

Globalization, Locality and the Struggle over a Living Space.

The Case of Karanfilköy

SEVIL ALKAN

In recent years the increasing literature on globalization draws the picture of a new borderless world order; that globalization is an »unstoppable«, »inevitable« and »relentless« process, that the spread of investment production and technology will make the world a more homogenous and singular place, that globalization is inevitable and even desirable. Moreover, global competition will undoubtedly increase economic efficiency, that global society, economy and cultures become »placeless«, they show themselves everywhere in the world resulting in homogenization. From the neo-liberal perspective, globalization is shown as an inexorable process and a powerful force arising from outside which should be accepted as it is.

The same scenario also presents a new system including the patterns of losers as well as winners in the global world. This approach is also reflected in the global city discourse promoting competition between cities and the tendency to create a hierarchical world city system. In this hierarchical map of the world, attaining the global city status becomes very important. In order to reach this status, which offers enormous opportunities, cities should orient their urban politics towards the aim of becoming a global city.

Globalization shows itself differently with complex affinities and processes varied according to different economic, social and cultural contexts. This study aims to point to the multi-dimensionality and complexity of globalization, especially when »other cities in other places«

are in question (Öncü/Weyland 1997). It treats globalization as a complicated and uneven process rather than a singular and homogenous formation. In line with this approach, it aims to show the importance of localities in the formation of globalizing cities and prove that the local does not exist as only an opposition and resistance against the global but it finds its special space in the city life in the interrelation with globalization.

The example taken in this thesis is a locality in a globalizing metropolis – Istanbul. Istanbul, like other cities, wants to reach a global city status and participate in inter-city competition in order to gain economic benefits from globalization. Urban politics are formed and many strategies are developed mainly under the influence of the dominant globalization discourse to »sell Istanbul« in the global arena. With this image creation, only one side of the city is to be shown to the market, the bigger part of the urban population which does not fit to this image are excluded from the global city project. We see the conversion of the decaying/dying, non-representative areas with its physical and social characteristics within the urban regeneration projects, gentrification of these districts and finally the displacement of the people who live there. Our example, Karanfilköy is one of the squatter housing neighborhoods that occupies this position in the frame of the global city project. The Karanfilköy case can be described as the product of the »power struggles over the living space and local identity« (Öncü/Weyland 1997) under the impacts of globalization in the city.

These power struggles are also reflected to the general public, which makes the inhabitants of Karanfilköy quite successful in expressing themselves, even finding their power from tools shared to the public. They have realised the power rising from the public and used this opportunity to organize themselves and to gain power. This reflection allows them to be more capable of dealing with the problems because they learnt how to represent themselves and to develop organizational infrastructures that can be seen in the urban life of Istanbul.

In short, with the example of Karanfilköy, it is intended to show how a locality is victimized first by the globalization processes of the city that caused power struggles between different groups while at the same time the globalization process provided opportunities to overcome this problem, especially in the public arena. It is expected to be shown with the case study that a locality in a globalizing metropolis is neither a completely closed community nor victims of globalization. A locality can become an important actor in the city although it is supposed that they are not dominant enough to exercise power. With this example, it is

expected to point to the uneven process and effects of globalization as an opposition to the neo-liberal approach.

The dominant globalization discourse

Most theories about neo-liberalism treat globalization primarily as an economic phenomenon. It tends to view globalization as a rather unproblematic term and produces works that are focused empirically on same aspects of the economic (rather than the social or cultural) geographies of globalization (Roberts 1995 in Leyshon 1997). The concept is treated as a natural force based inherent in the market. Capital is completely free and mobile so that this »placeless money« can be only controlled by the very few powerful transnational corporations which are completely free in their actions, independent from the national and local forms of power. This approach proposes that the nation state is weakening in this borderless economy through the establishment of transnational networks of production, trade and finance that is connoted as »the end of the nation state«. Such statements show the globalization process as an inevitable, relentless process emanating from outside, which is much beyond the political powers, actuated by capitalist development and technological change. This approach conforms to neo-liberal politics and supports the free market on a global scale. The essence of this scenario is also accepted and displayed by diverse actors and organizations like governments, transnational corporations, non-governmental organizations and even social movements, to perform and legitimize their political and economic programs.

This scenario also presents a new system including the patterns of losers as well as winners and the polarization between them in the global world. The social results of globalization or those »who having been left behind, want not so much a chance to move forward as to hold others back as well« should be dealt by the governments (McGrew 1998). This idea presents manifestly the expected passive role of the government and the desire of creating a kind of new hierarchy in the global system.

