, the existence of gated communities is good, however for those who do not work, it is bad. More rich may come to Beykoz. So as to we have job.” Gökhan, from the youth group of Soğuksu neighborhood, where includes these gated communities according to official borders, mentioned that “*Fabrikalar kapandığında biz burası bitti sanmıştık, ama bu villalar burayı kurtardı.*” (When the factories were closed, we considered that this place came to a dead-end. However, these villas rescued here). His sister-in-law was domestic worker in Acarkent, earning 1500 YTL which was relatively high.

¹⁶⁷ “*Bugün yine geç çıktık.*” “*Çamaşır makinesi bozuldu, tamire geldiler.*” “*İşten çıkartmışlar, oysa bu seferki kadın çok iyi diyordu.*”

workers' evaluation of their working conditions.¹⁶⁸ The characteristic of domestic work that the relation between the sides is not considered to be a simple employment relationship was observed in the interviews I conducted with a woman who had previously worked and a man who was still working with this wife in Acarkent.

When my informants were making critical generalizations about the people who employed domestic workers they usually referred to them as “the rich.” In the case of Özkan Köse, who was a former glassworker and now gardener, the employer had not increased his wages in two years. His employer had not even kept his promises to provide the means for Özkan's children to be educated. Since 1997, he and his wife had been working and also living in the same private house in Acarkent. Their total wage was 900 YTL, for what he mentioned “I am working for nothing with my family.” He added that “When I ask for a wage increase, you know the rich people... The guy stops talking with me for two months long.” Then, as he explained, his employer was “a little miser.”¹⁶⁹

For the informants out of this wage-labor relation, these women are considered to be “working for their food only” or “at the lowest ebb.” Their status is perceived as derogatory. The conversation of the women I met at the *Soğuksu Halk Eğitim Merkezi* (Soğuksu People's Education Center) illustrates this point:

(a woman, who used to work in an garment factory) Fatma: Those who are working there are not pleased either. One of my neighbors, the woman downstairs, works in one of those. But very, very seldom do they end up working for a nice person. That is, they are used like slaves. It is said that they make them work by tormenting.

(a woman, whose brother and father used to work in the glass sector) Derya: Let me tell you this, after all of those factories were removed

¹⁶⁸ For the importance of personal characteristic in the evaluation of domestic work see Aksu Bora, *Kadınların Sınıfı: Ücretli Ev Emeği ve Kadın Öznelliğinin İnşası*, (Istanbul: İletişim, 2005), pp. 137-154. Bora also mentions that however, maid workers seemed to be aware of their distinction from employers, they express this fact in cultural and personal differences.

¹⁶⁹ Özkan, interview by author, tape recording, in a coffeehouse in Paşabahçe, 20 March 2008. “Ben ailemle birlikte bedavaya çalışıyorum.” “Adam zam dediğim zaman, zenginleri biliyorsunuz yani... Adam 2 ay benimle konuşmuyor.”

from here, people became the slaves of the rich. People became the slaves of Acarlar and Beykoz Konakları.

Fatma: There is nothing there for the women. Only those in financial trouble, those who have no other choice work there.

Derya: Those who work there are in trouble. I mean, you should be really in a difficult situation to clean someone else's house. Don't misunderstand me, I am not belittling them. Definitely, this is not my intention, never. But they are doing it as a last resort... I mean it is very difficult. While the cleaning, you do in your own house, is itself very hard, think about someone else's house.

Fatma: They tell stories about the job. Once a dog bred ... The owner of the house told my friend: "Do not come closer! Germs would pass to it from you!" Can a person pass germs to a dog? The dog passes me the germs. (laughing)

(A teacher in a Kuran school) Meryem: If an animal lover hears what you just said, she would become very angry.

Fatma: But a person should not be so humiliated, just because she does cleaning there. I am superior to a dog, I mean, I should be superior as a human being. But that woman talked like this. How can you humiliate a person like this? On the other hand, the woman is our friend, who loves cats and dogs a lot. She feeds the street cats. This made me laugh a lot.

Fatma: They had given her more money previously because she took care of the animals. I mean, they had given her an extra tip for this. Also another person was fired because she called the dog "dog." What should we call the dog? Sir? What?¹⁷⁰

¹⁷⁰ The women in Soğuksu Halk Eğitim Merkezi, interview by the author, tape recording, in Soğuksu, 03 April 2008.

"(daha önceden tekstil fabrikasında çalışan kadın) Fatma: Orda çalışanlara da huzur vermiyorlarmış ki. Benim alt katımda çalışıyor bir tane kadın. Ama hiç yani, binde bir iyi bir insana rast geliyorlarmış. Onlar köle gibi kullanılıyorlar yani. Para veriyoruz diye eziyet ederek, iş yaptırıyorlarmış.

(Abisi ve babası şişe camda çalışmış kadın) Derya: Bak ben sana birşey söyleyim mi, bütün bu fabrikaları kaldırdılar, millet zenginlerin kölesi oldu. Acarlar'ın, Beykoz Konakları'nın halk kölesi oldu.

Fatma: Kadınlar için birşey yok. Çok sıkışan çalışıyor yani, artık başka çıkışı olmayan çalışıyor.

Derya: Ama oralarda çalışanlar çok müşkül. Yani başkasının evini temizlemen için hakikaten çok müşkül durumda olmalısın. Yanlış anlamayın onları aşağılamıyorum ben. Kesinlikle, asla öyle birşey yok. Ama onlar çıkış kapısı olduğu için... Yani çok zor. Evde yaptığımız temizlik zor geliyor, başkasının evini düşünsene...

Fatma: Anlatıyorlar, şimdi bir tane köpek yavrulamış . . . Demiş ki: "yaklaşma köpek mikrop kapar senden." Bir insandan bir köpek mikrop kapar mı? Ben kaparım köpekten mikrop. (gülüyorlar) . . . (Kuran kursu hocası)Meryem: Şunu bir hayvan sever duysa, nasıl kızar.

Fatma: Ama o kadar da insan aşağılanmaz orda temizlik yapıyor diye. Ben köpekten üstünüm, yani insan olarak üstün olmam gerekir. Yani demiş bunu. İnsan olarak sen bunu ne kadar aşağılıyorsun. Hem de kendisi baya kedi, köpek seven bir insan. Yani çok seviyor. Sokak kedilerine bakar. Çok güldüm anlatamam.

Fatma: Halbuki hayvanları sevdi diye, ona daha çok para da vermişlerdi. Bahşış vermişlerdi. Başkasına da köpeğe "köpek" dedi diye işten atmış. Yani ne diycez, beyfendi mi diycez köpeğe? Ne diycez?"

The home workers are perceived to be working like slaves in the gated communities. In the talk, the women in Soğuksu Halk Eğitim Merkezi provided a well detailed evaluation of this occupation that I heard in many cases from the people. Their employment is considered as a “last resort” because they can not survive without this work. Derya directly related the closures of factories to the “becoming slaves of the rich.” Her father and elder brother used to work in the Glass-Bottle Factory. She seemed nearly fifty years old, as she was older than the other women who were nearly in their twenties and thirties. Probably, her experience of the factories was more extensive than the other women, so as she directly referred to the closure of the factories.

On the other hand, Fatma described her acquaintance’s experiences with the person who employed her. As she mentioned, these women “faced” the personal characteristic of the employer. According to her, there were negligible amount of “good” people, while most maltreated the domestic workers by belittling them. In the conversation above, these women evaluated not only to be bonded to this low status occupation, but also the cultural habits of “the rich,” as the case of dog exemplified. Fatma was aware of that the employers have usually thought of the domestic workers as carriers of “germs.”¹⁷¹

However, Fatma did not experience domestic work individually. She was in an ambiguous position. On the one hand, she internalized being a domestic worker and got nervous to the employers’ attitudes against them; on the other hand, she was estranged from these women and described their humiliated position in relation to the rich, even laughing. For this latter treatment, it could be argued that she might have

¹⁷¹ Bora, *Kadınların Sınıfı*, pp. 147-149. For this common marking of home-workers with “dirt,” see also Gül Özyeğin, *Başkalarının Kiri: Kapıcılar, Gündelikçiler ve Kadınlık Halleri* (İstanbul: İletişim, 2001), p.6.

wanted to differentiate herself from home-workers who were mentioned to be slave-like. Her former attitude, however, was conditioned by the familiarization of her own position with the domestic workers and the distinction of herself from the rich. In other words, as she acknowledged her “social distance” from the rich, she experienced the “nearness” of the domestic worker in a “form of complicity.”¹⁷² As if she had called the dog “dog,” she asked “what should *we* call the dog?” With these domestic workers, she shared similar orientations. Both are living in the gecekondus near this gated community. More or less, they have similar economic capital with these domestic workers. In addition, their cultural habits can be also considered as identical as the narrative over the dog exemplifies. Correspondingly, she described the personal experience of a domestic worker, as if she had witnessed it.

This sensation of Fatma and the other women in the Halk Eđitim Merkezi should be related to the appearance of this new rich in the borough as a conditioning factor that would determine their fate in the neighborhood. As mentioned above, in Pařabahçe there is a clear thought that the place is planned to be “the rich’s place” where gecekondus and their inhabitants would be excluded. It could be argued that this sensation of urban transformation positions this employment relation with the “gentry” as a common relation for the inhabitants of gecekondus.

During the fieldwork, I observed that being a domestic worker in Acarkent had contradictory meanings for the inhabitants of Pařabahçe. On the one hand, the people who were employed by the rich conceived this occupation as an advantage for their sustenance of livelihood. For this condition, one of domestic workers suggested that “more rich may come to Beykoz, so we will have job.” They were becoming critical when this occupation did not realize their expectations and when they were

¹⁷² Pierre Bourdieu, “What Makes a Social Class? On the Theoretical and Practical Existence of Groups,” *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* 32 (1987), p. 5.

subjected to degrading treatment. Observing the workers' bonded situation, on the other hand, the women who were not working in Acarkent were clearer in the negation of the appearance of this occupation. To some extent, they perceived the domestic workers' employment relation with the rich like their own relation since they familiarize themselves with these workers. For these women, the social-spatial segregation between the gecekondu and the gated communities marked their perception of serving the rich. However, for those in the employment relation with the rich, the existence of gated communities meant retracting the pressure of unemployment.

Youth under the Yoke of Unemployment

In all interviews among different working groups, including the workers expelled from the factories, those in the workshops, and employed in the gated communities, the pressure of unemployment was a clear reference to define the working environment of Paşabahçe. The closure of workshops for the decoration of glassware which was subsequent to downsizing and closure of factories meant farewell to an important quantity of job opportunities from the district. Also the severance payments of the expelled factory workers were mentioned as being wasted in opening sweatshops in the textile sector. Due to the continuing contraction in this sector, there was a clear concern that these workers had lost their initial reserves, like many people mentioned. As I explained above, this contraction was mentioned to cause sharpening of the stress of unemployment, especially among the youth. Only the expanding service sector due to the development of gated communities was mentioned as an obstacle to the further deterioration of livelihood in the district. But

this possibility of employment was negated as being slave or “kunta-kinte” of the rich, since being maid was considered to be derogatory by those who are not employed there.

Youth are the most vulnerable group under these conditions. I was able to talk with two groups of youth, one in the headquarters of the Paşabahçe neighborhood and other in the Soğuksu neighborhood. For the three boys in Paşabahçe, nine-tenths of the young population were unemployed.¹⁷³ When we talked, one of them had newly returned from seeking employment as a waiter in a hotel in Bakırköy, a district far on the European side of the city. All were nearly 20 years old and they had been looking for jobs in those days. For them, the world of youth was determined not only by unemployment but also with drug-use. They approximated that equally nine-tenths of the youth had attempted using drugs at least once in their lives. They defined the working environment of Paşabahçe as *İş yok!* (“No Jobs!”).

In the interview with the youth of Soğuksu this expression of “no jobs” turned into “*İş var ama...*” (“There are jobs, but...”).¹⁷⁴ Murat, 20 years old, said:

Murat: But these do not appreciate any jobs.

Murat: I swear. See, actually there is no unemployment, if you want to work. I even took you to a job, did you keep on?

Halim: No, I did not.

Murat: See! He does not want to work. I called him myself, so that he would have a job. I also took his brother. He kept working only for three days, and then he quit. If I am comfortable at that job, they should be so anyway.

Halim: There are jobs, not that there isn't.

Alpkan: Do you have an income? From your family?

Halim: I don't have an income. Not from my family. Actually I don't exactly have a family. We get on somehow.

¹⁷³ This was an informal interview with three young male done for a previous study in the office of one leftist political party in the Paşabahçe neighborhood, in May 2007.

¹⁷⁴ For this similar account of jobs among the urban poor see Ayşe Buğra and Çağlar Keyder. February 2008. *Kent Nüfusunun En Yoksul Kesiminin İstihdam Yapısı ve Geçinme Yöntemleri*. Istanbul: Sosyal Politika Forumu. Available [online]: http://www.spf.boun.edu.tr/docs/kent_yoksullugu_rapor.pdf [15 June 2008].

Murat: How can you make these guys work? They should get to work in the same workplace all together with their friends, having fun, ridiculing and all that. So that they would bankrupt the shop they work!

Ayşe: Don't you do any job? How do you make a living? You should subsist yourself in some way.

Murat: He has a place to stay. He lives with his grandfather. His grandfather has a salary. How do you call it?

Alpkan: Pension. Where is he retired from?

Halim: From the ships.¹⁷⁵

Murat had been working in a textile factory that had recruited nearly 80 workers. He explained that he was insured since there was high risk of occupational accident in his position.¹⁷⁶ Murat's only complaint about his job was the low amount of wage. In the interview, he accused his friend Halim of not wanting to be employed. Halim's family was separated, for which he mentions "I have no family." He was working at only temporary daily jobs which became available in the construction sites in the gated community, Acarkent. For the work done, he received 15-20 YTL, as he used it like pocket money for his daily survival. But the main source of his subsistence was his grandfather's retirement pension. He was living the threshold of unemployment because as Murat mentioned sarcastically they disliked the job opportunities available in the district. However, Halim seemed to think

¹⁷⁵ The youth group of the Soğuksu neighborhood, interview by author and Alpkan Birelma, tape recording, in the park of the neighborhood, Soğuksu, 14 June 2008.

"Murat: Ama bunlar iş beğenmiyor . . .

Murat: Ya işsizlik yok vallaha bak. Çalışmak istiyorsan. Ben bile seni işe götürdüm geldin mi?

Halim: Gelmedim.

Murat: Bak çalışmak istemiyor. Ben kendim çağırdım hadi gel çalışsın diye. Kardeşini götürdüm 3 gün çalıştı sonra çıktı işten. Ben rahat ettiğime göre bunlar hayli hayli rahat eder.

Halim: İş var ya iş yok değil. . . . Acarkent . . .

Alpkan: Gelirin var mı? Aileden?

Halim: Gelirim yok. Aileden yok yani. Aslında tam olarak ailem yok. Bir şekilde idare ediyoruz yani.

Murat: Ancak bunlar nasıl çalışacak? O arkadaş bu arkadaş, hepsi aynı yerde makara kukara...

Gittikleri yeri de batıracaklar yani.

Ayşe: Hiç mi iş yapmıyorsun yani? Nasıl geçiniyorsun? Bir şekilde geçinmen gerekiyor.

Murat: Ya kalcak iş var. Dedesinde kalıyor da. Dedesinin de maaşı var. Ne maaşı diyorlar ona?

Alpkan: Emekli maaşı. Nerden emekli?

Halim: Gemilerden emekli."

¹⁷⁶ "Bizim iş tehlikeli olduğu için mecburen bize sigorta yapıyorlar. Hani elimizi kessek, şikayet etsek herhalde şirketi ahırz elinden."

working in a “permanent” job as possible as it could be in this working environment.

For this psychology of the youth, Gökhan, another member of this group, said:

The youth here is generally quick-tempered. They want to work, but they can't. They can not get along. They do not have a trade. Neither do I. And marihuana, alcohol... His only worry is to stop himself attacking anyone on that day. To hold yourself from becoming angry with anyone. Therefore he wants to get high. You can't find anyone sober here. He talks with you, but he used something just before, even if in a small amount.¹⁷⁷

To describe the conditions of unemployment, above all, Gökhan expressed the prevalence of drug use in the world of youth. For him, the “nervous” dispositions of these young males were the main reason for their dissatisfaction with the existing occupation possibilities. What needs to be added is that this youth had been expected to adapt to the above presented deteriorating working conditions. Correspondingly, Gökhan mentioned, they did not prefer to hold jobs in this environment, since these conditions did not meet their expectations and they easily quit working.¹⁷⁸ In his account, Paşabahçe was witnessing a definite pattern of deindustrialization, as in the literature the extensiveness of drug-using is mentioned as a common thing to happen to the youth's share.¹⁷⁹

However, there were signs of “ghetto-related behaviors”¹⁸⁰ among this youth; due to the integrated self-organization of community that was surviving as far as

¹⁷⁷ Gökhan and Ayça, interview by author, tape recording, in the park of the Soğuksu neighborhood, 11 June 2008. “*Burada oturan gençlik genellikle sinirli. Çalışmak istiyorlar, çalışmıyorlar. Anlaşmıyorlar. Meslek yok elinde. Ben de dahil. Esrar, içki... Hani diyor ki bugün kimseye saldırmayayım. Kimseye sinirlenmeyeyim. Kafam iyi olsun. Burada kimseyi ayık bulamazsın. Sohbet eder böyle ama biraz az bir şey kullanmıştır.*”

¹⁷⁸ “There is no job opportunity now. Some people do not want the available ones. He does not like it. For example, the job offers a minimum wage, 400 million. He does not like this. He thinks that I can only buy a couple of shoes. He doesn't have any trade neither.” “*Şimdi bir iş imkanı yok. Kimisi istemiyor. Beğenmiyor işte. Gidiyor adam, asgari ücret 400 milyon. Beğenmiyor. Diyor bir tane ayakkabı alırım. Meslek de yok.*”

¹⁷⁹ See M. Fine, and L. Weis, *The Unknown City: Lives of Poor and Working Class Young Adults* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1988); Elijah Anderson, *Code of the Street: Decency, Violence, and the Moral Life of the Inner City* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1999).

¹⁸⁰ W.J. Wilson, *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor* (Vintage: New York, 1997.)

possible from the old days of industry, the place seemed to resist the path of ghettoization. Gökhan explained this experience with reference to other districts in Istanbul where “the people did not know each other” and crimes like robbery were considered to be widespread.¹⁸¹ On the other hand, he mentioned that “all people have kinship ties here.” Therefore, he insisted that the place was “viable” despite its lack of preferable employment opportunities.

As a reason for unemployment, Gökhan also referred to the lack of vocation, which was related to the low level of education in the district. According to the head of Beykoz Municipality Muharrem Ergül, since the 1970s the education level in Beykoz has been worsening in relation to the overall level in Istanbul.¹⁸² At present, the statistics of Beykoz means that the district is penultimate district in the success rating of the OKS (the exam after primary school) and ranking last in OSYS (university entrance exam) education level in Istanbul.¹⁸³ This fact should be related to legacy of the craft characteristics of industrial sector, especially glassmaking in the borough. For instance, Gökhan, a graduate of junior high school, was working in a sweatshop of decoration during his schooling ages between 10 and 15 years old.¹⁸⁴ For him, the job losses in this sector meant lacking a profession that was suitable and also valuable in the changing working environment of Paşabahçe. Moreover, this low level of education also caused an obstacle, especially, for the young males to be

¹⁸¹ He gave reference to the youth of Sarıgazi-Ümraniye where he was working.

¹⁸² For the news see “*Eğitimin sorunları sadece konuşuldu.*” 24 May 2008. Available [online]: http://www.dostbeykoz.com.tr/haber_detay.asp?id=3688&tur=255 [25 May 2008]. Even he related this problem of lower levels of education to the failure of urban planning, since on the lands, that were planned to be education institutions, there are houses of inhabitants in the practice. According to 1990s census, the low level of education was mentioned as a specific social characteristic of Beykoz district. See *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi* s.v. “Beykoz İlçesi.”

¹⁸³ “*Beykozlu eğitimciler sonuncu.*” 18 March 2007. Available [online]: http://www.dostbeykoz.com/haber_detay.asp?id=2210&tur=0. [March 2008].

¹⁸⁴ He involved in the active working population of Paşabahçe, accompanying his elder brother who was also working in the same workshop in these years.

employed in the private security sector developed in relation to the gated communities. Their major occupational possibility was constricted with a law that restricted employment to high-school graduates.

On the other hand, Gökhan also added that the local employers did not prefer this youth for recruiting since they were considered to be idle and addicted to drug and alcohol. Thus, drug use and unemployment became a chicken and egg situation for this youth of Paşabahçe. Another informant, Yavuz Gürkan, who moved into Acarkent from the Tokatköy neighborhood, related the present “idleness” of the people to the closure of the factories as:

When the factories were closed down, people realized that the available jobs would not let the person make any savings. No matter how hard he works, the poor remains poor. Naturally, people lost their work discipline. Once I wanted to make someone dig a whole in my garden. I found some people here in the teahouse. They came the first day, but no one showed up at the second.¹⁸⁵

For him, the people ceased to work since they could not foresee a better alternative future. He expressed that the present working environment did not enable them to break the “poverty trap.” In contrast, Yavuz, nearly 50 years old, broke this trap early, before the closure of the factories. Because he was a university graduate, that meant to be very privileged in the district.¹⁸⁶ His social mobility fashioned also his spatial mobility, like moving into Acarkent. Due to the fact that he criticized the people who quit the job from the status of an employer, it can be argued that this

¹⁸⁵ Yavuz Gürkan, Erkan Atagün, and Muammer Nalcı, interview by the author, tape recording, in the local of Tokatköy Kent Kültürü Birliği, 01 March 2008. “*Fabrikalar kapanınca, insanlar baktılar var olan işler bir birikim sağlamıyor. Ne kadar çalışsa, yine yoksul yine yoksul. Tabii insanlar da iş disiplini kaybettiler. Bahçeyi kazdıracaktım. Buradan kahveden çağırdım. Birinci gün geldiler, ama ikinci gün kimse yok.*” Another former glassworker who got retired before the closure of factories mentioned that he could not find any young male that could work in repairing his house. He also added the “inappropriate behaviors” of youth who were disturbing other inhabitants. Mustafa, interview by the author, tape recording, in the office of security staff in the Glass-Bottle Factory, 9 March 2008.

¹⁸⁶ According to the research of Beykoz Municipality, the rate of university graduates was only one percent in 1987. Beykoz Municipality, *Beykoz Geri Görünüm ve Etkilenme Bölgesi İmar Planı Araştırma Raporu* (1987), p. 32.

status determined his evaluation of “work discipline” and idleness. He should be adapted to the hegemonic “discourse of idleness” to define the reason for the existence of poverty. However, he emphasized also that the poor were actually deprived of potential factors of social mobility because the working environment had deteriorated since the plant shutdowns. Correspondingly, his picture of unemployment did not differ from that of Gökhan, who mentioned that the present working conditions themselves excluded the youth from the labor market.

Interim Remarks

In this section, I tried to picture the working environment of Paşabahçe from the inhabitants’ points of view. During the fieldwork, when I was asking the people about this environment, many responded to me with reference to those people working in domestic service in Acarkent and in the textile sweatshops. Other than those workers, the disappearance of jobs in the neighborhood was an important point in their answers. For them, the closure of the factories meant the degradation of working conditions and even the vanishing of employment possibilities. Correspondingly, these actually working people are considered to be bonded to these less desirable occupations that are available in the borough. They are kept on the tenterhooks of unemployment. If they do not adapt to these working conditions, they are excluded from the labor market, like many of the young experience.

Only the development of the gated communities was mentioned as maintaining the livelihood in the district. However, the appearance of this employment possibility was not frictionless for many, who evaluated this employment relation as a symbol of social and spatial segregation between

themselves and the inhabitants of the gated communities. In fact, the description of these workers' new position as slave-like was typical in many of the interviews, as in the interview with the women in Soğuksu Halk Eğitim Merkezi. Even, the former factory workers, I talked to, used the metaphor of "kunta-kinte"¹⁸⁷ to explain the new position, workers are subjected to in contemporary working life. When I asked one of them what he meant by "kunta-kinte," he said "in the union meetings it used to be said that we won't become kunta-kinte, we will be workers who have rights."¹⁸⁸ In contrast to this image of the factory worker, they evaluated being a maid, gardener or chauffeur as a "last resort" that would be chosen only "at the low ebb."

Indeed, all occupations were evaluated as the lesser evil under these conditions. For one of the expelled factory workers it meant adapting to the deteriorated position in a state institution and becoming a "victim of privatization." To accept this position in a state institution meant only persuading "disease," while the jobs suitable in the "market" were seen as "death" for his age, 35. For those, who had not experienced being factory worker, the disease was jobs in the informal textile sector that are temporary and low and irregular paying. If they did not participate in this working life, they would enter the pool of unemployed. Thus, unemployment appeared like a "forced choice," especially for the youth, who were stressed about the lack of an alternative future. Then it became chronic as they adapted to using drugs. It was the bottom of the ladder. All in all, they perceived the deterioration of working conditions after the closure of the factories.

¹⁸⁷ The word "kunta-kinte" with its determined notions like being victim of violent oppression and the symbol of resistance should be considered as appeared in the common language of people with the television series *Roots* broadcasted in TRT, the official channel in Turkey, in the 1980s.

¹⁸⁸ İhsan Bekler, interview by author, tape recording, in a restaurant in Paşabahçe, 06 March 2008. "*Sendika toplantılarında biz kunta-kinte olmaycaz, biz hakları olan işçi olcaz denilirdi.*" Either, the union started to use the word "kunta-kinte" after the television series *Roots* or it is remembered only from this series, the denotation of word is important when the trajectory of people's livelihood is considered within the process of deindustrialization and the development of the gated communities.

Perceptions of Changing Conditions of Inhabitation: “Psychology of Exile”

In this section, the other face of the actual change which is experienced as a constant threat of deportation from the district with the implementation of urban transformation projects will be discussed. During the fieldwork, the urban condition behind the closure of the factories was on the edge of determining the fate of the people in the borough. For this fate, the standard explanation of many people I talked to was that “this place has no future” or “it would be the rich’s place.” The first refers to the experiences of the closures of the three factories which were the nerve center of district, while the second refers to their anxiety about the preparation of urban regeneration plans, which most people considered to be biased to promote capital seeking the “appropriation of rent . . . interest and profit by building new elements in the built environment.”¹⁸⁹ The gated communities, which have been developing at the higher elevations of the district, are the very reason for this consideration. But it should be mentioned that the fact that the Environment and Forestry Minister, Osman Pepe accused the contractor of Acarkent and Acaristanbul İsmet Acar of illegally pillaging the forest complicated this consideration for some inhabitants. Pepe also brought a law suit for the cancellation of the title deeds of villas in December 2006 as the owners of these luxury villas were claimed to be “illegal occupants” like gecekonu dwellers.¹⁹⁰ Then, the intrusion of “rentier” contracting firms to the neighborhood of Rüzgarlıbahçe¹⁹¹ was considered to be

¹⁸⁹ David Harvey, “Labor, Capital, and Class Struggle around the Built Environment in Advanced Capitalist Societies,” in *Classes, Power, and Conflict*, eds. by Anthony Giddens and David Held (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), pp. 545-561.

¹⁹⁰ However, at June 2008, a bill that was being considered to deliver the title deeds of Beykoz Konakları and Acarkent was being debated in the parliament.

¹⁹¹ This neighborhood is not included in this study since the place is considered to be out of the industrial basin of Paşabahçe. However the process in this neighborhood can be explained in brief. After the presentation urban regeneration plans for the neighborhood, contracting firms have

antecedent of the path other neighborhoods will follow in the near future. Another determinant of this consideration has been the *ecrimisil* (occupancy tax),¹⁹² which have come into question in the district, since it has been started to happen more frequently. As these events are connected to each other in the mental map of the inhabitants, they have been beset by worries and apprehension of what is to follow in the district. The “psychology of exile” was the account of a representative of the neighborhood protection society to explain the way of life on the edge of the preparation of urban regeneration plans.

The popular expression of this troubled life is “the problem of property” rather than “the problem of shelter.” They defined the lack of the right of the property of their houses as the basic problem of the district. Not against the property, but around the right of property, they have been competing with the rich who are considered to be intending to get the place from their inhabitation or the agents who are considered to be paving the way for the intrusion of the rich. The fact that they articulated their interest with reference to the right of property can be better understood as an implication of the hegemonic discourse of property rights and the past setting of this agenda on the problem of land registers. Before, the inhabitants did not feel the anxiety of banishment from the district, but recently the “psychology

introduced in the process of urban transformation. During the fieldwork, not only the gecekondu owners but also the owners of registered houses were displaced by these contracting firms who threatened the inhabitants, saying “if they did not sell their houses, the state would confiscate them in return for lower amounts of money.” Against this process, the inhabitants of the neighborhood organized two public protests in front of Beykoz Municipality and a petition campaign. Also their struggle was institutionalized as the Rüzgarlıbağçe Preservation and Development Association, which became one of the founders of the Union of Beykoz Associations. This association aim to unite the struggle against Urban Transformation Projects in different neighborhoods. For more information, see Chapter 4.

¹⁹² In the code “*ecrimisil*” means “the compensation paid by the occupant or demanded by the administration due to benefiting from a commodity in terms of occupation, use or in any other way without the permission of its owner and without the consideration of that the owner would be damaged or not because of the usage of this commodity by the occupant.” (“*Bir malın, sahibinin rızası dışında ve onun bu malı kullanmakla bir zarara uğrayıp uğramayacağı söz konusu edilmeksizin bu maldan işgal, tasarruf veya her ne şekilde olursa olsun yararlanılması sebebiyle füzuli şagil tarafından ödenen veya idarece talep edilen tazminatı ifade eder.*”) Devlet Malları Mevzuatı, p.162.

of exile” is the matter. It should be mentioned that, correspondingly, the protagonists of the struggle against the urban regeneration plans commenced to convert the language of property into “the right to shelter” in their “own” place. What should be added is that these protagonists or the neighborhood protection associations are heterogeneous according to their political choices since they are gathering nationalists, socialists, etc.

The fact that the time allocated to the fieldwork coincided with a critical phase in the Beykoz Municipality’s planning procedure, that the plans were in the phase of the presentation ¹⁹³ to the district population and local NGOs, enabled me to attend some meetings organized either by the municipality, which aimed to bring out plans or by Beykoz Foundation, the Union of Beykoz Associations, and independent individuals that purposed to organize collective action against the plans. Also in the interviews, the people’s views on the housing status of gecekondus and urban regeneration plans were dealt with in a detailed manner. In this section, I should mention their perception of changing conditions of inhabitation in the district in two parts.

The first part concerns the status of gecekondus as illegal constructions in harmony with the categorization of gecekondus owners as “illegal occupants” in the place. For the “factory families” and their migrant generation, the law let it go to that: categorizing the population to be “squatter,” so that criminal in the face of law, and punishing them to pay ecrimisil. In some cases, in addition to being taxed, the people were punished with a fine. However, the advanced practice of law implied that the determination of crime and punishment can be a matter of coming time and

¹⁹³ According to the principles of urban planning, the authorities have to incorporate the local population in the process. Necessarily, the Municipality had organized such information meetings on the new urban plans.

social and symbolic “roots” in the place.¹⁹⁴ 23 women from among the later migrants who located in the place by building gecekondus following the earlier ones were sentenced to prison for five-and-a-half months. How the difference between the generation of factory families and the latter generation influenced their actual experiences of the urban condition will be discussed with reference to Sedat’s and Emine’s explanations. In all, the issues will be whether they feel themselves to be “indebted” and “guilty”¹⁹⁵ or not and their way of claiming right on the land.

In the second part, the inhabitants concerns on the urban plans will be described in a detailed manner like how they relate the closure of the factories with this urban condition, their apprehension of the goal of the plans, their questions about the plans like “For whom?” and “For what?” since in the plans the place was animated as lacking of these people and their houses. In this section, the views of Rıza, who is a retiree from Leather-Shoe factory, will present the perception of housing conditions inside the “failure” narrative of deindustrialization. The prevalence of these questions and the open answer “the rich” among the public of Paşabahçe, would be argued as there have arisen a kind of critical awareness on the class motives of urban regeneration plans. That is, while urban plans were presented as a technical matter for the benefit of urban population, the inhabitants’ popular experience of these plans is through their social position in the space. On the one hand, they are feeling the anxiety of exile; on the other, they articulated a kind of

¹⁹⁴ As the 1980s witnessed further migration in Istanbul, Beykoz received its own share however population growth was relatively less in comparison to Istanbul. According to population statistics since 1985, two neighborhoods, Tokatköy and Soğuksu, welcomed new migrants. These new comers can be expected as not experienced factory employment, but employed informally or become self-employed. For further information see Chapter 2.

¹⁹⁵ For the study, expressing the gecekondu owners who occupied the land for shelter rather than for urban rent as feeling themselves guilty and indebted to the state see Erbatır Çavuşoğlu, *Hegemonik Bir Süreç Olarak Türkiye Kentleşmesi*, (Ph.d diss., Mimar Sinan University, 2004), pp. 224-225.

critical awareness on their plight in the context of deindustrialization and urban transformation.

“Squatters” and Their Claim of “Roots”

When my dad arrived there, he found that 3-4 people had already divided the land into parcels. As you know the media uses the word “squatter.” My dad, Hüseyin Dalar had paid for that land and bought it. At first, he had paid it at this time. You know there were only title deeds provided by muhtars at that time. Five or ten years later, the state said that “I own this place, you should pay ecrimisil.” Thousands of people paid ecrimisil for years. Not even for once. In the 80s, as you know, Turgut Özal introduced *tapu tahsis belgesi* (“the title deed allocation document”). This was trickery as you know. Certified offices were set up. And under the instruction of fiscal consultants these title deed allocation documents were disposed. Ecrimisil appeared not to be enough. The citizens paid twice for the place in which they settled. After many years, in 1992 the deputies of the SHP applied, and the title deed allocation documents were abolished. After this, the ecrimisil for the years back between 80 and 90 were also paid. Of course some of the citizens raised objections and litigated. . . . All in all, the citizen had come there, took care himself, and built his house. But he also had paid for that land. He had not occupied it.¹⁹⁶

Sedat Dalar (41), who is a son of a retiree from the Leather-Shoe factory and brother of a Glass-Bottle factory worker, was one of the founders of a cooperative *Kent Kültürü Birliği* (the Union of City Culture), which operated like a solidarity

¹⁹⁶ Sedat Dalar, interview by author, tape recording, in the bureau of Özgün Haber in Paşabahçe neighborhood, 03 March 2008. “Benim babam oraya gittiğinde 3-4 kişi oraları parsellemiş. Hani medya da çıkıyor ya işgalci işgalci. Benim babam, Hüseyin Dalar gitmiş arazi satın almış parasını ödemiş. 1. kez parasını ödemiş. O zaman biliyorsunuz muhtarlık tapusu var. Daha sonra devlet demiş ki buralar benim. 5-10 yıl sonra devlet diyor ki buralar benim. Ecrimisil vereceksin. Binlerce insan yıllar boyunca ecrimisil ödemiş. 1 kere de değil. 80’li yıllarda Turgut Özal biliyorsunuz tapu tahsis belgesi çıkardı. Bu bir kandırmacaydı biliyorsunuz. Yeminli bürolar kuruldu. Ve mali müşavirlerin kontrolü altında bu tapu tahsis belgeleri düzenledi. Vatandaşın, ecrimisil yetmemiştir. Vatandaş 2. kez oturduğu yerin parasını ödemiştir. Yıllar sonra 92 senesinde SHP milletvekilleri başırmıştır. Tapu tahsis belgeleri iptal edilmiştir. Bundan sonra geriye dönük 80-90 arası geriye dönük ecrimisil ödemiştir. Vatandaş tabi bir kısmı mahkemeye vermiştir. . . . Yani vatandaş gitmiş oraya başının çaresine bakmış. Evini yapmış, ama parasını da ödemiş. İşgal etmemiş.”

association to solve the housing question in the Tokatköy neighborhood.¹⁹⁷ At the time of our interview, he was publishing a local newspaper *Özgün Haber*. For him, to be named squatter had no real basis if the history of settlement was considered. He predicated his argument on his father's payment. He said, in all these procedures, from the beginning of the settlement in the borough, they had paid for the house four times; in the first enclosure of land to the "unknown" two or three people; second, at the first ecrimisil; third, to be entitled to a title deed; and last for the second ecrimisil. Since the story of his family's settlement in the Tokatköy neighborhood is typical for the generation of 1960s' migrant, he easily shifted from the narrative of "my father Hüseyin Dalar" to the "citizen paid." For him, the payment for the house should be considered the legitimate ground for the claim of the right of property in the place, as he obtained the language of property.

Emine (50), who was sentenced to prison for trespassing on forestry land by building a gecekondu, had also paid for the land. She explained that "I have papers showing that I bought this place" and "I used to know nothing about anything such as a title deed."¹⁹⁸ Her explanation of ignorance about the land registry may be her strategy to legitimize her occupation of the land. However, it should be mentioned that she was illiterate. She had earned enough money for the land by knitting net in her house when she was a tenant in another borough, in Gültepe, until the mid 1980s. After nearly ten years from her family's settlement to Tokatköy, with 22 other women she was judged to be an illegal occupant and imprisoned. She claimed that she was not guilty:

¹⁹⁷ I will mention this association as a bygone case of collective organization in the realm of residence in the following chapter.

¹⁹⁸ Emine, interview by author, tape recording, in her house, Tokatköy, 17 March 2008. "Benim burayı aldığıma dair kağıtlarım var." "Ben ne anlarım tapudan."

No, my child, why should I be punished? I did not commit any crime. I bought this land with money. They sold to me here. This land was for sale. *Vallah da billah, bak günahımız varsa boynuma olsun* (“Honestly! See, if I have a sin, let me carry its burden”). How could I know there is a forest in Istanbul? When they came, we all were shocked. They said that this place is forest land. Honestly. We cried all Ramadan long. If we had had any savings, we would have left this place and moved anywhere else; we would have bought somewhere else with a title deed. We made this by struggling against many difficulties. As I said, my husband was sick, he could not work. We did not eat, we did not drink, we did not let our children wear nice clothes, and we bought this land in this way; then they upset us.¹⁹⁹

Like the son of the factory worker Sedat, Emine argued that she had not committed an illegal act since she had paid for the land. To convince, she resorted to religious references, like she had not “sinned.” For her, being proclaimed to be “criminal” was unexpected. Her “shock” related to the reason behind their penalty was that the land was “forest” before they built their houses was related to their first intrusion on the land. As she had migrated from a village in Erzurum in northeast Anatolia region, she could not identify the land with “two hazel and planted bean of the seller”²⁰⁰ as a “forest.” Also, she staked her claim for the right of property of her house saying she had paid for the land. Her reference matters of legitimacy were her labor and her family’s suffering life. However, she served five-and-a-half months for her illegal settlement, she had not acquired the right of property. She said “they should give it already, we stayed in prison for five months, not short.”²⁰¹ At a last resort, she demanded to own the gecekondu legally in exchange for having been imprisoned.