Furthermore, it is also claimed that a global homogenization in social, economic and political fields, eliminating the differences between regions in the world, is inevitable and it will lead to a singular »global society«, replacing the diversity of cultural systems which were prominent until now. This homogenization thesis presents the globalization in a sense that there is an absolute harmonization with the standardized consumption culture and equalization of the acts and modes of human conditions. In addition, this approach does not take cultural and practical

experiences, like personal relations, political and religious tendencies, national and ethical identity patterns, local practises and their relations to different contexts into consideration.

Until now, the perspective that is drawn above reflects only one dimension of globalization, which is only based on the economic point of view. In addition, in these discussions the meaning and essence of the term is often deformed and mis-formulated, reducing the complexities of globalization into a one-sided, simple approach. Thus, globalization should be treated sceptically and one should be aware of the caricatures of globalization and the political contexts in which these are being deployed, but it does not mean that the very existence of the process should be denied (Dicken/Peck/Tickell 1997).

At this point, an alternative approach should be cultivated to understand power struggles, changing patterns of the local under the changes at the world scale, the positioning of the states and local governments to the existence of globality. It is so apparent that fundamental changes are occurring in the world, but how these changes and their powerful consequences should be treated is a very crucial question and should be answered carefully.

Undoing the dominant globalization discourse – The complexity of globalization

One of the basic arguments from the neo-liberal perspective to the globalization thesis is the »weakening role of the nation states« because of the increasing importance of transnational flows of capital, commodities, labour, images and information. Some studies have shown that the main discussion is not if there is more or less of a nation-state, it is rather that the states adopt themselves according to differing conditions under globalization.¹

It means that the states are gaining changing structure and orientation. It is obvious that the nation states do not carry the same characteristics and structure as it was before. However, it does not necessarily mean that the states lost their key positions in forming their politics in the global arena, but other forms of politics have become important. According to Jessop (1995), the nation state is »still the most significant site of struggle among competing global, triadic, supra-national, national, regional and local forces«. What is changing is that the state ca-

1 See studies like Peck and Tickell, 1994; Amin and Thrift, 1997; Dicken et al., 1997; Jessop, 2000; Yeung, 2002 and Park, 2003.

pabilities and structures are re-organized in intricate and complicated ways leading to a new economic and institutional orientation of the nation-state, which opens up new possibilities.

Additionally, globalization is not an external force that is unavoidable or inevitable, contrary to what the neo-liberal global perspective proposes. According to Dicken, Peck and Tickell (1997) globalization does not exist as a free-floating structure unrelated to the economic and institutional context in which it arises. Rather, it is the result of complex interactions through the process in which different social, political and economic actors, nation states, transnational corporations, localities etc., play important role. Globalization is built materially and discursively from the complex correlations and power struggles between these actors happening simultaneously among various geographical scales. Marcuse (1997) points out that »globalization does not move on its own. It is the result of human actions consciously undertaken by specific persons and groups, if with varying degrees of coordination«.

The neo-liberal hypothesis also proclaims the homogenization of cultures, claiming that the forces of commoditization will generate cultural homogenization and standardization in social life. The world becomes one singular place by offering the standardization of culture and institutional structures. According to Featherstone (1995), the process of globalization suggests two different kinds of culture scenarios. One is that the upper limits of the world are the determination, which is the globe. In this scenario, all heterogeneous cultures, whose existence becomes incorporated, melt into one global culture producing the big unification of the globe. On the contrary, the other scenario offers that the different cultures flow side by side and, at a certain point, they are confronted with each other. Within the overlap of their confrontation, various possibilities and complicated circumstances appear. Indeed, the global cultural condition is a matter of flows, meanings as well of people and goods, happening at the different levels of networks between different regions of the globe as Appadurai (1990) explains in his article. According to him, culture carries characteristics of definite fundamental disjuncture between economy, culture and politics. Reducing this complexity into a situation, which is believed to be the result of economic and technological improvement will limit our understanding of the complexities in the real life of citizens in cities, reflecting different characteristics and sometimes paradoxes of globalization. On one side, the global culture shows itself as an emerging entity, on the other side, there is another kind of culture arising which reflects the merging of the influence coming from the global level (cultural, political and economical) and the values existing in a place.

In the light of the points discussed above, the appropriate understanding about globalization and its effects on culture seems to be the one, which takes the multi-dimensionality and complexity of the process into the consideration. Within globalization the new forms of changes in the cultural field, such as the emergence of a new global culture, are observed. However, these changes are not only one-sided, that there is a rising complex composition of cultural forms differing according to their distinct components and that can be explained with the help of hybridization and global flows perspectives. In this respect, it is very crucial to evaluate the potential of hybrid differences emerging under the impact of globalization in order to analyze changing forms of relations in cultural, economical and political fields.