¹⁹⁹ Emine, interview by author, tape recording, in her house, Tokatköy, 17 March 2008. “*Yok yavrum ne ceza alıyorum. Suçum yok ki. Ben parayla aldım burayı. Getirdiler burayı sattılar. Dediler bura satılık arsaydı. Ben vallah da billah, bak günahımız varsa boynuma olsun, ben İstanbul’da orman olduğunu da bilmirdim. O zaman geldiler ya. Böyle şok olduk hepimiz: “Bu orman diye.” Vallaha. Biz bir ramazan ağla ağla. Varlığımız olsa burayı bırakıp gideriz. Başka bir yerden tapulu bir yer alırız. Zaten burayı zorluklarla yaptık, aldık. Diyom ya adamda hastaydı çalışamırdı. Hastaydı. Yemedik, içmedik, uşaklarımıza giydirmedik, dedik buradan arsayı alak, geldik işte. Sonra bizi alt-üst ettiler.*”

²⁰⁰ “İki fındık var idi. Bi de adam fasulye ekmişti.”

²⁰¹ “*Versinler artık, beş ay yattık, az yatmadık.*”

For Emine's housing narrative, it should be mentioned that, although she represented herself in toil, in our interview in her gecekodu, she seemed to have gotten free of this toil more or less. She had benefited by the municipality illegally, like being enabled to use natural gas in her house.²⁰² The reason for this special treatment of the municipality can be linked to her religious references in the interview and her daughter's (18) enrollment in a Kuran course in a dormitory.²⁰³ It seems that by being adopted by a religious community, they were benefiting from urban life. However, what was remarkable in Emine's explanations was that she considered this treatment as not a benefit for themselves, but for the rich whom she was anticipating to displace them from their houses as she expressed "We think, may be some people have bought. Maybe the rich bought, therefore they made it. How do I know? Some of us say that the rich have bought this area, they will remove us by claiming that here is forest."²⁰⁴ She also felt the anxiety of exile.

Both Sedat and Emine grounded their claims on the matter of having paid for the land. Nonetheless, the events of reference were different in their narratives of housing. According to the years of inhabitation, they represent different generations as they had different "calendars of events and experiences."²⁰⁵ Emine's story is important in this thesis, as the experience of the generations of factory workers can be checked with reference to her narrative. Correspondingly, it can highlight some distinctive characteristics for the lives of inhabitants whose fates were directly

²⁰² For this fact, Erkan Atagün the former muhtar of the Tokatköy neighborhood said that the head of the municipality had "privately" provided natural gas for this house. Her house is very far from the center of the district like clustered in at most 20 houses. Adding to the religious references of Emine, this fact appeared as a sign of paternalist relation between the local authorities and Emine's family.

²⁰⁴ "Biz de diyirik belki birileri satın aldı. Zenginler belki satın aldı, onun için yaptılar. Ne biliyim... Kimisi diirlerki, buraları zenginler almış, bizi orman diye çıkartacaklar."

²⁰⁵ Kevin E. McHugh, "Generational Consciousness and Retirement Communities," in *Population, Space and Place* 13, no. 4 (April 2007), pp. 293-306.

determined by deindustrialization. Emine's family did not migrate to the district to be factory workers, which was the very reason for the settlement of Sedat's father. Through relative and *hemşehri* (place of origin) networks, her family settled in the place with her sister's family, which had also been sentenced to prison, as their houses were at close quarters. Their houses were a long way from the factories and the centers of the district, which made their place and daily relations enclosed within a smaller parish in the district. Due to these socio-spatial restrictions, they did not participate in the socialization of the previous generation around the factories. This fact is possibly the reason for their distinguishable experience with the legal framework and the penalty they paid for building *gecekondu*.

On the other hand, like Sedat's family, most of the factory workers settled in the borough in the 1950s and 1960s as some neighborhoods have nearly fifty years of past in the place. For the former factory workers I met, the provision of jobs in the factories was the conditioning factor for their settlement in the district. Based on this long presence, they asserted that this district is distinguishable from other boroughs, which do not have similar pasts. Sedat's case of differentiation was Küçük Armutlu, which was built with the support of radical leftist groups in the 1980s. For this differentiation of Tokatköy, he referred to the plane-trees of the neighborhood, which was the origin of the slogan of their campaign, aiming to own the right of property: "We are as deep-rooted as the plane trees, and rightful in our cause."²⁰⁶ His father's belonging to the generation of factory workers, made him socially and symbolically rooted in the place of inhabitation. For Nezihe, another member of this generation, the roots are "her deaths in the graveyard."²⁰⁷ These roots were one of the reasons for

²⁰⁶ "Çınarlar kadar köklüüz, davamızda haklıyız."

²⁰⁷ Meeting in the local of Tokatköy Kent Kültürü Birliği, 15 April 2008. "Benim bu mezarlıkta üç tane ölüm var."

that Sedat joined in the struggle for the right of land register with his neighbors, which he called “childhood friends,” who were the founders of a solidarity association, *Tokatköy Kent Kültürü Birliği*. The differences between Emine and Sedat in the timing of settlement and their experiences of place influenced their strategy and the scope of the possession of the district.

What is common in Sedat and Emine’s narratives is that the categorization of the gecekondü owners as “squatters” was perceived as a source of anxiety and anger as it was for many inhabitants of Paşabahçe. I observed in a meeting organized by the Beykoz Municipality to present urban regeneration plans to the local people. Nearly 300 people attended to this meeting to protest these plans, as the head of the municipality, Muharrem Ergül, and the representative of the firm which prepared the plans could not make the presentation.²⁰⁸ One man shouted as, “We have been here for so many years! But you call us squatters!” Ergül responded as follows: “We don’t call you squatters, never. There is no such thing.” But another man’s question “Then why have so many people ended up in court?” did not receive as answer. As Sedat and this man mentioned, many of the “squatters” had not paid *ecrimisil*, either due to their inability to pay or because they had perceived the implementation of the bill “illicit” and inconclusive. Most of them went to court. During my fieldwork, the procedure of collecting *ecrimisil* was renewed as splitting the payment or “debt” in eighteen installments, for the gecekondü dwellers who would renounce the suits. The legal authorities were trying to bypass the suits and were insistent on collecting the payment. Without any distinction between the generations of settlement, the gecekondü owners are claimed to be squatters in debt to the state.

²⁰⁸ Meeting about Urban Regeneration Plan in Beykoz Municipality, 16 April 2008.

At the dawn of urban transformation, what was a matter of crisis in the borough was the demand of authorities to pay higher amounts of ecrimisil which was a sign for the rising “urban rent” for the inhabitants. Whether or not they paid, they could not get the right of the property of their houses since the payment did not change their status of being “squatters” in the face of the law. Their reject of being named “squatters” or “debtor” does not seem to come to an end. Moreover, they perceived these changes in housing conditions as a threat to their houses, their communities, and their roots in the borough. Under these conditions, the “psychology of exile” reminded them of their roots and the past to the migrant generation of factory workers different than Emine.

This difference of the factory generation should be considered with reference to the peculiar urbanization of the borough which resulted in a distinct experience of socialization among the inhabitants that centered the factories. As mentioned in the previous chapter, Paşabahçe was once an integrated and self-sufficient place around the factories. On the one hand, many industrial conflicts permeated the livelihood of the borough; on the other hand, the factory workers had played principal roles in the shaping of the borough in many aspects. Therefore, the generation of Sedat has a different “sense of past”²⁰⁹ which lead to different repertoire in defining the actuality with which the people of Paşabahçe live. It should be considered like the “custom” of factory generation, what Thompson delineates as “an ambiance, mentalite, and as a whole vocabulary of discourse, of legitimation and of exception.”²¹⁰ However, the

²⁰⁹ Eley reinterprets Thompson’s *Making* pointing out the “sense of past” which is “not just as an assemblage of myths and ideas about past, through these are clearly important, but as a continuous and developing radical tradition.” He adds that “a sense of belonging to such a living tradition was vital for the maintenance of solidarity and for socializing new recruits of movement.” Geoff Eley, “Edward Thompson, Social History and Political Culture: The Making of a Working-class Public, 1780-1850,” in *E.P. Thompson, Critical Perspectives*, eds. by Harvey J. Kaye and Keith McClelland (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990), pp. 12-49, p. 32.

²¹⁰ Thompson, *Customs in Common*, (London: Penguin, 1993), p.2.

possibilities and the limits of “the appeal to past” in the current confrontation with the issue of displacement should be considered in the following chapter.

“Planning for the Sake of the Rich”

The plan is developing step by step. They of course closed these factories consciously. If you take a look, you’ll see that there are at least small industrial estates everywhere except Beykoz. Only Beykoz is lacking one of those. There are textile workshops, but they are illegal. Now, if they also get closed, all workers will be left hungry. This is what they are after anyway. According to what we heard about the new plans, the plans are very self-evident: It is projected that the population will be lowered from 270,000 to 80,000. ... In addition to that three marinas will be built in Beykoz, in the Paşabahçe bay, and in the Çubuklu bay. And it is said that five-star hotels will be built these points. In fact, in a meeting I asked “I understand the marinas but where will they build the five star hotels? Is there empty space in this borough?” A friend answered “At the place where your house stands!” This is right, I was aware of this. I asked to see whether people were also aware of this or not.²¹¹

In this scenario posed by Mehmet Çakır, the representative of the Soğuksu Neighborhood Protection Association, the start of the process was the closure of the factories which redefined the inhabitants as “surplus population” to be displaced in the district. He anticipated the next step the closure of the textile sweatshops, which was considered as on the agenda that would cut down even the low-paying employment opportunities. What was to follow, the flow of job possibilities, was the demolition of their houses, in order to rebuild the place with new lucrative elements.

²¹¹ Mehmet Çakır, interview by the author, tape recording, in Soğuksu Neighborhood Protection Association, 17 March 2008. “*Aşama aşama geliyor. Bilinçli olarak tabii ki bu fabrikaları kapattılar. Yani şöyle bir dikkat ederseniz Beykoz’un dışında her yerde şöyle bir küçük sanayi sitesi var. Sadece Beykoz’da yok. Tekstil atölyeleri var da, onlar da kaçak, göçek. Şimdi onları da kapatılırsa hepsi aç. Zaten onun peşindeler. Şöyle ki aldığımız duyumlara göre, yapılan planlara göre, zaten planlar kendini gösteriyor: 270 bin nüfusu 80 bine direkman indiriyor. Onu da neden indiriyor. Atmıyoruz. Yasal planlarda adet adet sınıflandırmış zaten. 270 bin nüfusu 80 bine indiriyor. Artı Beykoz’un üç noktasına marina yapılıyor. Paşabahçe koyları, Çubuklu koyu. Ve buralarda 5 yıldızlı otellerin yapılacağı söyleniyor. Hatta bir toplantıda bir arkadaş dedi ki ‘ya işte Marina yapacaklar da, bu 5 yıldızlı otelleri nereye yapacaklar? Burada yer mi var?’ dediğimde, dedi ‘Senin evinin olduğu yere.’ Doğru ben onu biliyorum diye şey yaptım. Bakalım ne diycek diye şey yaptım. Aynen böyle dedi. Gerçek.”*

He acknowledged that in the city the provision of houses was directly related the people's determinate social position as this pattern of urban planning would result in its "aim for spatial segregation."²¹²

He asked his neighbor whether or not he was aware of this near future and might be the "victim of segregation." When we interviewed, the zoning plans for a quarter section of his neighborhood Soğuksu had been announced. He said that if these plans were practiced, three hundred houses would be demolished.

Concomitantly, the population would be reduced by half, from 12,000 to 6,000. He added the twenty-five meter width of roads that were drawn to be suitable for the inner side of the neighborhood. He argued that the present widths of the roads were appropriate for the inhabitation of low-income people among whom of least some had cars. Correspondingly, for him, these roads were drawn in order to fashion the district as a summer resort for the use of the rich.

For Mehmet, this scenario was only pertinent to the visible plans. Also he claimed that there were hidden plans:

They will lower to 80,000. Only servants will remain here. We had a meeting with the governor of the district 1.5 years ago, we discussed there. The man said: "My friends, after 10 years you will not be here. Who will be here? The rich. They will give you wreckage payment. In fact they will give more money than it requires, so that you will leave without causing any problems. You will leave. But you will not be able to live where you go. Your children will not be able to live there. The return will start. And when you will come back, you will work for these people as drivers, gardeners or servants." This is the reality. And we are talking about a short period of time, ten years. You can see the news about this meeting in *Marmara* newspaper. The situation is this. The situation is not pleasant at all.²¹³

²¹² Lefebvre, "Spectral Analysis" in *The Writings on Cities*, eds. and trans. by Eleonore Kofman and Elizabeth Lebas, (Cambridge, Mass, USA: Blackwell Publishers, 1996), pp. 139-140.

²¹³ "80 binden eleyecekler. Burda sadece hizmetkarlar kalacak. Bizim kaymakamla 1,5 yıl önce bir toplantımız vardı orda tartışıyoruz. İşte. Adam dedi ki, 'Arkadaşlar' dedi. 'Bundan 10 sene sonra sizler burada olmayacaksınız.' 'Kimler olacak burda?' 'Zenginler olacak burda.' 'Sizler' dedi, 'o insanlara para vericekler enkaz bedeli. Hatta hatta fazla da verecekler gidin diye' dedi. 'Gideceksiniz' dedi. 'Gittiğiniz yerlerde yaşayamayacaksınız. Çocuklarınız yaşyamayacak tekrardan dönüş bu taraflara başlayacak. Ve geldiğiniz de bu insanların yanında ya şoför olarak, ya bahçıvan

His information source was *kaymakam*, the governor of the district. Whether it is credible or not, this “bleak” scenario for the following ten years that included both displacement and return to the district is notable since in Mehmet’s life, it had been realized partially. His two-storey *gecekondu* was demolished in 2004 in exchange for 30,000 YTL as wreckage payment, and the option of ownership of a flat in one of the projects of the Mass Housing Administration.²¹⁴ He was expected to pay for this flat in Kurtköy, near the eastern edge of Istanbul, by installments in the amount of 500 YTL. Fulfilling this bleak scenario, he could not “stand” this place and his new neighbors the Roman people, as a result, he had returned to the district. For him, Paşabahçe meant to be *50, 60 yıldır iç içe yaşamış* and *kız alıp kız vermiş* (“living side by side for fifty or sixty years and to give and take brides”), a distinctive “social and cultural experience.” Like Sedat, Mehmet had in mind his roots in the place. Moreover, I should mention that his claim that only the people serving the rich would remain is a typical obsession for most of the inhabitants I interviewed. Like the women whose comments on “serving the rich” were noted above, Mehmet also negated to be employed by the rich who would settle in the place, they might be exiled.

The inhabitants contemplated various models of this depressing scenario about the fate of the district. Derya, a woman I met at the *Soğuksu Halk Eğitim Merkezi* (People’s Education Center), said “the place will be a cradle of the rich and we will be kicked out step by step.”²¹⁵ For Rıza Akay, a retiree from the Leather-Shoe factory, the district had come “worn-out” and resembled a “village” after the

olarak ya da hizmetkar olarak çalışacaksınız” dedi. Gerçek bu. Ve de kısa dönem 10 yıl. Marmara gazetesinde hala haberi vardır. Durum bu. Durum hiç iç açıcı değil.”

²¹⁴ For the incorporation of Mass Housing Administration in the urban transformation projects see Helin Özge Burkay, *Social Policy of Urban Transformation: Social Housing Policies from 1980s to Present* (master’s thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2007).

²¹⁵ The women in Soğuksu Halk Eğitim Merkezi, interview by the author, tape recording, in Soğuksu, 03 April 2008. “*Ne olacak zengin yatağı olacak, bizi de burdan yavaş yavaş atacaklar.*”

closure of the factories. Like Mehmet and Derya, he related this process to the aim of urban plans which would banish the population in the near future. He said:

The rich, Acarlar came from higher elevations. In fact when they came and made their buildings, the closure of the factories became a current issue. Also the earthquake was an important turning point. When Beykoz's ground came out to be firm, the rich came here.²¹⁶

Different from Mehmet, Rıza argued that the coming of the rich with the building of the gated communities in the higher elevations was the reason behind the closure of factories. Also he added another determinant as the acknowledgement of the earthquake-resistant structure of the place in a possible Istanbul earthquake. He was depressed with this new situation, saying "But we don't have a place to go." He was born in Beykoz as one of ten children of a worker, migrated from Kastamonu, a province in the center of the Black Sea region. He had never seen Kastamonu, as he emphasized that "I don't know where it is." He belonged to Paşabahçe. Since his family was crowded, he could not live in his father's multi-storey *gecekondu*, where his brothers lived. He was a tenant in Paşabahçe. Maybe for this reason, he mentioned the lack of the right of land register and property as important problem. Nevertheless, the problem of unemployment was primary for him. His son, who had dropped out of high school and was unemployed; as with his wife, they complained about their future. They were anxious for their child as they shared the common negative perception of the life of the youth of Paşabahçe. Possibly, this fact was the reason for him saying that the district had come to the "dead-end," as he was pessimistic about the future:

I do not think that the future of this place is promising in any sense. This is a place with no future. No money enters Beykoz. Those who

²¹⁶ Rıza and his wife Yasemin, interview by author, tape recording, in their home, Paşabahçe, 04 March 2008. "*Zaten yukardan Acarlar, zenginler geldi. Zaten ne zaman onlar geldi binalar yaptı. O zaman gündeme geldi. (Fabrikaların kapanması) Ne zaman birde depremden sonra, bu tarafın zemini sağlam çıkınca zenginler bu tarafa geldiler.*"

have a place, a home have left to live in their hometowns. In fact their goal was to make people do this. They have succeeded.²¹⁷

His insistence on the “defeat of the district” can be better understood with reference to his experience of deindustrialization. In the literature on deindustrialization the “dissolution of place”²¹⁸ and the working class communities are said to be a characteristic outcome of plant-shutdowns. Since he discerned “disinvestment” in the district, he argued that Beykoz had been marginalized. He contemplated how the more affluent people had fled, while the district had been left to the people who had no place to go. His observation of the flight of the more affluent people should be considered credible, as I interviewed three of them.²¹⁹ However, for his perception that the workers had returned to their hometowns, it should be mentioned that it was unique to his story, which diverged from that of the other people. Moreover, even the workers who had gone to different provinces to continue working for the same company, were said to have returned by other informants, since they could not adapt to the new place and fellow workers.²²⁰ His insistence on being the one who had suffered could be a sign of that he was very much adapted to the “failure” narrative of deindustrialization.²²¹ His picture of the

²¹⁷ “Ben buranın geleceğini hiç iyi bulmuyorum. Geleceği bitmiş bir yer burası. Para girmiyor Beykoz’a. Yeri yurdu olan gitti. Memleketine gitti. Zaten onların gayesi de buydu. Yaptılar işte. Başardılar.”

²¹⁸ See Wacquant, “The Rise of Advanced Marginality,” pp. 121-139; Cowie and Heathcott, *Beyond the Ruins*.

²¹⁹ I interviewed with two inhabitants who moved out of the district and settled in relatively higher status neighborhoods like Kavacık and Küçükyalı. For them it should be mentioned that one was trade-unionist in Glass-Bottle, while the other was a supervisor in the Leather-Shoe factory. The story of the third interviewee, Yavuz who fled from the neighborhood was unusual as he settled to Acarkent the nearby gated community. I will make some comments on his story in the next chapter.

²²⁰ For instances, Ahmet, whose son and daughter-in-law were working in the textile sector, the brother of Sedat Dalar and the husband of one of the women I interviewed at the Halk Eğitim Merkezi had returned to the district since they could not adopted to the working environment in different provinces.

²²¹ This common narrative of deindustrialization is expressed by Portelli as “the songs and the stories about plant closings are about silence, emptiness, defeat, disappointment – and anger.” Portelli, “‘This Mill Won’t Run No More’: Oral History and Deindustrialization” in *New Working*

district was typical of the “neighborhoods of relegation” that Wacquant conceptualized as where the change from “communal ‘places’ suffused with shared emotions, joint meanings and practices and institutions of mutuality” to “independent ‘spaces’ of mere survival and contest” occurs.²²² For him, the district was becoming void, compatible with the aim of the urban regeneration plans.