Globalization and localization

In relation to the discussion of complexity of the globalization process, the problem of the local, which is also underestimated by the dominant globalization discourse, should be open to discussion. The issue of local in the context of globalization has also ended with several approaches to that problem. In the most common sense, a local culture is frequently represented as a being opposite of the global and as the cultural space of embedded communities. The local in the general case has been treated as a static, closed and bounded place, which is outside the logic of globalization. People in these narrow social worlds make sense of their world and form their political identities in a culturally bounded micro-territory, the locality. These local cultural meanings are represented as generating identities inherently oppositional to the global restructuring of society and space (Smith 2001). In the same line, there is a tendency to claim that »globalization is a process which overrides locality« (Robertson 1994). Furthermore, locality is mostly represented as the space of resistance to the pressing influences and processes of globalization, that localization and globalization are shown completely opposing notions to each other. However, the new studies claim that there is actually a mutual influence and relation between the local and the global. In other words, the local is not a closed entity but it interacts, responds to the changes and flows on the global scale. Today, the notions of global and local become inseparable from each other in a way that »rather than being mutually exclusive, they are ›in‹ one another in ways that make their interpretation as important as their differentiation« (Öncü/Weyland 1997). In words of Long (1996): »[...] local situations are transformed by becoming part of the wider global arenas and processes, while global

dimensions are made meaningful in relation to specific local conditions and through the understandings and strategies of local actors». In other words, there is a continuous interaction of local cultural elements and global cultural influences, which play an important role in the construction of local forms.

Then, how is this interaction possible, contrary to the very common expectation, from the local in the form of resistance to the disruptive processes of globalization? From the cultural point of view, within the distinct means of flows in the global world, the locals adapt themselves to global and transnational contexts and they contact with »external« cultural elements. Moreover, these external elements may become a part of the local cultures when they enter a local context. They become part of it after being filtered and adapted to the new context (Schuerkens 2004). In short, this cultural global flow is filtered by the existing local experiences with refusal, interpretation, combination and transformation of actions and forms in order to come up with the new cultural forms and new representations. This approach somehow shows that localities are not only the passive receivers in the case of the problem of dealing with global flows.

According to Öncü and Weyland (1997), different social groups with distinct relations to global flows and processes are mobilized to re-describe »their political and cultural boundaries vis-à-vis other relevant social actors in the metropolitan arena«. It is self-evident that images and commodities circulate and flow and find themselves in metropolises all over the world. Beside this, the localities are »engaged in active power struggles to maintain their conditions of social existence and cultural distinctiveness vis-à-vis other relevant actors, including the state elite« (ibid.) under the influence of globalization. The circumstances about locality is not pure resistance to global practices, the actors who are engaged in the globalization processes involve themselves in the struggle to change the circumstances of metropolitan life in order to redefine their existence according to each other. In this sense, even the resistances in globalizing cities do not address the pure opposition to globalization but to an attempt to redefine their local identities and positions in the changing relationships during the globalization processes. Even in the resistance case, the local and the global interact, interconnect and form complicated relations which are shaping the nowadays' metropolises of the world.

In brief, the global-local relation differs according to metropolises, their distinct cultural, social and economic structures as well as their histories and their engagement in globalization processes. It is self-evident that global-local interrelations will show themselves relatively different,

for instance, in New York and in Istanbul. In order to understand this distinction, an approach, which treats globalization as an uneven development should be developed and closer research should be initiated in the real life of the metropolises, without being fixed to the dominant globalization discourse, offering a one-dimensional approach to these problems. In short, globalization and localization are complicated and heterogeneous processes, which can not be simply reduced to opposing notions. On the contrary, they have a mutual relation and strong influences on each other.

Squatter housing *gecekondu* and changes within the globalization

The establishment in Turkish cities of *gecekondu*, as a type of dwelling responding to the shelter demands of a part of the population, dates back to post War II period, when the country was exposed to the major developments and changes within the frame of an agriculture-based development strategy. During this period, structural interventions in agriculture were implemented in order to integrate it to the market, mostly supported by the Marshall Plan that caused a large amount of peasants migrating to the cities. However, the major cities of Turkey were not capable of answering the housing demands of the newcomers. Therefore, the migrants remained at the margins of cities by building their own shanties in undesirable sites when they first arrived. These shanties are called *gecekondu*, literally meaning, »built in one night«.

While migrants took their place in the urban economy, they tried to meet their shelter needs by building their *gecekondus* on public land. Their *gecekondu* constructions were tolerated by the government and by the private sector as their cheap and flexible labor helped the industrialization process (Erman 2000). For this reason, the *gecekondu* was born as a non-market solution for the people who were excluded by formal housing market as well as the state. The *gecekondu* was home to the ones who were newcomers to the city and tried to take part in city life and who the state and market forgot and ignored (Işık/Pınarcıoğlu 2002).

However, in the neo-liberal period, there were big changes in the urbanization process of cities guided by new policies. Until this period, there were considerable compromises between different groups and institutions about the structuring of cities (Işık/Pınarcıoğlu 2001). However, these harmonious interrelations were exposed to the change in a way that several actors appeared in the urban scene to take part in urban annuities, that they even applied different strategies and roles in these

changing conditions. Taking part in urban annuities, especially by the urban poor became an important requirement in order to survive in the urban life of cities (ibid).

The governing party of the period – the Motherland Party – interestingly issued a series of amnesty laws in the early beginning of the eighties, which aimed at making *gecekondu* settlements gain a legal status in order to solve the property rights problem for including the *gecekondu*s into the formal housing markets (Şenyapılı 1998 in Kalaylıoğlu 2006). The law passed in 1984 especially gave opportunities to the *gecekondu* population in order to built 4 storey buildings instead of their *gecekondu*s which resulted in the »apartmentalization« of *gecekondu*s. Most of the *gecekondu*s were converted into apartments whereby the owners suddenly attained very precious property rights. In this way, *gecekondu* lost its defining characteristic as »basic shelter« and became a commercial phenomenon.

Until the 1980s, the *gecekondu* population was treated as others in the city but they were still tolerated with their economic and cultural realities in urban life. However, this situation has dramatically changed in the neo-liberal period. After the 1980s, the notion of *gecekondu* has gone beyond the idea of sheltering needs and lost its innocence in the public debates and the opinion of people. Especially after the *gecekondu* transformations, *gecekondu* was presented by the elites and media as a means of making easy money and the owners were viewed by the public as »undeserving rich«. In this new negative representation, the terms like »illegal *gecekondu*«, »*gecekondu* invasion«, »illegal construction«, »invasion or occupation of public lands«, »land mafia«, »plunder and opportunist« were often pronounced making the *gecekondu* gain a position beyond the moral legitimacy (Kalaylıoğlu, 2006).

Beside this, in the 1990s, a dramatic approach to the *gecekondu* has been formed and promoted in the public. A new term *varoş/varoşlu* was introduced to the society in very negative connotations. The term was firstly used by the media after the Gazi Events in 1995 and in the following year 1 May Demonstrations in which both the leftist groups were engaged with the vandalism and fights with police forces that ended with the death of some people. Within these two major events and their reflection to the society through media, the term *varoş* has started to imply a certain part of the class who are economically deprived (the deprivation may be relative or absolute) and impoverished lower classes who tend to engage in criminal activities and radical political actions directed against the state. In other words, *varoş* is a living place, which watches the city from the outside but can't be part of it (Işık/Pınarcıoğlu 2002) and *varoşlu* is the person who exercises the violence and represents this

culturally as against the other actors in the city. The new notion of *varoş*, with its very negative connotations, refers to a culture as strangers in the context of urban life and, moreover as invaders directed to ruin the social and cultural texture of the city (Kalaylıoğlu 2006). In this sense, *varoş* does not only refer to a spatial entity, but also to a space with its social and cultural dimensions. However, these social and cultural features of *varoş* are correlated with danger and fear that these spaces are a »threat« to civilized and modernized urbanity. »The *varoş* is oppositional to the city and is setting itself against the city; it is hostile and antagonistic to the city. The city is besieged by the *varoşlu*« (Erman 2000). The term of *gecekondu* in this sense lost its innocent sense of the rural population who cannot integrate to the city, this time attacking its values, institutions and its social order (ibid.). While the notion of *gecekondu* implied an expectation of integration of the rural population to the city gradually, with the introduction of *varoş* this expectation should be left because *varoş* are culturally and socially completely against the city and its urban culture. They are the »others« and »losers« who already lost their chances to be part of the city and do not have any hope to be included. Since the *varoş* is a story of losing, it is unavoidable that they have a tendency towards violence.