Having observed the plight of the district in the broader context of deindustrialization and urban transformation, both Rıza and Mehmet argued that there were precise class biases in the urban regeneration plans that would force them out of the district. In the interviews, they gave reference to the gated communities Acarkent and Beykoz Konakları as they saw the future of the district in them. This fact was expressed by the stationer in the Soğuksu neighborhood:

I have the title deed of my house. But who knows? When I look out of my balcony, I see a building, whose only one floor is 1,250 million dollars worth. On the other hand, mine is called a gecekonu. They won't let me stay here.²²³

These gated communities and their houses are near each other on the borders of the same neighborhood Soğuksu and in the same uncertainty according to their legal status. However, their social difference was considered to determine who would continue to live in the borough. Mehmet's peculiar experience of urban planning, that he had been previously accommodated to the transformation project and later returned to the neighborhood, can be assessed with reference to his protagonist role in the struggle against the implementation of these plans. This experience fashioned

Class Studies, eds. by John Russo and Sherry Lee Linkon (Ithaca [N.Y.]: ILR Press, 2005), pp. 54-59, p.57.

²²² Wacquant, *The Rise Of Advanced Marginality*, p. 126. He differentiates place from space, those accompany respectively fordism and post-fordism: “Places are ‘full’ and ‘fixed,’ stable arenas whereas ‘spaces’ are ‘potential voids,’ ‘possible threats’ arenas that have to be feared, secured or fled.”

²²³ Recep and his friend, interview by author, tape recording, in his shop in Soğuksu, 12 June 2008. “*Tapulu evim, ama hiç belli olmaz. Ben balkondan baktığım zaman bir katı 1.250 milyon dolar olan evi görüyorum. Benimkine ise gecekonu deniliyor. Oturtmazlar beni burada.*”

his role. When he returned to the borough, he participated in the association for neighborhood preservation as a representative. In contrast to Mehmet, the retired worker Rıza seemed to be confined in his experience of deindustrialization, which he has considered as the failure of the “working class”²²⁴ and the “success of the rich.” He had fallen into the ruins of the factories. What both Rıza and Mehmet pointed was that the motive behind deindustrialization and the urban regeneration plans was remaking the place in the interest of the rich. The experienced urban condition developed their critical awareness as they articulated their interest as being opposite that of the rich.

Concluding Remarks

Since the closure of the factories, the working people have been considered to be bonded to the less desirable occupations available in the borough. They are kept on the tenterhooks of unemployment. If they do not adapt to these working conditions, they will become excluded from the labor market like many young have experienced. All in all, the available has been always the lesser evil. Or unemployment becomes a choice.

The novelty that the gated communities caused was the appearance of new occupations in the service sector. Even these jobs are not considered a simple employment relationship. There are conflictual images about “serving the rich,” especially when the transformation of borough is taken into account. The people who are employed in the gated communities conceive the existence of this occupation as an advantage for their sustenance of livelihood. However, there are also those who

²²⁴ It should be mentioned that he was using the language of “class” however in a hesitant manner.

perceive the domestic workers' employment relation with the rich as derogatory. The social-spatial segregation between the gecekondu and the gated communities influences their perception of serving the rich. Therein, the people identified their conditions with impoverishment and located the employment relation with the newcomers as their own relation with the rich inhabiting in the gated communities. Indeed, the evaluations of the former factory workers are important as they characterize the new position of the worker in contemporary working environment with the metaphor of "kunta-kinte" that is mentioned to be antithetical to the image of the worker in the fordist factories. Thus, this metaphor should be considered as not only referring to the economic displacement the people are living, but also the cultural displacement they are faced. The refusal of this newcomer rich could be argued as the remnant of the past formation of the borough.

The other axis of change in the neighborhood was the disquiet arisen out of the development of the gated communities and the urban transformation as they characterize the present condition of inhabitation with the "psychology of exile." In fact, the class bias in the process of urban planning, which seeks to displace them, while sponsoring the rich, is a pervasive anticipation among the public of Paşabahçe. Their claim of the right of property is based on having paid for the land in different times and ways, as they are inclined in the language of property.

Under the constant threat of displacement, however the years of settlement imprinted on the strategies and the scope of identification with Paşabahçe's space. The distinctive experience of the generation whose migration was determined by the factories represents itself, as the members invoked to the past formation of the borough and concerned their roots embedded in the place. In fact, the generation of migrant factory workers has a different repertoire of events from those of the later

migrant generation, who were delinked from the factories. They have different “sense of past” as it is shown with their symbolic attachment to the place.

In both defining the experiences of new work life and the present urban condition, the response of the people, if it was critical, was based on their appeal to past. Especially, this is the case of the factory workers and their close community, since either they became victims of privatization, observed the conditions of the following generation who work informally, or in the derogatory positions like “serving the rich.” They are couching these changes in the generic narrative of deindustrialization: “defeat, disappointment, and anger.” They witnessed both economic and cultural displacement with the closure of factories. They also apprehended what will follow: absolute displacement from Paşabahçe. Thus, the past matters also as belonging to the place.

CHAPTER IV

SOLIDARITY, RESISTANCE, AND THEIR LIMITS

This chapter will analyze the changing nature of working life and actual urban condition as a conflict-generating ground. In the realm of working life, deterioration was perceived by these inhabitants, compatible with the new condition of jobs as it has been more fragmented and divergent in comparison to the occupations provided by factories. Before, the terms of confrontation related to working life appeared as unions and strikes corresponding to the forms of solidarity and resistance when workers sought to appropriate the control of their working conditions. In this chapter how the unions became ill-suited to fit this picture should be explained in addition to what was left to the space of Paşabahçe as cases of confrontation and agency of worker in the working life. How the experience of the closure of factories determined the pattern of disorganization in the work-related issues will be discussed.

In the realm of urban condition, first the terms of discussion will be provided, since these will be diverging from the working life. The fact that class tensions in the realm of urban affairs usually appear within the language of citizenship and as cases of confrontation with state authorities will be discussed. Then, the neighborhood protection associations which were established as an emergent reaction will be evaluated as the formative faces of this constant threat of displacement with which the people of Paşabahçe live. Last, the limits of solidarity and resistance to confront the expectant future of the borough will be represented.

At the Level of Working Life

Through the voice of people who have experienced the explicit deterioration of working conditions, the picture of working life in Paşabahçe was drawn in the previous chapter. In short, working life has been restructured within the synchronized social transformations of deindustrialization and the development of the gated communities. From Beytullah's story, the institutional change in working life became apparent as he actually had been called a "victim of privatization" after the closure of the factories. Although he continued to be employed in a state institution, his occupation was interpreted as being degraded position, both in economic terms as his wage was cut in half and in terms of the type of employment contract, which assigned him very few rights, including the right to be a union member.

Then, the interview with the textile workers displayed the results of the scaling down of the manufacturing sector at the workshop level as insecure, temporary, and low-wage jobs became the most available for especially those who had not experienced factory employment. But inside this segment of the population, the mismatch between the youth's expectations and existing occupations has occurred as some have been on the fringe of unemployment and essentially excluded from working life. In addition to these straight changes related to the closure of the factories, there appeared a new employment relation in the service sector with the development of the gated communities. However, this flourishing employment relation is unlike the existing ones, because its logic is quite different, mostly due to the individualized relation between the sides.

This heterogeneous picture of working life could be identified with the increasing dissolution of the type of the "happy worker" who once called the

borough “*Türkiye ’nin Almanyası*” (“the Germany of Turkey”) with “stable employment and strong loyalty to the firm.”²²⁵ In this context, however the gaze turned at collective action and collective organization among workers fails to fit the picture of Paşabahçe. Unions, as the well-known formal institutions of workers’ collectivity, have been dismantled due to both the changing nature of employment relations and worker’s attitudes towards unions. Thus, the individual acts resorted to by the workers will be considered in this section. Focusing on the pattern of informalization in the working life, Beneria considers the erosion of the character of the “happy worker” as the culture of work and says that workers’ attitudes towards the employer have been altered. The evidence of this argument are the high turn-over rates, the rise of negative commitment to the employer, absenteeism, and lack of discipline.²²⁶ In addition to the absence of a collective form, these acts of the workers will be mentioned in the form in which they appeared in the interviews.

The Failure of Primary Resort: The Dislocation of the Unions

When the issues about working life are taken as a conflict-generating area based on class lines, the usual focus has been the agency of the workers utilized in collective acts. Therein, the terminology of class struggle about working life came to the fore as collective action via collective organizations, namely strikes and resistance movements for better working conditions and unions. However, the space of Paşabahçe has gotten rid of its publicly noted unions and collective actions in the

²²⁵ Beneria considered that the contemporary change in the culture of work with “the ‘happy worker’ model of the past, with stable employment and strong loyalty to the firm, is becoming less relevant for a large proportion of the working population.” Lourdes Beneria, “Changing Employment Patterns and the Informalization of Jobs: General Trends and Gender Dimensions,” *Geneva: International Labor Office* (2001).

²²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

working life compatible with the structural change occurred in the organization of production from fordism to flexible production. Accompanying the contemporary tendency in Turkey, unions belonging to the scope of formal employment relations have failed to adapt to the reality of Paşabahçe.²²⁷ The unionized jobs have been located only in the state sector including the municipality, health and education sector and outside this industrial basin, Paşabahçe. To the inhabitants I interviewed the unionized workers were not a reference group in explaining the working environment of Paşabahçe since they constituted a marginal group among the inhabitants.

In an interview published in the local newspapers, the contingent failure of unionization was expressed with reference to the experience of workers in the garment industry:

Interviewer: Do not workers react against these conditions?

Onur: There are some who try. For example, workers tried to unionize in Darsa. But their attempt was heard too early by the boss. He dismissed all of those unionized. He even gave their compensations to stop the quest for rights.

Faysal: For them, the most important thing is the maintenance of the pervasive exploitation and working conditions. Therefore they don't hesitate to pay the compensations to prevent unionization.

Ufuk: On the other hand to seek your right you should unite. Because of the fear of unemployment workers can not unite.

Onur: Also this production line system and the shift system divide the workers. At most 20-30 workers can get together.²²⁸

²²⁷ See F. Adaman, A. Buğra, A. Insel. 26 February 2008. *Societal Context of Labor Union Strategy: The Case of Turkey*. Available [online]: *Labor Studies Journal Online* [15 March 2008]; Aziz Çelik, "Türkiye'de Sendika Üyeliği ve Sendikalaşma İstatistikleri," *İş Güç Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi*, 2 (2004). Çelik calculates the decline in the percentage of unionization from 22% in 1988 to 10% in 2000s.

²²⁸ This interview was published in *Bilgi Beykoz* at September 2004.

"Interviewer: İşçiler bu muamele karşısında bir şey yapmıyor mu?"

Onur: Yapmaya çalışanlar oluyor. Mesela Darsa'da sendikalaşmaya çalıştılar. Ama çok erken duyurdular sendikayı. Patronları sendikalaşmaların hepsini çıkardı. Hak arayışı yaygınlaşmasın diye gerektiğinde tazminatlarını bile verdiler.

Faysal: Onlar için en önemlisi var olan sömürünün ve çalışma koşullarının olduğu gibi sürmesi. O yüzden sendikayı engellemek için tazminat vermektense çekinmiyorlar.

Ufuk: Bir de hakkını aramak için birlik olmak lazım. İşsizlik korkusu var o yüzden işçiler birleşmiyor.

Onur: Birde bu bant sistemiyle vardiya sistemi işçiyi bölüyor. En fazla 20-30 işçi toplanabiliyor."

The question of the interviewer refers to whether and how the workers intend to appropriate the existing labor process as their own. Onur primarily referred to the attempt and failure of unionization in a workplace other than his own. He was sharing the similar ground of general consideration about workers' agency that had been institutionalized in the collective form of unions. He interpreted to the lack of workers' agency in the failure of unions. It was not his own experience, and possibly his workplace was far then fashioning any attempt of unionization. For Onur and Faysal, the essential reason for the failure of unionization was the hostile attitudes of the employers against unions. Correspondingly, the workers failed since they could not keep their attempts "secret."²²⁹

Moreover, the unions have been rendered useless by the existing conditions of working life. As Ufuk said that due to the lack of job security and the pressure of unemployment, workers lacked organization and could not unite at the level of workplace. Since informal work was the rule of this working life rather than a marginal issue, unions was dislocated.²³⁰ Another contemporary feature of working life, the scaling down of production and employment relations, should be added to the restrictions workers face in the formation of collective agency in this well-known form. In fact, since actual working conditions characterize wage-labor relation with

²²⁹ Although workers have definite right to unionize, they are not "capable" to utilize this right especially because of the lack of job security. So the attempt of unionization needs to be kept secret, until enough collectivity is formed in the workplace. For recent three attempts of unionization in contemporary Turkey see Alpan Birelma, *Three Cases of Worker Mobilization* (Master's Thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2007).

²³⁰ According to a research on the conditions of garment and textile industry only %3 of workers were unionized while 80 percent of workplaces were in the scale of sweatshops, identified with the lack of registers. Joint Initiative on Corporate Accountability and Workers' Rights. July 2004. "*Basic Information on Labor Conditions and Social Auditing in the Turkish Garment Industry.*" Available [online]: <http://www.jo-in.org/pub/docs/JoIn-turkBackgndStudy-2004-07.pdf> [March 2008].

“desocialization of labor,” workers have been deprived of their collective means of bargaining power for the amelioration of working conditions.²³¹

What needs to be added is that the public conception of unions became questionable in the process of deindustrialization, as I explained in the second chapter. Previously, the reason for the detraction of unions had been the sharpening of intra-class stratification in the borough.²³² This concern was also established by the mediation of the discourse of privatization as unions and its representatives have been accused of as falling into the trap of their “vested interests by exploiting their collective bargaining power.”²³³ Moreover, during the closure of the factories, unions were blamed by the factory workers for the erroneous organization of resistance activities and being in collusion with the industrial management.²³⁴ Correspondingly, in the talks with the people, some negated the possible beneficiary effects of unions and responded like “there used to be unions here, but see what happens at the end!”²³⁵ Gökhan, a young from Soğuksu neighborhood, also described the actual existence of union representatives in the present working life as “They come to work, go upstairs, then they start working at 11 o’clock.”²³⁶ He considered the role of union representatives as decayed rather than providing better working conditions.

²³¹ Wacquant, *The Rise Of Advanced Marginality*, p. 126.

²³² For a recent study on intra-class stratification see Buğra, Adaman and İnel, “Societal Context.”

²³³ Surhan Cam, “Job Security, Unionization, Wages and Privatization: a Case Study in the Turkish Cement Industry,” *The Sociological Review*, 47, no.4 (1999), pp. 695-714, p. 696.

²³⁴ Also the building of Kristal-İş was damaged in the last day of resistance by workers.

²³⁵ “*Burada vardı da ne oldu?*”

²³⁶ The youth group of the Soğuksu neighborhood, interview by author and Alpan Birelma, tape recording, in the park of the neighborhood, Soğuksu, 14 June 2008. “*İşe gelirler, yukarı çıkarlar. Sonra 11’de çalışmaya inerler.*”

While the three textile workers had recourse to the absence of unions as a corollary to the lack of agency among the workers, in other interviews they were described as organizations ill-suited and corroded to grapple with the issues of working life. In the first case, they were represented as malfunctioning in this changing nature of working conditions, since the attempts at unionization were easily defeated and ever at the expense of losing jobs. Belonging to the sphere of formal employment relations and scaling of production at the mass level, so that being identified with the working life of previous generation, unions could not adapt to the characteristics of the new working life. In the second case, however, the collective role ascribed to unions was neglected due to their contemporary existence in the workplaces. They lost their legitimate basis and became marginalized, since they were considered to correspond to the prosperous part of the working population which had been fragmented in the different worlds.²³⁷ When these cases are considered in unison, it could be argued that there has occurred a rupture in the generational transmission of coping strategies due to either without changes in the organization of working life or within the dynamics of the working population. This was the pattern of disorganization observed in the working life.

Leaving Work as a Form of Resistance

The nonexistence of collective action associated with the formal practice of unions did not mean workers were showing deference to the existing conditions. In contrast, as detailed in the previous chapter, the common attitude of actively working

²³⁷ Bugra et al. considers three different worlds of labor existed among the contemporary working population corresponding to unionized, un-unionized/formal, and informal groups. Bugra et al., "Societal Context."

people towards the existent jobs was to consider them as only the lesser-evil compatible with the vanishing of the model of the happy worker. Concurrently, what has been left to the space of Paşabahçe is individual and everyday acts in the sphere of working life. In the interviews the fact became obvious only in the workers' choice in leaving work. When the conditions of work and pay fail to meet their expectations, they opt out of this working environment. The other recourses and coping strategies of people that can be called "everyday forms of resistance"²³⁸ or "eigensinn"²³⁹ belonging to the sphere of working life, did not appear because of my concentration of the case of Paşabahçe as heightening conflict-generation mainly due to the tension of urban transformation. Correspondingly, in this section, the attribute of the people quitting work should be considered like an unarticulated form of resistance, as the reflection of actual working conditions led to the individual termination of work rather than collective work stoppage realized in the case of strikes. Gökhan's experience is an example:

I was a cutter. The boss did not pay my insurance. I was offended and quit. See, I was toiling there. But when a new worker started to work, a relative of the boss, he immediately insured him. I was really resentful. Since he kept saying that he could not afford the expense of the insurance, but he began to pay for his relative. He was paying the insurances of certain people.²⁴⁰

Gökhan, in his fourth year in this kind of workshops, did not continue working since the employer did not fulfill his promise to insure him. Until he

²³⁸ James C. Scott, "Everyday Forms of Resistance," in *Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*, ed. by Forrest D. Colburn (1989), pp. 3-33.

²³⁹ For a pioneer approach to everyday forms of resistance in the realm of workplace see Alf Lüdtke, "Polymorphous Synchrony: German Industrial Workers and Politics of Everyday Life" in *The End of Labour History?*, ed. by Marcel van der Linden (The Internationaal Instituut voor Sociale Geschiedenis, Amsterdam: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 39-84.

²⁴⁰ Gökhan and Ayça, interview by author, tape recording, in the park of Soğuksu neighborhood, 11 June 2008. "Kesimciydim. Patron baktım sigortamı ödemiıyor. Bende darıldım çıktım ordan. Yani şöyle bir şey var. Bir emek sarfediyorsun orada. Sonra yeni biri geliyor. Akrabası hemen sigorta yapıyor. Benim ağrımaya gidiyor. Kurtarmıyor diyor ama akrabasına yapıyor. Belli başlı insanlara yapıyor."

acknowledged the unequal treatment in the workshop, the employer was giving the common reason that the workplace was not earning enough to compensate the premiums. When he perceived that his employer was lying, his response was to quit. His choice was to “exit” rather than to “voice” his discontent.²⁴¹ In fact, for many young workers in the same position of Gökhan, the temporariness of jobs is the rule; however, in some instances it is the choice of the worker.

Some domestic workers employed in the gated communities could be considered to do a similar thing, when they feel abased at certain moments in the confrontation with the rich. Narrating the experience of her downstairs neighbor, Selma, one of the women in *Soğuksu Halk Eğitim Merkezi* said that she might quit working after the employer belittled her. She said “Is it ever possible to work there?”²⁴² Alike Özkan, the live-in gardener in Acarkent whose wife work as domestic worker, said his fellow workers in the neighboring villas quit work due the employer either not paying premium or paying low wage.²⁴³ He was also expecting to leave work in the following year when he had acquired enough savings to repair his own ruined house in Paşabahçe and his son would start earning money.

To some extent, both workers in the service sector and garment workshops could circulate between the workplaces, where they faced the misbehaviors of

²⁴¹ Gökhan had worked in the textile sector, until he was 19 years old. Gökhan’s choice should be considered as conditioned by his age. Sennett mentions that “young workers, more pliant, favor to exit when discontented; however older workers, more judgmental, give voice to their discontents.” Richard Sennett, *The Culture of the New Capitalism* (Yale University Press, 2005), pp. 96-97. For the effect of age on the workers’ perception of working conditions in contemporary Turkey, see Theo Nichols, Nadir Sugur and Ali C. Tasiran, “Signs of change in Turkey’s Working Class: Workers’ Age-related Perceptions in the Modern Manufacturing Sector,” *British Journal of Sociology*, 54, no.4 (December 2003), pp. 527–545. Although, this article is based on a research in advanced manufacturing sector, it is inspiring as Theo et al. argues that young workers “make for a less committed more critical workforce.” They mention that contemporarily “young workers have higher expectations and aspirations that make them relatively less satisfied” with their working conditions.

²⁴² The women in *Soğuksu Halk Eğitim Merkezi*, interview by the author, tape recording, in *Soğuksu*, 03 April 2008. “*Çalışılır mı orada?*”

²⁴³ Özkan, interview by the author, tape recording, in a coffeehouse in Paşabahçe, 20 March 2008.

employers. The characteristic of these workplaces, being like clusters in the borough, could be considered as deployed by the workers for their own sake. They obtained diminished but still considerable networks of knowledge about working conditions, as these networks are also channels of finding better jobs.²⁴⁴ These workers could be considered as utilizing the space of Paşabahçe, where workplaces and residences are still intertwined. However, it should be noted that it was weakened in the effectiveness in comparison to the days that factories existed within the limits embedded in the organization of actual working life, as mentioned in the previous section.²⁴⁵

To this experience of space, the economic means should be added, as receiving pensions and being home-owner were ample to sustain this period of unemployment as in the case of Halim represented in the previous section.²⁴⁶ In fact, the networks of solidarity among the workers and inhabitants became important for surviving, until acknowledging the better ones among the available jobs and receiving the wage. If these were available, workers could afford this condition of unemployment.

In some cases, also it would be expected that the workers left the employers in the lurch, since the production process was designed according to the method of just-in-time.²⁴⁷ When this problem of retention of workers in the workplace was

²⁴⁴ However, in the interview with a stationer in Soğuksu neighborhood, the existence of some firms of cleaning services was mentioned, those can be considered as not fitting the actual labor demand of the gated communities which was approximately 4000-5000 workers.

²⁴⁵ For this pattern of class formation realized in the days of factories see the section “from factories to the ‘basin strike’” in Chapter 2.

²⁴⁶ For the importance of the contribution of pensions to the subsistence of workers’ livelihood see Ayşe Buğra and Çağlar Keyder. February 2008. *Kent Nüfusunun En Yoksul Kesiminin İstihdam Yapısı ve Geçinme Yöntemleri*. Istanbul: Sosyal Politika Forumu. Available [online]: http://www.spf.boun.edu.tr/docs/kent_yoksullugu_rapor.pdf [15 June 2008]; Korkut Boratav, *İstanbul ve Anadolu’dan Sınıf Profilleri*, (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1995).

²⁴⁷ Erdem Yörük, *Social Relations of Production within the Workshop System in Istanbul’s Apparel Industry* (Master’s Thesis, Boğaziçi University 2006).

related to the skilled workers, for the owner it meant rising costs as the female head of one of the sweatshops explained:

I spent 1.5 billion and bought a new machine for her. She told me that she would work. She worked for one month, then not. The women disappeared. [Not physically.] She even did not say anything. She used to live downstairs from me.²⁴⁸

This employee was narrated as she did not “voice” her reason to leave the work, but “exited” from the work. As usual, from the position of the employers these acts were interpreted as signs of “idleness” and lack of “work ethic” among the workers. She described the worker as having failed to show reasonable commitment to her. Here, the judgment of Yavuz about youth should be also remembered. As it was mentioned in Chapter 3, he was complaining about young workers lacking the discipline of previous generation. These cases could be interpreted as the uses of actual flexibility in the working life from the workers’ perspectives’. On the one hand, these are individual responses to the experiences of work, on the other they are concerted within the same attitudes of workers in similar positions.

This condition needs to be compared to the expressions of the textile workers about the reasons of the failure of organization. Therein, the lack of job security and the pressure of unemployment were said to undermine the workers’ capacity to form a long-lasting collective organization and action. Yet, it should be noted that this condition of the agency of the worker was not the point of unemployment for some workers. The workers, who have means to afford leaving work until finding a better job, are those mentioned as having still favorable networks in the place and economic conditions to subsist in the period of unemployment. So the gaze should be

²⁴⁸ The family members who were running a sweatshop in the basement of their home, interview by author, tape recording, in the Çiğdem neighborhood, 13 June 2008. “1,5 milyar para verdim de, yeni makine aldım onun için. Çalışcam demişti. Bir ay çalıştı sonra yok. Kadın ortadan kayboldu. Haber bile vermedi. Halbuki alt katımda oturuyordu.”

returned again to the former factory workers who once became the prosperous faction of working population. The sources of previous intra-class stratification in the borough could be considered as deployed in the contemporary working life as they have retirement pensions which the rest do not have equally.

Yet, considering the whole picture represented in this section about working life, an interim conclusion could be drawn. With the structural changes undergone in working life, the available repertoire of collective action and struggle has been dismantled in the borough. The informed ways are no longer valid, as this change should be also conceptualized another outcome of the rupture between the generations of working people. Either unions were considered to be corrupted, or they had been made impossible within the changes in the working life. The dislocation of unions as a form of collectivity is concurrent to the happening of workers' individual acts as it is exemplified in this section by the choice of leaving work. This actively working population of Paşabahçe is mostly critical of the employment conditions. However, these critical voices heard in the interviews are not "voiced" either individually or collectively by the employees in working life.

Urban Tension

In the previous chapter, from the perspectives of some inhabitants, the urban conditions they are experiencing were identified by the "psychology of exile." It meant constant threat of displacement from the borough related to the intrusion of the rich and the preparation of urban rehabilitation plans in the claim of urgency. They had been categorized as illegal occupants, a status they rejected. Sedat and Emine, belonging to the different generations of rural-to-urban migration, were trying to

legitimize their right to property referring to the payment, they had made at the initial settlement and the various penalties to which they were subjected. However, the differences between Emine and Sedat in the timing of settlement and their experiences have stamped their strategy and the scope of the possession of the district. Disparately, Sedat talked in the name of the borough, in a manner referring to the factories and compatible formation of social and symbolic “roots” in the place. Both were embarrassed by what was to follow in the district. “It would be the rich’s place” was the usual answer in all interviews, when people considered the aim of the present urban planning. They saw the future of the borough in the present of the gated communities, which were also the basis of their critical awareness. Being trapped in the narrative of deindustrialization as “the defeat of the district,” Rıza, the retiree from the Leather-Shoe factory, voiced the end as “they did, they succeeded.” On the other hand, Mehmet had participated in the struggle against the implementation of the urban plans. His experience with this planning procedure was the evidence with which he predicated the future of the original inhabitants: choose to depart either forcibly or voluntarily, and then return to the borough, yet as a servant to the rich.

This section will constitute the formative face of this urban tension among the inhabitants, including its limits. The fact that these people live in a place which has been increasingly politicized should be taken into account, related to the potentials of resistance and solidarity, it created but also lacked. The actual tension was identified in the previous chapter with the rich in the aim of displacing impoverished people. Here, this process will be evaluated within the framework of class relations and its relation to spatial forms.

By all means, this effort relates to Henri Lefebvre and his early accounts on the production of space and class relations. In his writings on the relation between industrialization and urbanization, Lefebvre mentions that this double process is not neutral and agentless, without voluntary interventions of the “ruling classes” or “fractions of ruling classes.” On the contrary, he denotes the existence of a “class strategy” behind this process not only in economic and social terms, but also in cultural and artistic terms.²⁴⁹ Writing at the dawn of 1968’s France and having witnessed the reconstruction of workers’ housing estates on the outskirts of cities, he notes that the spatial strategy of the ruling class, indeed, aims for “segregation” either spontaneously, voluntarily or programmed.²⁵⁰ In addition, to Lefebvre, the working class is the victim of this segregation, not only in terms of the housing issue, but also in terms of the access to the creative capacity of urban life. He argues that only when the working class contests the “class strategy [of segregation] directed against it,” will the counter plea, “the right to the city,” be accomplished. Yet, he adds that “this does not mean that the working class will make urban society all on its own, but that without it nothing is possible.”²⁵¹ If the working class is “silent” and expelled from this process, “then both the subject and the object are lacking.”²⁵²

²⁴⁹ Henri Lefebvre, “Industrialization and Urbanization” in *The Writings on Cities*, eds. and trans. by Eleonore Kofman and Elizabeth Lebas, (Cambridge, Mass, USA: Blackwell Publishers, 1996), pp. 65-85. For the ruling class, strategy is either planned or spontaneous, but converges a final result, justified by an ideology, namely rationalism: “A typical class strategy, does that mean a series of concerted actions, planned with a single aim? No. Class character seems that much deeper than several concerted actions, centered around several objectives, has nevertheless converged towards a final result.” For the manifestations of this strategy of rationality in the context of Istanbul, see Asu Aksoy and Kevin Robins, “Modernism and the Millennium: Trial by Space in Istanbul,” *City*, 8, no. 2 (1997), pp. 21-36.

²⁵⁰ Lefebvre, *The Writings on Cities*, p.138. For Lefebvre’s personal experience of urban renewal in France see Eleonore Kofman and Elizabeth Lebas, “Lost in Transposition – Time, Space and the City” in *Writings on Cities*, eds. and trans. by Eleonore Kofman and Elizabeth Lebas (Cambridge, Mass, USA : Blackwell Publishers, 1996); Ira Katznelson, *Marxism and the City* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), pp. 93-98.

²⁵¹ Lefebvre, *The Writings on Cities*, p. 158 and p. 154.

²⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 155. However, the agency of the working class is somehow ambivalent – or seems to be expelled, in Lefebvre’s further accounts on urbanization and the everyday life. In his book

However, the tension in the urban space is not directly in accord with the terms of class struggle. Furthering this line of thought, Harvey considers that for the residential place, the struggle of labor to consume items of “built environment” (houses, roads, parks, and etc.) is related to factions of capital seeking, either “the appropriation of rent” or “interest and profit by building new elements” in this environment; however, they intervene in this struggle through the “agency of state power.”²⁵³ He considers the class struggle around the built environment like “displaced forms of class struggle from the workplace to the community.”²⁵⁴ Therein, the terminology of the confrontation between labor and capital diverges from that of workplace, since it appears to be an affair of citizenship, community conflict, and the organization of voluntary local associations. He mentions that these struggles can “assume a certain relative autonomy from that waged in the factory;” however, these should be utilized “for working class ends.”²⁵⁵ On the other hand, Castells argues that the state’s intervention into this struggle redefines them in a certain manner. He conceptualizes the “grassroots movement,”²⁵⁶ in which “coalitions” matter since they are formed “on a multi-class or non-class basis to

Urban Revolution, he considers the actual passivity of working class against the mentioned class strategy. In his words: “ideologically, technically, and politically, the quantitative has become rule, norm, and value. . . . even in business, bodies that represent working class express their demands and aspirations in quantifiable terms: salary and work week. The quantifiable is worn down. . . . In this situation, since the quantitative is never seriously questioned, the working class has no scope for political action. In terms of urbanism, it can offer nothing in consequence.” Lefebvre, *The Urban Revolution*, trans. by Robert Bononno, foreword by Neil Smith (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003), pp.185-186.

²⁵³ David Harvey, “Labor, Capital, and Class Struggle Around the Built Environment in Advanced Capitalist Societies,” in *Classes, Power, and Conflict*, eds. by Anthony Giddens and David Held (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), pp. 545-561, p. 545 and p. 550.

²⁵⁴ Michael Peter Smith and Richard Tardanico, “Urban Theory Reconsidered: Production, Reproduction, and Collective Action” in *The Capitalist City: Global Restructuring and Community Politics*, eds. by Micheal Peter Smith and Joe R. Feagin (Oxford & New York: Basil Blackwell, 1987), pp. 87-110, p. 94.

²⁵⁵ Harvey, “The Urban Process Under Capitalism: A Framework of Analysis,” in *A Companion to the City*, eds. by Gary Bridge and Sophie Watson (Oxford, UK ; Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2003), pp.116-123, p.122.

²⁵⁶ Manuel Castells, *The City and the Grassroots: A Cross-cultural Theory of Urban Social Movements* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), pp. 264-269.

promote distinctively ‘urban’ issues such as defense of place, culture or urban social services.”²⁵⁷ In the *Grassroots*, he analyzed the Madrid Citizen Movement, which is argued to embrace “all aspects of life except work” since the “movement avoided issues like wages, work conditions, and other economic policies.”²⁵⁸ Thus, Castells considers urban social movements as autonomous movements in the sphere of social reproduction, yet, “challenging the structure of a class society.”²⁵⁹

The space of Paşabahçe reflects some aspects of this discussion as will be seen in this section. The spatial segregation in which people were forced to live characterized the actuality of the borough as a “psychology of exile.” The intrusion of rich into the borough with the development of the gated communities revealed the new mentality of the appropriation of urban rent by the upper-classes. Then, urban planning stepped up at the municipality level in association with the rise of Istanbul as a space of confrontation between local associations and planning agencies at the metropolitan level.²⁶⁰ With the announcement of the Bosphorus Law in 1983, the place was proposed as a site for the tourism sector and as a residential zone. However the seed of discontent was the question, “residence for whom?”

After the closure of factories, this fact came to be the nerve center of the borough at an accelerating pace. The objective basis of this tension was the legal status of existing housing since most of the settlements were in violation of zoning

²⁵⁷ See Smith and Tardanico, “Urban Theory Reconsidered: Production, Reproduction, and Collective Action,” p. 94.

²⁵⁸ Castells, *The City and the Grassroots*, p. 268.

²⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 269. For a detailed analysis of Lefebvre’s, Castells’s and Harvey’s thoughts on the relation between class struggle and urban social movements see Katznelson, *Marxism and City*, pp. 92-140.

²⁶⁰ Fırat Genç and Tuna Koyuncu (interviewers), “Bir sözümüz var duymak isteyene,” *İstanbul Dergisi*, 63 (Nisan 2008).

regulations, either located in green-field sites, forest, or public domain.²⁶¹ Concurrent with the fact that the local community acknowledged the threat of displacement, neighborhood protection associations were established. These neighborhood associations also united at the municipality level, as they founded the Union of Beykoz Associations.

In this section, first, this formative process in the locality will be represented in relation to these associations. They will be characterized by the potential of collective subjectivity, utilizing the seeds of the urban tension. Then, the limits of this formation will be depicted. Yet, since my fieldwork captured this formation from the middle or possibly from the beginning of this process and since the process has been open to contradictory tendencies, the germs of both formation and deformation should be mentioned.

Emergent Neighborhood Protection Associations

Different from the dissolution of collective organizations in working life, there appeared a new form of collectivity and organization in response to the challenge to the continuation of inhabitation in the district. These associations claimed to unite the common murmuring of the people about the urban rehabilitation plans and to gain the right of the property of their houses. It should be added that, in time, this claim of right to property became incorporated with other “urban rights” as will be mentioned below. However, they were founded by a very few people in distinct neighborhoods in last two years. Under the umbrella of the Union of Beykoz

²⁶¹ Inside the borders of Beykoz Municipality, 86 percent of buildings have been described as violating the zonig status according to 2005 statistics. See Beykoz Municipality, *5 Yıllık Stratejik Plan*.

Associations, they increasingly became visible in the public space of Paşabahçe.²⁶² In this process, they participated in the planning process, however from a counter-position. This section will analyze these associations, including the observed profile of the members, their discursive strategies, their identification of present urban planning, and last the process of organization of a demonstration-like meeting I was able to attend in the Beykoz Municipality.²⁶³ This last issue will also depict the contested relation with the local state agency.

In the course of the fieldwork, I observed that the involvement in these organizations was a matter of age, occupation, generation of migration, being socially recognized people in the politics of neighborhoods, and last ownership status of housing. Due to the reasons mentioned above in the depiction of working life, the youth have dissocialized from this form of collectivity as they do not participate in these associations. They were almost exclusively middle and old-age activists, retirees from the factories, tradesmen, or holding honorable status in the working life. Therefore, they could be expected to be relatively less effected by the increasing economic vulnerability in the borough. However, the protagonists belonged to different and even contradictory political identities specific to the neighborhoods; they have formed the Union of Beykoz Associations, which can be considered a coalition of all. In addition, they seemed to be settled in the borough in the wave of rural-to-urban migration that dated to the 1960s. Last, almost all were house-owning, rather than tenants in the borough.²⁶⁴ Correspondingly, for the profile of these members, it should be mentioned their distinctive characteristic was that they were not participants in the working life discussed above.

²⁶² Various news about the activities of this association were published in the local newspapers. Available [online]: www.dostbeykoz.com.tr; www.bilgibeykoz.net; www.dogushaber.com.

²⁶⁴ Only one of the representatives of the associations from Beykoz was a tenant.

However, the fact that these associations gathered together a specific faction, which was in a better position according to the status in working life did not mean that these associations were delinked from the deterioration of the working conditions. At the discursive level, they gathered together the problems about employment as expressed in the manifesto like pamphlet:

We demand to have access to urban facilities in corresponding with artistic, cultural and sports activities as well as the right to shelter, urban infrastructure, sufficient health and education service without leaving our neighborhoods where we have various memories at every corner. We find it revealing that Beykoz was planned as a place for those who do not have any economic or employment problems. We want that the work places ensuring the employment for the shoe and glass masters, who constitute the qualified workforce of Beykoz, to be settled in the plan. We also want the workforce and resulting traffic flow out of the district to be prevented by the opening of new work areas adequate to the workforce's qualifications of the district. Starting with the right to shelter, we want all of our urban rights to be legally guaranteed, so that we do not have the anxiety of "what will happen tomorrow?"²⁶⁵

Based on this excerpt, these associations could be considered as aiming to talk in the name of the neighborhoods. They referred to the past of the neighborhoods, just as Sedat considered them like "roots." They identified urban rights with the right of shelter, urban infrastructure, sufficient health and education service, and other urban facilities corresponding to various leisure activities. In addition, the lack of viable employment opportunities was an important matter for these associations, since the plight of the borough was observed in the synchronized changes of deindustrialization and urban transformation. This synchronization should

²⁶⁵ Taken from the pamphlet with the title: "*Beykoz'da rant planları iptal edilsin*" ("Dismiss the plans of rent in Beykoz!"). "*Her bir köşesinde ayrı bir anımızın olduğu mahallelerimizi terk etmeden altyapı, sağlık, eğitim, barınma ve iş olanaklarına sahip olmayı ve aynı şekilde kentteki sanatsal, kültürel ve sportif etkinliklere eşit ve yeterli biçimde ulaşabilir olmayı istiyoruz. Beykoz'un ekonomik problemleri, iş sorunu olmayanların yaşadığı bir yer olarak planlanmasını anlamlı buluyoruz. Beykoz'un vasıflı işgücünü oluşturan kundura ve cam ustalarının istihdamının sağlanabileceği iş alanlarının planlamada yer verilmesini ve bölgenin işgücü yapısına uygun yeni iş alanları açılarak bölge dışına yoğun işgücü ve buna bağlı trafik akışının engellenmesini istiyoruz. Barınma hakkımız başta olmak üzere tüm kentsel haklarımızın "yarın ne olacak" endişesi yaşamayacağımız şekilde hukuki güvenceye kavuşturulmasını istiyoruz.*"

be considered a conditioning factor. Indeed, because the past formation of the borough had imprinted on the appearance of the actual urban tension, at the discursive level, they did not differentiate their “right to the city” from the “provision of work.”²⁶⁶ The demand of legal provision to be “equal” and “capable” to use these rights was on the agenda. In fact, the specific formation of the borough in the past shapes the discourse of these associations as they do not differentiate “the right to work and living wage” from the other urban rights.

Moreover, these associations utilized the language of citizenship, compatible with the common tendency in urban social movements. It should be also considered as a response to the fact that the ongoing urban change and planning undermined the promises of citizenship.²⁶⁷ They considered the focus of the present urban planning was the appropriation of rent, rather than the purveyance of better living conditions for the existing population. In fact, yet not defined literally, they anticipated the mentality of “neoliberal urbanism,” which Smith identifies with “the shift from an urban scale defined according to the conditions of social reproduction to one in which investment of productive capital holds definitive precedence.”²⁶⁸ As one of the representatives of these associations said, for them the aim of planning was “the deportation of people outside of a certain income group from Istanbul”²⁶⁹ and it was expressed in informal way like “the serving up of Beykoz itself to the rich.”²⁷⁰ Obviously, this “income group” referred to the position of the rich living in the gated

²⁶⁶ In the context of urban social movements, the issues related to work is usually conceptualized as dismissed from urban rights. Castells, *The City and the Grassroots*, pp. 264-269.

²⁶⁷ David Harvey, *Spaces of Hope* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), p. 150.

²⁶⁸ Neil Smith, “New Globalism, New Urbanism: Gentrification as Global Urban Strategy,” in *Spaces of Neoliberalism*, ed. by Neil Brenner and Nik Theodore, (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), pp. 80-103, p.89.

²⁶⁹ Meeting of eight representatives of the neighborhood protection associations in Soğuksu, 17 March 2008. “Belirli bir gelir grubunda olmayanların İstanbul’den uzaklaştırılması.”

²⁷⁰ “Beykoz’un zenginlere peşkeş çekilmesi.”

communities. For them, the development of the gated communities characterized the mentality of this new urbanism as the state “unequally” treated them, while it seemed to sponsor the rich. While they struggled against the pressure of dislocation, the gated communities were allowed to develop in the higher elevations of the district. The representative of the Gümüşsuyu neighborhood’s association described the power struggle in the borough as “Either you have a lot of money or you will have a strong fist.”²⁷¹

Moreover, these associations criticized the urban planning to be anti-democratic, due to the fact that the inhabitants had been excluded from the process. Indeed, they did not reject the rationale of urban planning, as the representatives frequently stated. Rather, they argued that the present plans had been prepared by technicians who knew nothing about the life of the people in the borough. Their demand was expressed as:

The details of the plans should be shared in detail with locals, local governments, local associations as well as with establishments such as the Chamber of Architects, the Chamber of Urban Planners, the Chamber of Environmental Engineers. The requests and points of view of the people of Beykoz are to be shaped with the contributions of the chambers of occupations. The natural beauties and the green areas of Beykoz should be protected in this way. With this point of view the plan should be prepared not for the interest of a handful of rentiers, but of everybody living in Beykoz, even of all citizens.²⁷²

Through meetings in the locals, they sought to inform people about the present urban plans and their legal rights to make an objection about the decisions involving their houses. Also they negotiated with other local associations, most of which were founded on place-of-origin networks, in order to collaborate with them in

²⁷¹ “*Ya cebin kalın olacak, ya yumruğun sağlam olacak.*”

²⁷² Taken from the pamphlet with the title: “*Beykoz’da rant planları iptal edilsin*” (“Dismiss the plans of rent in Beykoz!”). “*Planların bütün ayrıntılarının mahalle halkı, muhtarlar, mahalle dernekleri ve aynı zamanda Mimarlar Odası, Şehir Plancıları Odası, Çevre Mühendisleri Odası gibi meslek kuruluşları ile paylaşılmalıdır. Beykozluların görüş ve istekleri meslek odalarının katkılarıyla şekillendirilmeli, böylece Beykoz’un doğal güzellikleri ve yeşili korunmalı bu bakış açısıyla bir avuç rantçı için değil bütün Beykozlular hatta kentlilerimiz için plan yapılmalıdır.*”

this struggle. In this process, their primary demand from the state agencies was to embrace these associations in the status of primary spokesman in the realm of residential problems.

In the course of the fieldwork, they were at trial to appropriate this status and in some confrontations they were becoming successful. The case of a meeting organized by the Beykoz Municipality should represent this fact.²⁷³ While the municipality aimed to realize the necessary principle of urban planning, that it had to inform the local population and local NGOs about the plans, it had become as if sabotaged with the participation of the members of these associations and other inhabitants. The municipality officials lost control of the meeting. They lost control of the microphone to speak to the audience. As a result, the representatives of these associations dominated the meeting with the support of audiences.²⁷⁴

Indeed, this meeting should be also understood as a public encounter between the sides; there was the municipal authority in confrontation with the neighborhood protection associations. Both parties resorted to tactics during this confrontation. To overcome the tension in the meeting, the first tactic of the municipality planning authority was to appeal to manipulation as he claimed that the plan had been prepared in collaboration with the neighborhood protection associations. However, this was challenged by the representatives as the turmoil in the meeting rose. The second tactic was to marginalize the representatives. The mayor claimed that there has been “provocateurs” in the meeting. He has also said, “Perhaps, some of you may not even know why you are here.”²⁷⁵

²⁷³ Meeting about urban planning process in Beykoz Municipality, 16 April 2008.

²⁷⁴ About the audience, it should be mentioned that due to the time of the meeting (16:00) working people were not able to attend. They were mainly old and middle-aged people.

²⁷⁵ “*Belki bazılarınız buraya niçin geldiğinizi bile bilmiyor.*”

However, as these tactics failed to meet their aim, a third appeared as the police entered in the meeting room and tried to catch one of the representatives of these associations. Women in the room have started to say things like “We won’t let him go!” “We will obstruct!” “We will close the road!”²⁷⁶ The police had to release the representative. Since the municipality officials lost control of the meeting, the speech of the mayor was interrupted at various moments by people hooting. In contrast, the talks and rhetorical questions of the representatives of these associations were welcomed with clapping by the audiences as they were there to be activists. Accordingly, the meeting organized initially for the presentation of present plans by the Beykoz Municipality turned into demonstration.

In fact, this meeting was the unique organized activity I attended during the fieldwork. The other gatherings of these associations could be considered as very segmented in contrast to this one.²⁷⁷ This might be due to the fact that these locality-based collective organizations were at the beginning of the formation process. To some extent, they were recognized symbolically as they were rising as an addressee of the struggle for better living conditions. Moreover, these neighborhood protection associations should be characterized with the potential of collective subjectivity, utilizing the seeds of the urban tension. Yet it has been open, the limits have been inherent in this process of formation, as will be discussed below.

²⁷⁶ “Çıkartmayız.” “Engel oluruz.” “Yolu kapatırız.”

²⁷⁷ Different from these gatherings, two collective actions were organized in relation to the implications of urban planning in the neighborhood of Rüzgarlıbahçe, where the process of displacement was in an advance phase. However, this neighborhood is not included in this study since the place is considered to be out of the industrial basin, Paşabahçe, the process in this neighborhood can be explained in brief. After the presentation urban regeneration plans for the neighborhood, contracting firms introduced in the process of urban transformation. During the fieldwork, not only the gecekondü owners but also the owners of the registered houses were displaced by these contracting firms who threaten the inhabitants as “if they did not sell their houses, the state would confiscate them in return for lower amounts of money.” Against this process, the inhabitants of the neighborhood organized two public protests in front of the Beykoz Municipality and a petition campaign. Also their struggle was institutionalized as Ruzgarlıbahçe Preservation and Development Association which was one of the founders of the Union of Beykoz Associations.

Limits

This section will picture the limits to confront the urban condition of displacement from the borough. In contrast to the above-mentioned process of formation, the germs of deformation should be expressed and even some facts would be represented contradictorily, due to the openness of this process. First, the limits inherent in the shaping of the present neighborhood protection associations will be discussed, by pointing out the possible rising of a fragile subjectivity related to the traps of degeneration in local politics and seeking for self-interest. Related to the process of deindustrialization, the limit should correspond to the dissolution of the community and economic dislocation, the people experienced. Also the experience of rupture between generations will be argued as a limit to social cohesion and solidarity in the borough. Last, the tactics of capital and state agencies will be discussed as manipulating the process as if it was individualized, to surpass the formation of a counter collectivity.

The limits inherent in the organization of the neighborhood protection associations should be better expressed in relation to a dissolved organization *Tokatköy Kent Kültürü Birliği* (Tokatköy Union for City Culture) which was active till the local elections in 2004.²⁷⁸ This organization, founded in 1995, was unique before these neighborhood protection associations emerged in the realm of residential issues. However, the Kent Kültürü Birliği was very successful in gaining

²⁷⁸ During the fieldwork this organization was existing formally but it was not active.

the rights of land registers for nearly one-third of the gecekondus, the association dissolved in the process of local elections as the protagonists sought to participate in local politics from the counter positions of the AKP (Justice and Development Party) and the CHP (Republican People's Party). Sedat was one of the founders of this association. His story of settlement was discussed in Chapter 3. As both Sedat and other three members reported, when it was founded, this organization was considered to be “above politics,” and was even based on networks of friendship that dated back to childhood.²⁷⁹

However, this initial formation of Kent Kültürü, as a coalition of people with different political identities was dismantled during the process of the local elections. During the fieldwork, a possible risk of degeneration of these associations in the traps of local politics was observed as an obstacle for them against fashioning a collectivity in the neighborhoods. In fact, some interviewees also mentioned that they gathered only supporters of unique political identities specific to the different neighborhoods.

Moreover, from the experience of the Tokatköy Kent Kültürü Birliği, the second trap these associations would face should be mentioned. The fact that one of the founders had moved into Acarkent through owning a house could be interpreted as constituting to the trap of arbitrage. In fact, some interviewees considered the present protagonists in these associations as seeking their self-interests rather than aiming to form a counter collectivity in response to the urban transformation. Concurrently, these people did not trust the representatives in these associations.

For the de-formative effect of deindustrialization on community networks, as mentioned above, the space of Paşabahçe depicted the tendency of dissolution either

²⁷⁹ Sedat Dalar, interview by author, tape recording, in the bureau of Özgün Haber in Paşabahçe neighborhood, 03 March 2008.

for economic reasons or for more socio-cultural reasons. The case of Rıza represented the narrative of deindustrialization as the failure of place. Beyond his personal account, many interviewees defined the place as having dissolved in comparison to old days that factories were functioning in full. For some, the focus was the identification of the present age in the place with the idiom “long live the snake that does not touch me.” As the stationer in Soguksu neighborhood explained:

Everybody here knows that [the coming of displacement]. There was cooperation and unison among people back then. Now people say, “long live the snake that does not touch me.” Ten years, even five years ago, I used to know everybody that passed the street. Foreigners used be scared, they wouldn’t come here around 95. Now there is neither cooperation nor union as it used to be. Also the immigration had an effect.²⁸⁰

He pointed to the dissolution of social cohesion and solidarity in the neighborhood. In his account, the community, which was self-consciousness and collective, seemed to be remembered in painful flashbacks from the industry. Moreover, he said that the fabric of the neighborhood was transformed with the continuing rural-to-urban migration. As in the case of Emine discussed in Chapter 3, these late comers should be considered as not participant in the socialization centering the factory-based networks. This generation’s settlement coincided with the declining of factories in being the nerve center of the borough.

Indeed, the dissolution of place was the common complaint of all interviewees; however, they referred to different reasons. The expressions of Beytullah, the victim of privatization, denote a different perspective:

Now there is no friendship left. We used to make cakes and pies with tea though... People know each other still, but now material issues are so much active in daily lives that they infected people like typhoid fever or tuberculosis. Material... Everybody thinks of his own survival. Well, people

²⁸⁰ Recep and his friend, interview by author, tape recording, in his shop in Soğuksu, 12 June 2008. “Buradaki herkes bunu biliyor. Yok ama. Eskiden birlik beraberlik vardı. Şimdi bana dokunmayan yılan bin yıl yaşasın.. On yıl önce, bırak on yılı 5 yıl önce sokaktan gelen herkesi tanırdım ben. Korkardı yabancı gelemezdi 95 de falan. Yok şimdi eskisi gibi birlik beraberlik. Bir de göçle falan.”

here are all low income people. They can't just afford to buy two pies and visit each other to chat. Maybe he can act in this way once or twice, but never the third. In fact, everybody loves each other but material issues prevent people from being together.²⁸¹

Since Beytullah experienced the erosion of economic conditions himself as an expelled worker from the Tekel Alcohol Factory, he gave this reason for the dispersal of the community. For him, Paşabahçe resembled a space of mere survival after the closure of factories. Alike Sabri one of the youth I interviewed in the Soğuksu neighborhood, said that:

No consciousness. They say long live the snake that does not touch me. People are in such a horrible situation. For instance, I can not even think of my best friend next to me. I can only have a chat. I can't help him any subject because I am not pleased with myself as well.²⁸²

These excerpts from different interviews, all in all, exemplified the appearance of the present reason for the lack of promising solidarity among the inhabitants as the economic dislocation in which they lived. It should be also that these people did not respond to the development of the gated communities, since these were considered providing occupations for the people. Ahmet, a former glassworker, mentioned this fact like: "I suggested then to act against these. But see, we couldn't. They said, 'people need jobs. What we can do?' Now, they work there like slaves."²⁸³

²⁸¹ Beytullah, interview by author, tape recording, in the security office of Glass-Bottle Factory, 15 March 2008. "*Şimdi dostluk da kalmadı. Eskiden börek, çay yapardık ama... İnsanlar birbirini tanıyor da artık maddi olaylar o kadar işin içine girdi ki. İnsanların hayatına o kadar bulaştı ki. Tifo gibi verem gibi bulaştı. Maddi... Artık herkes kendi gırtlığını düşünüyor. Kendi geçimini düşünüyor. E buradaki insanlar hep geçimi dar olan insanlar. Adamın maddi gücü yok ki desin ben iki börek alıyım sohbete gidiyim. 1 yapar. 2 yapar. 3. yü yapamaz. Aslında herkes birbirini seviyor ama maddi olaylar insanları birbirinden kopartıyor.*"

²⁸² The youth group of the Soğuksu neighborhood, interview by author and Alpkan Birelma, tape recording, in the park of the neighborhood, Soğuksu, 14 June 2008. "*Bilinç yok ki. Diyor ki bana dokunmayan yılan bin yıl yaşasın. Ama millet de öyle bir hale gelmiş ki yani. Ben mesela yanımdaki insanı en yakın arkadaşımı düşünemiyorum ki. Anca oturup muhabbet edebiliyorum yani. Hiçbir konuda yardımcı olamıyorum. Çünkü bende kendi halimden memnun değilim.*"

²⁸³ Ahmet, interview by author, in one of the coffeehouses in the Soğuksu neighborhood, 17 March 2008. "*Ben dedim o zaman karşı çıkalım bunlara diye. Ama olmadı işte. İnsanların işe ihtiyacı var, ne yapalım dediler. Şimdi orda köle gibi çalışıyorlar.*"

In the discussion about why no one could resist the present urban planning, Sabri added that young people had been excluded from the process. In his words:

Look! There are so many young people in this neighborhood. Did they ever call and ask them to act together? ... Why don't they support youth?²⁸⁴

In fact, he pointed to the rupture between generations, mentioned also in the constraints to fashion a collectivity, in the realm of working life. From the perspective of young interviewees, who were living their own version of deindustrialization as being on the fringe of unemployment and drug-abuse, this fact appeared as exclusion.

Last, the tactics of capital and the state should be considered as undermining the formation of a possible collectivity. It was voiced by Sabri in response to his friend Gökhan's account:

Sabri: It is not certain what's going to happen to this place tomorrow. If you ask the inhabitants, 90% of them have no land registry.

Alpkan: You mean you will leave.

Sabri: Now, nobody can send people away from here. Everybody would protest. What is the first thing than they would do? How do these people make a living? Leather-Shoe, Tekel, Şişe-Cam. First, they should close these. Then people will move to earn a living. Some of them will go to Mersin, some of them will go to Trakya. As you see, they are sending them day by day.

Gökhan: When they come here, a riot will break out anyway.

Ayşe: But, you know, it is coming all ready.

Sabri: You [he is talking to Gökhan] say like that but we've talked this over before. What do we say? We're coming here and say "they demolished two houses there." What about today? Today they can come and demolish two more houses also here. What will happen tomorrow? They will demolish two houses there. This is how we talk in vain. In the end, you may realize that the only house which remains is yours. That's exactly what it is. They are sending people away day by day without being noticed. If they destroy all the houses at once, people would directly attack them, you know.²⁸⁵

²⁸⁴ The youth group of the Soğuksu neighborhood, interview by author and Alpkan Birelma, tape recording, in the park of the neighborhood, Soğuksu, 14 June 2008. "*Bak bu mahallede ne kadar gençlik var. Bu zamana kadar kaç tane gence gelin beraber olalım demişler? ... Neden gençleri kazandırmıyorlar?*"

²⁸⁵ The youth group of the Soğuksu neighborhood, interview by author and Alpkan Birelma, tape recording, in the park of the neighborhood, Soğuksu, 14 June 2008. "*Sabri: Buraların yarın öbür gün ne olacağı belli değil. Halka sorsan buradaki insanların %90ının tapusu yok.*"

In fact, this talk with the youth of Soğuksu revealed the synchronized process of deindustrialization and urban transformation. Sabri characterized this process as the individualization strategy of the state and the rich to displace the inhabitants from the borough. He was right in that observation, since some of gecekondu were torn down either for building connection roads, which have freed the inhabitants of the gated communities using the roads inside their neighborhoods or due to the fact that the legal owners of title deeds appeared with the increasing urban rent. Based on the observation of these evidences, he discredited Gökhan's account that there would appear eminent rebellion if the houses were demolished.

Concluding Remarks

As the case of Paşabahçe replicates the pattern observed in deindustrialized places, the collective struggle around the workplace and about the issues related to work conditions such as wage level, time measurement, and job security seemed to disappear with factories from the common terrain. Either the available work positions did not enable workers to organize any collectivity or its old institutions had become ill-suited. Moreover, the changing conditions of working life meant generational rupture, since the repertoire of the factory workers became void in this process. However, the disappearance of collective forms should not mean that

Alpkan: Gitcez diyosun yani.

Sabri: Şimdi bu milleti buradan kimse atamaz. Herkes ayaklanır. Önce ne yapacak? Bu insanlar nerden geçimini sağlıyor. Deri-kundura tekel şişe cam. Önce bunları kapatacak. Ondan sonra millet yavaş yavaş ekmeğinin peşine gidecek. Kimi Mersin'e kimi Trakya'ya. Yavaş yavaş gönderiyorlar yani.

Gökhan: Buraya doğru geldiler mi zaten isyan çıkar.

Ayşe: Ama geliyor yani.

*Sabri: Ama öyle diyon da bak yani biz deminde*** konuştuk. Ya biz ne diyoruz. Geliyoruz bak burada diin iki tane ev yıkılmışlar diyoruz. Bugün ne olur gelir iki tane burada ev yıkarlar. Yarın ne olur iki tane orada ev yıkarlar. Biz deriz böyle. Bir bakmışsın sadece senin evin kalmış. Aynen böyle işte. Milleti uyandırmadan bunlar yavaş yavaş gönderiyorlar. Toplu bir şekilde burada ev yıksalar millet direk saldırır yani."*

workers showed deference to this deterioration of working life. In fact, all jobs were evaluated to be lesser evil as the model of “happy worker” did not suit this picture. However, some workers opted to quit working, as they could afford a period of unemployment. In this period, the conditions of sustenance were determined by the spatial networks and economic support mechanisms like the pensions of retired factory workers, which should be considered as legacies of the factories.

Moreover, the confrontations related to the reproduction of community and its place (like housing conditions, health and education services, environmental conditions, leisure facilities, transportation means), which seemed to be surpassed or managed by the former struggle in the workplace, came to the fore with the new mentality of urbanism and increasing rent in the place. In this process, the eminent response of some inhabitants was forming voluntary neighborhood protection associations. They were in trial to become the voice of “the right to city” which emerged due to the threat of displacement. They also incorporated the provision of better work to the urban rights which they demanded being equal and capable of deploying. However, the limits were also inherent in this formative process. Either the dissolving effects of deindustrialization were the conditioning limits or the traps of deformation in the local politics and arbitrage were potential risks. Moreover, the strategies of the rich and the state became also limits, since this strategy manipulates the issue of displacement, as if it was individualized.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

This thesis analyzed the case of Paşabahçe which had witnessed deindustrialization as a prominent social change and has come to be threatened by displacement due to the rise of neoliberal urbanism. The specific characteristic of the district has been that once it was a blue-collar worker basin where generations of factory workers were the main current in the production of a self-sufficient and integrated space in its social and economic life. In time, however, the fordist industry that characterized the basin was eliminated either within the process of privatization or accompanying the decentralization of industry in Istanbul. While the Leather-Shoe and Alcohol factories were privatized and closed down, the Glass-Bottle Factory has been relocated to different cities and also in foreign countries to facilitate export-oriented growth. In this context, the stories of the factory workers were about decline, dispersal, and defeat of the community and place. On the other hand, the development of the gated communities in the higher elevations of the district and the urban planning process increased. The place and its inhabitants have been left with the ruins of the factory buildings waiting their arrangement in the new urban politics, since the production of space in the district that dated back to the fordist phase of urbanization became superfluous with plant-closings. Either the heritage of these industries has been planned to be commodified or their lands will become holiday resorts, marinas, or a university. These developments put pressure on the gecekondu inhabitants, who feel the constant threat of displacement. In fact, the place is on the

brink of losing its uniqueness on the Bosphorus shoreline, which has been home to the former workers or retirees from the factories.

In the process of deindustrialization, nearly ten thousand formal jobs, available in the full-functioning of factories until the 1980s, faded away. Also, related to the glass industry, the workshops which were numerous and compatible with the characterization of the borough with glass making was closed down in this process. After the plant-shutdowns, the remaining jobs in the industrial sector were scaled down especially in the textile workshops clustered around the borough. However, not only the employment possibilities in the factories were unequally replaced by this small-size manufacturing, but also these were mentioned to be closed in the near future according to the implications of new urban planning. In fact, a structural change occurred in the type of employment as the service sector grew at the expense of the industrial sector. Moreover, women participated in the working life from the lower ranks as textile workers in the sweatshops and domestic workers in Acarkent. The returns of these structural changes were the rise of unsecure, temporary and low-wage jobs that became the most available for especially the young who have no experience in factory work.

In fact, in the realm of working life, deindustrialization meant the end of the specific occupation of being a factory worker and the appearance of multiple, fragmented, and even derogatory job positions. The people are kept in this working life by the pressure of unemployment. Only the development of the gated communities was mentioned as a novelty, maintaining the livelihood in the district. However, the appearance of this employment possibility was not frictionless for many, who evaluated this employment relation as a symbol of social and spatial segregation between themselves and the gated communities. As a result, there

occurred contradictory images about “serving the rich,” especially when the transformation of the borough was taken into account. Therein, the people identified their conditions with impoverishment and located the employment relation with the new comers as their own relation with the rich of gated communities. In fact, the generation that experienced the factories depicted these workers’ new position as slave-like since they could observe the plight of the borough in the processes of deindustrialization and the development of the gated communities.

The type of factory worker, which was once enjoyed the conditions of work and pay in the factories and responded with loyalty to the firm concurrent to the appearance of intra-class stratification in the borough has eroded in the process of deindustrialization. However, at the same time, the struggle around the workplace and about the issues related to work conditions such as wage level, time measurement, and job security disappeared with factories from the common terrain. Either the available work positions do not enable people to organize any collectivity or its old institutions have become ill-suited. Belonging to the sphere of formal employment relations and the scaling of production at the mass level, so that being identified with the working life of the previous generation, unions could not adapt to the characteristics of the new working life. In fact, the available repertoires of collective action and organization have been dismantled within the structural changes undergone in the working life. It is also the result of the rupture between generations of working people as the informed ways is no more valid and sides are considered as not incorporating each other. All in all, the previous social formation in the borough and its relation to wage labor have become disorganized either without the structural changes in the working life or within the dynamics of the working population. The place is characterized by dislocatedness about work-related issues. It has become to

be the space of individual confrontations and acts, yet, of those who are able to afford the results of this act.

In this thesis, beyond this close experience of deindustrialization, the fact that these people are living in a place which has been increasingly politicized is taken into account related to the experience of trembling urban condition and the potentials of resistance and solidarity, it create but also lack. The present condition of inhabitation is characterized with the “psychology of exile” since the inhabitants consider that the urban plans help the rich appropriate the rent. The divide between generations according to migration and years of settlement in the borough do not differ this identification of urban planning with class bias. However, the fact that these generations have different calendars of events and experiences marks on their narration of the contemporary pressure of displacement. The factory generation has a distinct social-cultural formation that incorporated also the space of Paşabahçe. The imprint of this historical setting is observable in this process, as they have been judging the present threat of displacement within the memories of the past. They have a different “sense of past” as it is shown with their symbolic attachment to the place.

In fact, in the realm of residence and urban tension, new forms of collectivities have been observed in the formative process. It seems that after the closure of the factories, the struggle related to the reproduction of the working class community and its place, which was surpassed or managed by the former struggle in the workplace, has come to the fore in Paşabahçe. The inhabitants organized in the neighborhood protection associations have been not corresponding to the workers whose trajectory in the working life have been drawn above. However, their participation in these collective organizations could be evaluated beyond the

“employment aggregate” they constitute. They appeal to the social and cultural formation in the place to protect their neighborhoods, where their roots are embedded. Indeed, the past formation of borough and the actual deterioration of working conditions have left imprints on the appearance of the actual urban tension, as at the discursive level these associations does not differentiate their “right to the city” from the provision of the right to work and a living wage.

The limits are also inherent in this pattern on organization, notwithstanding. Degeneration in local politics and the seeking arbitrage should be considered the potential traps of these associations, as these factors might lead raise a fragile subjectivity for them. Here, the process of deindustrialization appears also as a counter fact, either with its failure narrative or with its ends in the borough as dissolution of community and economic dislocation. Moreover, this pattern of organization is not free from the rupture between generations according to age and migration. These facts are the *within* limits of social cohesion and solidarity in the borough. Another factor that restricts the organization of collectivity and resistance is from *without*. The state and capital have been applying the strategy of manipulation of the displacement as if it is individualized.

In this context of Paşabahçe, the promise of this thesis was to frame the discussion over the actuality of working class like whether it is dead or how it is living. As mentioned with reference to the historical formation of Paşabahçe, this case suits the general appearance of this discussion with its “factory workers,” the previous social and cultural formation centering the factories, and last, the realization of the “farewell to the factory.” However, the live-in change in the employment structure is an important matter shown above, this study approached the issue of the working class beyond the employment aggregate it has been conventionally thought

to be. Correspondingly, this thesis considered the changing experience of working life as diffused in broader aspects of life. The dislocation, people experienced was not only limited to the erosion of economic conditions, but also incorporated the break in social and cultural habits. Due to the contemporary tendency of the fact that urban space matters in class relations became clearer within the framework of neoliberal urbanism, this study included also the urban axis of class relations. As class is considered a partial social configuration within a constant process of organization-disorganization-reorganization, both tendencies is pointed in this thesis. The ongoing process is considered to be matter of class struggle, as the focus was on the response of the people.

All in all, in both defining the experiences of new working life and the present urban condition, the response of people, if it was critical, was based on their appeal to past. Thus, this “appeal to past” should be considered with its potential contributive effect to a novel formation, yet, the process is open.

LIST OF INTERVIEWS AND MEETINGS

Interviews

1. Yakup. Former glassworker. Interview by author. Tape recording. In his new workplace Istanbul University. 20 December 2006.
2. Ahmet Soylu. Former glassworker. The muhtar of the Gümüşsuyu neighborhood. Interview by author. Tape recording. In his office in the Gümüşsuyu neighborhood. 22 December 2006.
3. Hüseyin Karababa. Retired glassworker. The muhtar of the Çiğdem neighborhood. Interview by author. Note taking. In his office in Paşabahçe. 23 December 2006.
4. Youth group in the Paşabahçe neighborhood. Two of them are sons of factory workers. Unemployed. Interview by author. Note taking. In the office of one leftist political party in Paşabahçe. 25 December 2006.
5. Yavuz Gürkan, Erkan Atagün, Muammer Nalcı. The founders of *Tokatköy Kent Kültürü Birliği* (Union of City Culture). Interview by author. Tape recording. In the local of Tokatköy Kent Kültürü Birliği. 1 March 2008.
6. Sedat Dalar. The son of a Leather-Shoe Factory worker and brother of a Glass-Bottle Factory worker. One of the founders of Tokatköy Kent Kültürü Birliği. Local journalist. Interview by author. Tape recording. In bureau of *Özgün Haber* in Paşabahçe. 3 March 2008.
7. Şefik Yavuzyılmaz. Retired glassworker. The muhtar of the İncirköy neighborhood. Interview by author. Tape recording. In his office in İncirköy. 3 March 2008.
8. The security personnel of the Glass-Bottle Factory. Interview by author. Note taking. 3 March 2008.
9. Rıza and his wife Yasemin. Rıza is the retired Shoe-Leather worker. Yasemin is unemployed and her application for a job in a coiffeur in Acarkent was rejected. Interview by author. Tape recording. In their home. 4 March 2008.
10. Erkan Atagün. The muhtar of the Tokatköy neighborhood between the years 1994 and 2002. Interview by author. Tape recording. In the local of Tokatköy Kent Kültürü Birliği. 6 March 2008.
11. İhsan Bekler. One of Kristal-İş union representatives. Worker in Hayal Kahvesi in Etiler. Interview by author. Tape recording. In a restaurant in Paşabahçe. 6 March 2008.

12. Mustafa. Retired glassworker. Interview by author. Tape recording. In the Glass-Bottle Factory security staff office. 9 March 2008.
13. Yalçın Kızılcam. One of Kristal-İş union representatives. Worker in Hayal Kahvesi in Çubuklu. Interview by author. Tape recording. In Çubuklu. 13 March 2008.
14. Beytullah. Former worker in the Tekel Alcohol Factory. 4/C staff in Ümraniye State Hospital. Interview by author. Tape recording. In the Glass-Bottle Security Staff Office. 15 March 2008.
15. Ayten and Mehmet Çakır. Ayten(20) was working in Acarkent previously. Mehmet is the representative of the Soğuksu Neighborhood Protection Association. Interview by author. Tape recording. In their office in the Soğuksu neighborhood. 17 March 2008.
16. Ahmet. Former glassworker. Interview by author. Tape recording. In a coffeehouse in the Soğuksu neighborhood. 17 March 2008.
17. Emine. Prisoner for five months due to her illegal occupation in Tokatköy in 1995. Interview by author. Tape recording. In her home in Tokatköy. 17 March 2008.
18. Özkan. Former glassworker. Domestic live-in worker in Acarkent. Interview by author. Tape recording. In a coffeehouse in Paşabahçe. 20 March 2008.
19. İsmail Özkan. Former glassworker and unionist. Interview by author. Tape recording and note taking. In *Emekli Öğretmenler Derneği* (the Retired Teacher Association). In Paşabahçe. 22 March 2008.
20. Women in *Soğuksu Halk Eğitim Merkezi* (People's Education Center). Interview by author. Tape recording. In the Soğuksu neighborhood. 3 April 2008.
21. Veli and Cemil. Retired Leather-Shoe Factory workers. Veli was the supervisor of the factory. Interview by author. Tape recording. In Cemil's house in Yalıköy. 7 June 2008.
22. Gül. Retired Shoe-Leather worker. Interview by author. Tape recording. In her house in Yalıköy. 7 June 2008.
23. Gökhan and Ayça. Gokhan as former textile worker. Ayça as textile worker. Interview by author. Tape recording. In the park of the Soğuksu neighborhood. 11 June 2008.
24. Recep and his friend. Stationer in the Soğuksu neighborhood. Interview by author. Tape recording. In his shop in Soğuksu. 12 June 2008.

25. The family members, running a sweatshop in the basement of their home. Interview by author. Tape recording. In the Çiğdem neighborhood, 13 June 2008.
26. The youth group of the Soğuksu neighborhood. The employeds are working either in the gated community, in the textile sector, in the sweatshop, or out of the basin. There were also two unemployeds and two men drug and alcohol addicts. Interview by author and Alpkın Birelma. Tape recording. In the park of the Soğuksu neighborhood. 14 June 2008.

Meetings

1. “The Problem of Property in Beykoz.” Panel in Beykoz Vakfı. Panelists were the former mayor of Beykoz Municipality Alaattin Köşeler, the Municipality Representative of MHP (Nationalist Action Party) Sadık Ali Uslu, and Şaban Torun the head of Beykoz Foundation. Tape recording. In Beykoz Foundation. 27 February 2008.
2. The meeting of *Herkesi Sağlık Güvenli Gelecek Platformu* (the Platform for Health, a Secure Future for All). In *Emekli Öğretmenler Derneği* (Retired Teacher Association). Note taking. In Paşabahçe. 13 March 2008.
3. The meeting of the eight representatives of the neighborhood protection associations. Note taking. In the Soğuksu neighborhood. 17 March 2008.
4. The meeting in *Tokatköy Kent Kültürü Birliği* (the Union of City Culture). About how to protest against the urban plans. Tape recording. In Tokatköy. 15 April 2008.
5. Meeting about urban planning process in the Beykoz Municipality. Tape recording. 16 April 2008.

APPENDIX

Table 1: The Population Growth of Beykoz (1935-2008)

Year	Urban Population	Total
1935	10,315	21,308
1940	25,970	41,492
1945	25,611	32,813
1950	29,628	37,122
1955	36,859	48,832
1960	45,679	58,317
1965	51,689	67,758
1970	61,206	76,385
1975	76,804	92,767
1980	94,101	114,812
1985	118,697	136,063
1990	142,075	163.786
1997	165,028	193,067
2000	178.438	217.316
2008	200,572	241,833

Source: *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, s.v. “Beykoz”; Beykoz Municipality, *5 Yıllık Stratejik Plan*, (İstanbul: Beykoz Belediyesi, February 2006); Turkish Statistical Institute, “İlçelere göre şehir ve köy nüfusları.” Available [online]: http://tuikrapor.tuik.gov.tr/reports/rwservlet?adnks=&report=turkiye_ilce_koy_sehir.RDF&p_il=34&p_kod=1&desformat=html&ENVID=adnksEnv [15 June 2008].

Table 2: The Population of Beykoz and Neighborhoods (1985-2000)

Neighborhoods	1985	1990	1997	2000
Beykoz (Total)	136,063	163.786	193.067	217.316
Beykoz (Urban)	118,697	142.075	165.028	178.438
Acarlar	0	0	0	5.000
Çiğdem	9.503	10.856	11.054	11.721
Gümüşsuyu	10.829	12.215	13.881	15.761
Paşabahçe	5.605	6.693	5.249	6.223
Soğuksu	2.919	5.770	9.748	4.915
Tokatköy	3.637	9.093	12.748	13.923
Yalıköy	6.599	6.636	4.539	6.207
İncirköy	14.248	15.630	17.239	17.393

Source: Beykoz Municipality, *5 Yıllık Stratejik Plan*, (İstanbul: Beykoz Belediyesi, February 2006).

Table 3: Labour Force (Population aged 12 and more) (2000)

		Total	%	Male	%	Female	%
Total		136.410	64,83	68.569	63,97	67.841	65,46
Labour Force	Total	60.827	44,59	46.798	68,25	14.029	20,68
	Employment	51.071	83,96	40.065	85,61	11.006	78,45
	Unemployed	9.756	16,04	6.733	14,39	3.023	21,55
Not included in labour force		75.583	55,41	21.771	31,75	53.812	79,32

Source: Beykoz Municipality, *5 Yıllık Stratejik Plan*, (Istanbul: Beykoz Belediyesi, February 2006).

Table: 4 Employment Status in Beykoz (Population aged 12 and more) (2000)

	Total	%	Male	%	Female	%
Total	51,071	83.96	40,065	85.61	11,006	78.45
Agriculture, hunting, forestry and fishery	295	0.58	278	0.69	17	0.15
Manufacturing Sector	14,250	27.90	10,710	26.73	3,540	32.16
Construction	3,558	6.97	3,447	8.60	111	1.02
Mass and Retail trade, restaurants and hotels	9,955	19.49	8,315	20.75	1,640	14.90
Community services, social and personal services	13,654	26.74	10,209	25.48	3,449	31.34

Source: Beykoz Municipality, *5 Yıllık Stratejik Plan*, (Istanbul: Beykoz Belediyesi, February 2006).

Table 5: The Characteristics of the Buildings

The Characteristics of the Buildings			
	Number	(%)	Characteristics
The number of the licensed buildings	2.754	6,20	From May 2005
Unlicensed, in violation of license, gecekondü, and the buildings not characterized	41.632	93,80	
The number of total buildings	44.386	100	42.155 Building taxpayer 3.437 Land taxpayer <u>5.356</u> Estate taxpayer 50.948 Total

Source: Beykoz Municipality, *5 Yıllık Stratejik Plan*, (Istanbul: Beykoz Belediyesi, February 2006).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Internet Sources

- “*Beykozlu eğitimciler sonuncu.*” 18 March 2007. Available [online]:
http://www.dostbeykoz.com/haber_detay.asp?id=2210&tur=0 [March 2008].
- “Cam-Köy Gazetesi.” Available [online]:
http://www.ekenek.gen.tr/?islem1=sayfaana_detay.php&anasayfa_id=55 [September 2007].
- “Deep Darkness on Night Shift.” 13 March 2008. Available [online]:
<http://www.turkishdailynews.com.tr/article.php?enewsid=98856>. [15 March 2008].
- “Eğitimin sorunları sadece konuşuldu.” 24 May 2008. Available [online]:
http://www.dostbeykoz.com.tr/haber_detay.asp?id=3688&tur=255 [25 May 2008].
- “Hizmette Paylaşım, Yönetimde Adalet.” 26 August 2006. Available [online]:
http://www.dostbeykoz.com.tr/haber_detay.asp?tur=382&id=1589 [15 March 2008].
- “İncirköy ve Soğuksu’da Tapu Sevinci Sürüyor.” 21 July 2008. Available [online]:
http://www.beykoz.bel.tr/g_haber_detay.asp?tur=313&id=2301 [22 July 2008].
- “Osmanlı, Beykoz Yenimahalle’yi Fethetmeye Kararlı.” 21 November 2007.
Available [online]:
<http://www.bilgibeykoz.net/default.aspx?pid=33591&nid=38706> [22 July 2008].
- “Paşabahçe İşçi Hareketleri Dosyası.” Available [online]:
http://www.ekenek.gen.tr/?islem1=sayfaana_detay.php&anasayfa_id=45
[September 2007].
- “Tekel işçisi oyunu düşünerek kullanacak.” 06 June 2007. Available [online]:
<http://www.bilgibeykoz.net/default.aspx?pid=16793&nid=29957> [15 March 2008].

Newspapers

Bilgi Beykoz, 2004 – July 2008 (www.bilgibeykoz.net).

Doğuş Haber, 2002 – July 2008 (www.dogushaber.com).

Dost Beykoz, March 2005 – July 2008 (www.dostbeykoz.com.tr).

Kent Kültürü, 2001 – 2004.

Özgün Haber, February 2008- June 2008.

Radikal İki, 18 August 2002.

Books and Articles

Acar, Erhan. “İşçi Konutu Olarak Gecekondu.” In *Türkiye Birinci Şehircilik Kongresi*. Ed. by Yiğit Gülöksüz. Ankara: ODTÜ Şehir ve Bölge Planlama Bölümü, 1982.

Acar, Erhan and Murat Güvenç. “A Study on the Housing Conditions of Industrial Labor.” In *The Development of the Istanbul Metropolitan Area and Low Cost Housing*. Eds. by İlhan Tekeli (et al.). Istanbul: Belbim A.Ş., 1992.

Ak, Lütfü. *Şişecam’da Otuz Yıl*. Istanbul, 1975.

Aksoy, Asu and Kevin Robins. “Istanbul Rising: Returning the Repressed to Urban Culture.” *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 2 (1995): 223-235.

Aksoy, Asu and Kevin Robins. “Modernism and the Millennium: Trial by Space in Istanbul,” *City*, 8, no. 2 (1997): 21-36.

Anderson, Elijah. *Code of the Street: Decency, Violence, and the Moral Life of the Inner City*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1999.

Aydın, Zafer. “Direnişin Ardından Paşabahçe,” *Birikim*, 162 (2002):125-128.

Bartu, Ayfer. “Kentsel Ayr(ı)şım: İstanbul’daki Yeni Yerleşimler ve Kemer Country Örneği.” In *21. Yüzyıl Karşısında Kent ve İnsan*. Ed. by Firdevs Gümüsoğlu. Istanbul: Bağlam Yayınları, 2001.

Bartu-Candan, Ayfer and Biray Kolluoglu-Kirli. “Neoliberalizm ve Yerel Yönetimler Bağlamında Kentsel Dönüşüme Nasıl Karşı Durulabilir?” *İstanbul*, 60 (2007): 68-71.

- Bayramođlu, Fuat. *Turkish Glass Art and Beykoz-ware*. Tehran: RCD Cultural Institute, 1976.
- Baytın, C. et al. "Istanbul-Bosphorus as our Cultural Heritage: the Process of Change over Time," paper presented in *CIPA 2003 XIXth International Symposium*. 30 September – 04 October, 2003, Antalya, Turkey.
- Behar, David and Tolga İslam (eds.). *İstanbul'da "Soylulaştırma."* İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2006.
- Beneria, Lourdes. "Changing Employment Patterns and the Informalization of Jobs: General Trends and Gender Dimensions." *Geneva: International Labor Office*, (2001).
- Beykoz Municipality. *Beykoz Geri Görünüm ve Etkilenme Bölgesi İmar Planı Araştırma Raporu*. İstanbul: Beykoz Belediyesi, 1987.
- Beykoz Municipality. *5 Yıllık Stratejik Plan*. İstanbul: Beykoz Belediyesi, February 2006.
- Birelma, Alpkan. "Three Cases of Worker Mobilization" (Master's Thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2007).
- "Boğaziçi Kanunu," *Resmi Gazete* 18229, 1983.
- Bora, Aksu. *Kadınların Sınıfı: Ücretli Ev Emeđi ve Kadın Öznelliđinin İnşası*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2005.
- Boratav, Korkut. *İstanbul ve Anadolu'dan Sınıf Profilleri* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1995).
- Boratav, Korkut. "Özelleştirme, Kaynak Transferleri ve Yozlaşma," in *75 yılda Çarklardan Çhip'lere*. Ed. by Oya Baydar. İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 1999.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. "What Makes a Social Class? On the Theoretical and Practical Existence of Groups," *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 32 (1987): 1-17.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Weight of the World: Social Suffering in Contemporary Society*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1999.
- Brenner, Neil and Nik Theodore. "Cities and the Geographies of 'Actually Existing Neoliberalism.'" In *Spaces of Neoliberalism*. Ed. by Neil Brenner and Nik Theodore. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.
- Buđra, Ayşe. "Bir Toplumsal Dönüşümü Anlama Çabalarına Katkı: Bugün Türkiye'de E. P. Thompson'ı Okumak." In *İngiliz İşçi Sınıfının Oluşumu*. Trans. by Uygur Kocabaşođlu. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2004.

- Buğra, Ayşe. "Immoral Economy of Housing in Turkey," *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 22 (1998): 303–17.
- Buğra, Ayşe. F. Adaman, A. Insel. 26 February 2008. "Societal Context of Labor Union Strategy: The Case of Turkey." Available [online]: *Labor Studies Journal Online* [15 March 2008].
- Buğra, Ayşe and Çağlar Keyder. February 2008. *Kent Nüfusunun En Yoksul Kesiminin İstihdam Yapısı ve Geçinme Yöntemleri*. İstanbul: Sosyal Politika Forumu. Available [online]: http://www.spf.boun.edu.tr/docs/kent_yoksullugu_rapor.pdf [15 June 2008].
- Burawoy, Micheal. "The Limits of Wright's Analytical Marxism and an Alternative," *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 32 (1987): 51-72.
- Burkay, Helin Özge. "Social Policy of Urban Transformation: Social Housing Policies from 1980s to Present" (Master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2007).
- Camın Teri*. The documentary of Suha Arin, 1985.
- Castells, Manuel. *The City and the Grassroots: A Cross-cultural Theory of Urban Social Movements*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
- Cowie, J. R. and J. Heathcott. *Beyond the Ruins: The Meanings of Deindustrialization*. Ithaca: ILR Press, 2003.
- Çam, Surhan. "Trade Unions, Wages, Job Security and Privatization: The Case of the Turkish Cement Industry," *Sociological Review*, 47, no. 4 (1999): 695-715.
- Çavuşoğlu, Erbatur. "Hegemonik Bir Süreç Olarak Türkiye Kentleşmesi" (Ph.d Diss., Mimar Sinan University, 2004).
- Çelik, Aziz. "Türkiye'de Sendika Üyeliği ve Sendikalaşma İstatistikleri," *İş Güç Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi*, 6, no.2 (2004).
- Çelik, Aziz and Zafer Aydın (eds.). *14. Genel Kurul: Olağanüstü Bir Dönemden Haberler-Yorumlar 2000-2004, Kristal-İş*. İstanbul: Kristal-İş Sendikası, 2004.
- Çelik, Aziz and Zafer Aydın. *Paşabahçe 1966: Gelenek Yaratan Grev*. İstanbul: TÜSTAV, 2006.
- Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, s.v. "Beykoz İlçesi."
- Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, s.v. "Beykoz Deri ve Kundura Fabrikası."
- Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, s.v. "Paşabahçe."
- Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, s.v. "Paşabahçe Tekel İçki Fabrikası."

- Eley, Geoff. "Edward Thompson, Social History and Political Culture: The Making of a Working-class Public, 1780-1850." In *E.P. Thompson, Critical Perspectives*. Eds. by Harvey J. Kaye and Keith McClelland. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990.
- Eley, Geoff and Keith Nield. "Scholarly Controversy: Farewell to the Working Class?" *International Labor and Working-Class History*, 57 (Spring 2000): 1-30.
- Fantasia, Rick. *Cultures of Solidarity: Consciousness, Action, and Contemporary American Workers*. Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1988.
- Fantasia, Rick. "From Class Consciousness to Culture, Action, and Social Organization," *Annual Review of Sociology*, 21, (1995): 269-287.
- Fantasia, Rick. Scott G. McNall, Rhonda F. Levine (ed.). *Bringing Class Back in: Contemporary and Historical Perspectives*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1991.
- Fine, M. and L. Weis. *The Unknown City: Lives of Poor and Working Class Young Adults*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1988.
- Genç, Fırat and Tuna Koyuncu (interviewers), "Bir sözümüz var duymak isteyene," *İstanbul*, 63 (Nisan 2008).
- Genis, Serife. "Producing Elite Localities: The Rise of Gated Communities in Istanbul," *Urban Studies*, 44, no. 4 (April 2007): 771-798.
- Güvenç, Murat and Oğuz Işık. "İstanbul'u okumak II: Mahalle düzeyinde konut mülkiyeti-statü farklılaşmasına ilişkin bulgular nasıl genellenebilir?" *Toplum ve Bilim*, 72 (1997): 153-164.
- Güvenç, Murat and Oğuz Işık. İstanbul'u Okumak: Statü-Konut Mülkiyeti Farklılaşmasına İlişkin Bir Çözümleme Denemesi, *Toplum ve Bilim*, 71 (1996): 6-60
- Hamnett, Chris. "Gentrification, Postindustrialism, and Industrial and Occupational Restructuring in Global Cities." In *A Companion to The City*. Eds. by Gary Bridge and Sophie Watson. Oxford, UK; Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2003.
- Harvey, David. "Labor, Capital, and Class Struggle around the Built Environment in Advanced Capitalist Societies." In *Classes, Power, and Conflict*. Eds. by Anthony Giddens and David Held. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.
- Harvey, David. "Neoliberalism as Creative Destruction," *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 610 (2007): 21-44.
- Harvey, David. *Spaces of Hope*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

- Hobsbawm, E. J. "From Social History to the History of Society," *Daedalus*, 100 (Winter 1971): 20–45.
- Isık, Oğuz and Melih Pınarcıoğlu. *Nöbetleşe Yoksulluk: Gecekondulaşma ve Kent Yoksulları Sultanbeyli Örneği*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2001.
- İçduygu, Ahmet and İbrahim Sirkeci. "Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye’inde Göç Hareketleri." In *75 Yılda Köylerden Şehirlere*. Ed. by Oya Baydar. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı, 1999.
- Joint Initiative on Corporate Accountability and Workers’ Rights. July 2004. "Basic Information on Labor Conditions and Social Auditing in the Turkish Garment Industry." Available [online]: <http://www.jo-in.org/pub/docs/JoIn-turkBackgndStudy-2004-07.pdf> [March 2008].
- Karakışla, Yavuz Selim. "The Emergence of the Ottoman Industrial Working Class, 1893-1923." In *Workers and Working Class in Ottoman Empire 1839-1950*. Eds. by Donald Quataert and Erik Jan Zürcher. London; New York: I. B. Tauris, 1995.
- Katznelson, Ira. *Marxism and the City*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Keleş, Ruşen. *Türkiye’de Sosyal Konut Politikası*. Ankara: Sevinç Matbaası, 1966.
- Keleş, Ruşen. "Urban Regeneration in İstanbul." Paper presented to Priority Action Programme, Regional Activity Center (May 2003), Split.
- Keyder, Çağlar and Ayşe Öncü. "Globalization of a Third World Metropolis: İstanbul in the 1980s." *Review*, 17, no. 3 (1994): 383-421.
- Keyder, Çağlar (ed.). *İstanbul: Küresel ile Yerel Arasında*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2000.
- Keyder, Çağlar. "Liberalization from above and the future of the informal sector: land, shelter, and informality in the periphery." In *Informalization: Process and Structure*. Ed. by Faruk Tabak and Michaeline A. Crichlow. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.
- Keyder, Çağlar. *Türkiye’de Devlet ve Sınıflar*. 9th edition. İstanbul: İletişim, 2003.
- Keyder, Globalization and Social Exclusion in İstanbul, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29, no. 1 (2005): 124-134.
- Kofman, Eleonore and Elizabeth Lebas. "Lost in Transposition – Time, Space and the City." In *Writings on Cities*. Eds. and trans. by Eleonore Kofman and Elizabeth Lebas. Cambridge, Mass, USA : Blackwell Publishers, 1996.
- Kristal-İş. *Cam İşçisi Temmuz 1990 Anket Sonuçları*. İstanbul: Çiftay Matbaacılık, 1991.

- Kristal-İş Sendikası. *Paşabahçe Direnişi*. İstanbul: Kristal-İş Sendikası, 1992.
- Kuban, Baha. "Cam sektörü ve Şişe Cam." In *75 Yılda Çarklardan Çip'lere*. Ed. by Oya Baydar. İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 1999.
- Kurtuluş, Hatice. "İstanbul'da Kapalı Yerleşmeler: Beykoz Konakları Örneği." In *İstanbul'da Kentsel Ayrışma*. Ed. by Hatice Kurtuluş. İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları, 2005.
- Küçükerman, Önder. *Geleneksel Türk Dericilik Sanayi ve Beykoz Fabrikası: Boğaziçinde Başlatılan Sanayi*. Ankara: Sümerbank, 1988.
- Küçükerman, Önder. *Türk Cam Sanayi ve Şişe-Cam*. İstanbul: Türkiye Şişe ve Cam Fabrikaları A.Ş., 1998.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *The Writings on Cities*. Eds. and trans. by Eleonore Kofman and Elizabeth Lebas. Cambridge, Mass, USA: Blackwell Publishers, 1996.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *The Urban Revolution*. Trans. by Robert Bononno; foreword by Neil Smith. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003.
- Lüdtke, Alf (ed.). *The History of Everyday Life: Reconstructing Historical Experiences and Ways of Life*. Trans. by William Templer. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- Lüdtke, Alf. "Polymorphous Synchrony: German Industrial Workers and Politics of Everyday Life." In *The End of Labor History?* Ed. by Marcel van der Linden. The Internationaal Institut voor Sociale Geschiedenis, Amsterdam: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- McHugh, Kevin E. "Generational Consciousness and Retirement Communities," *Population, Space and Place*, 13, no. 4 (2007): 293-306.
- Nichols, Theo. Nadir Sugur and Ali C. Tasiran. "Signs of Change in Turkey's Working Class: Workers' Age-related Perceptions in the Modern Manufacturing Sector," *British Journal of Sociology*, 54 no. 4 (December 2003): 527-545.
- Özkan, Evrim and Senem Kozaman. "Gated Communities: as an Efficient Force in the Fragmentation Process of İstanbul," *42nd ISoCaRP Congress* (2006).
- Özyeğin, Gül. *Başkalarının Kiri: Kapıcılar, Gündelikçiler ve Kadınlık Halleri*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2001.
- Portelli, Alessandro. *The Death of Luigi Trastulli and Other Stories: Form and Meaning in Oral History*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1991.

- Portelli, Alessandro. “‘This Mill Won’t Run No More’: Oral History and Deindustrialization.” In *New Working Class Studies*. Eds. by John Russo and Sherry Lee Linkon. Ithaca [N.Y.]: ILR Press, 2005
- Pamuk, Şevket. “Economic Change in Twentieth Century: Is the Glass More Than Half Full?” In *Cambridge History of Modern Turkey* 4. Ed. by Reşat Kasaba (2007).
- Pérouse, Jean-François and Didem Daniş. “Zenginliğin Mekanda Yeni Yansımaları: İstanbul’da Güvenlikli Siteler”, *Toplum ve Bilim*, 104 (2005): 92-123.
- Russo, John and Sherry Lee Linkon. “Collateral Damage: Deindustrialization and the Uses of Youngstown.” In *Beyond the Ruins*. Eds. by J. R. Cowie and J. Heathcott. Ithaca: ILR Press, 2003.
- Savage, Mike. *Class Analysis and Social Transformation*. Open University Press, 2000.
- Scott, Allen J. “Industrial Organization and the Logic of Intra-Metropolitan Location: I. Theoretical Considerations,” *Economic Geography*, 59, no. 3. (July 1983): 233-250.
- Scott, James C. “Everyday Forms of Resistance,” In *Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. Ed. by Forrest D. Colburn. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Sennett, Richard. *The Corrosion of Character*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1998.
- Sennett, Richard. *The Culture of the New Capitalism*. Yale University Press, 2005.
- Smith, Neil. “New Globalism, New Urbanism: Gentrification as Global Urban Strategy.” In *Spaces of Neoliberalism*. Eds. by Neil Brenner and Nik Theodore. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.
- Smith, Michael Peter and Richard Tardanico. “Urban Theory Reconsidered: Production, Reproduction, and Collective Action.” In *The Capitalist City: Global Restructuring and Community Politics*. Ed. by Micheal Peter Smith and Joe R. Feagin. Oxford & New York: Basil Blackwell, 1987.
- Standing, Guy. “Global Feminization Through Flexible Labor: A Theme Revisited,” *World Development*, 27, no. 3 (March 1999): 583-602.
- Sümerbank*. Ankara: Sümerbank, 1946.
- Swyngedouw, Erik, Frank Moulert and Arantxa Rodriguez. “Neoliberal Urbanization in Europe: Large Scale Urban Development Projects and the New Urban Policy.” In *Spaces of Neoliberalism*. Eds. by Neil Brenner and Nik Theodore. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.
- Şenyapılı, Tansı. “Charting the Voyage in the Urban Spatial ‘Quadruped,’” *European Journal of Turkish Studies*, 1 (2004).

- Tekeli, İlhan. *Türkiye'de Yaşamda ve Yazında Konut Sorununun Gelişimi*. Ankara: T.C. Başbakanlık Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığı, 1996.
- Thompson, E. P. *The Making of the English Working Class*. New York: Vintage Books, 1966.
- Thompson, "Eighteenth Century English Society: Class Struggle without Class," *Social Theory*, 3, no.2 (May 1978): 133-165.
- Thompson, E. P. *Customs in Common*, London: Penguin, 1993.
- Tolga, Hikmet Burak. "Endüstriyel Alanların Dönüşümü, Kentsel Mekana Etkileri: Beykoz Deri ve Kundura Fabrikası İçin Bir Dönüşüm Senaryosu." (Master's thesis, Yıldız Technical University, 2006).
- Tuski, Donald L. "Folk Constructions of a Plant Closing" (Ph.d Diss., Michigan State University, 1998).
- Türkiye Sendikacılık Ansiklopedisi*, s.v. "Beykoz Deri ve Kundura Fabrikası Grev ve Eylemleri, 1975."
- Türkiye Sendikacılık Ansiklopedisi*, s.v. "Deri Sanayi İşkolu."
- Türkiye Sendikacılık Ansiklopedisi*, s.v. "Kristal-İş."
- Urry, John. *Consuming Places*. London; New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Uzun, Nil. "The Impact of Urban Renewal and Gentrification on Urban Fabric: Three Cases in Turkey," *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 94, no.3 (2003): 363-375.
- Wacquant, L. J. D. "Scrutinizing the Street: Poverty, morality, and the pitfalls of urban ethnography," *The American Journal of Sociology*, 107, no. 6 (May 2002): 1468 – 1532.
- Wacquant, L. J. D. "The Rise of Advanced Marginality: Notes on its Nature and Implications," *Acta Sociologica*, 39, no. 2 (1996): 121-139.
- Wacquant, L. J. D. "Making Class: Middle Class(es) in Social Theory and Social Structure." In *Bringing Class Back in: Contemporary and Historical Perspectives*. Eds. by Rick Fantasia, McNall Scott, and Rhonda F. Levine. Boulder: Westview Pres, 1991.
- Wedel, Heide. *Siyaset ve Cinsiyet: İstanbul Gecekonduklarında Kadınların Siyasal Katılımı*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2001.
- Weinbaum, Eve S. "From Plant Closing to Political Movement: Challenging the Logic of Economic Destruction in Tennessee," in *New Poverty Studies: The Ethnography of Power, Politics, and Impoverished People in United States*.

ed. Judith Goode and Jeff Maskovsky. New York, New York University Press, 2001, pp. 399-401.

Weinbaum, Eve S. "Successful Failures: Local Democracy in a Global Economy" (Ph.d Diss, Yale University, 1997).

White, Jenny B. *Money Makes Us Relatives: Women's Labor in Urban Turkey*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1994.

Wilson, W.J. *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor*. Vintage: New York, 1997.

Wright, E. O. *Classes*. London: Verso, 1985.

Wright, E. O. "Reflection on *Classes*," *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 32 (1987):19-49.

Yörük, Erdem. "Social Relations of Production within the Workshop System in Istanbul's Apparel Industry." (Master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2006).