In short, the changing image of the *gecekondu* population brought a dramatic positioning to the *gecekondu* problem and its population. This appears to be a big obstacle in regulating harmonious urban life between different social groups. It resulted in the exclusion of one segment of the city population that comes to important conflicts in urban life. From the point of the *varoşlu*, this situation also restricts their further demands about their urban life, as they already do not deserve it in the minds of the urbanites and the state. Their non-acceptance in this sense causes their attachment to their cultural and social identities more to represent a strong identity and organization as a counter presence.

Karanfilköy – A locality in the metropolis

When approaching from the 2nd Bosphorus Bridge towards the CBD of Istanbul, Karanfilköy appears on the left hand side of the road. Then, you reach a place where Istanbul is the most connected to the global network, processes and activities. The standard spatial requirement of being a finance centre has already been completed here so that the surroundings come into existence with a strong expression of global activities, its fundamental requirements such as offices, big and expensive shopping malls, gated communities close by are the typical spatial re-

flection of globalization in Istanbul in this part of the city. Finally, Karanfilköy, as a *gecekondu* settlement, appears in the middle of all these global activities. However, there is something interesting and, at the same time, strange about it. The first impression about Karanfilköy is that it is a *gecekondu* settlement. However, it is not post-*gecekondu* which has been converted into an apartment building after 1980s. It has a kind of a village structure, and it is pre-modern in the middle of Istanbul's representation to the global network. It seems that it is simultaneously incorporated and left behind. It is not a part of the global urban network although it is located in the core of this network. The place has been frozen² as it was in the 1950s. It seems that the typical development of the neo-liberal period, which has shaped the urban life of Istanbul, has not affected Karanfilköy. While many urban transformations have been realized by the municipality in order to get rid of »decaying areas« (*çöküntü alanları*) in order to become a representative global city, Karanfilköy remains as it is with its *gecekondu* identity, which can not be promoted in the minds of elites on the way to the global city. How is this situation possible? Can a place stay as it is while there is a continuous large-scale development around? Why does Karanfilköy exist there with these characteristics although there is a strong demand for the urban land, especially in this very precious part of the city? These are impressions and the questions, which arise about neighborhood at first sight. When deeper research and investigation are made in the neighborhood, it is understood that there are complicated interrelations between different actors, as well as very different dynamics shaping the condition of Karanfilköy. The situation of Karanfilköy today is a result of complex relations and different power dynamics in cultural, social and economic fields affected by the globalization process.

The effect of globalization on Karanfilköy

In the middle of these global movements, Karanfilköy retains its *gecekondu* identity, a place where local practices are grounded in the core of their everyday life. According to the findings of this research, it can be claimed that the condition of Karanfilköy can be characterized by a complex interrelation between globalization and localization. Öncü and Weyland (1997) also point out the same fact that »any attempt to make practical and political sense of contemporary metropolitan experience must therefore begin by recognizing that process of globalization and lo-

2 Orhan Esen used the term »frozen« in an informal talk to describe the specific situation of the neighborhood.

calization interconnect and intertwine to produce place-based political struggles« that reflects very well the position of Karanfilköy in a globalizing city. Karanfilköy, in this sense, points to a locality which is victimized by the globalization process of the city but, at the same, defeats this obstacle by the using the opportunities and means which globalization offers and provides. Within this time, Karanfilköy has adapted to the changing life of the metropolis under the intense impacts of globalization and satisfied the requirements in order to become a strong locality to declare its existence.

As it is discussed before, the localities tend to be shown as static and closed communities, which are completely outside the logic of globalization. However, Öncü and Weyland point out that the mixture of varied and different cultural forms, producing new diversities, requires complex reading in such dual oppositions as traditional/modern, indigenous/foreign or local/global. The position of the Karanfilköy residents »can be understood within the cultural frames of relevant social actors; that is social groups which are positioned differentially within the power constellations of a different system« changing under the impacts of globalization (Öncü/Weyland 1997). In other words, the Karanfilköy case is the product of power struggles determining the hierarchical relations under the impacts of globalization in the city. These power struggles come into being within the changing characteristics of city life, which are shaped by the different power dynamics in cultural, social and economic fields. In this research, these struggles are named as »living space – or *lebensraum* – struggles« as Öncü and Weyland (2007) have introduced in their work. Social groups in different relations to the global flows are:

»[...] mobilized to reassert or redefine their political and cultural boundaries vis-à-vis other relevant actors in the metropolitan arena. Place-based struggles entail contending social actors whose frames of reference, projects and practices have their logic and coherence within distinctive ensembles of the class and culture of the metropolis.« (Öncü/Weyland 2007)

Today, the situation of Karanfilköy is the result of strong power struggles carried out by different actors, such as the locals, state elites and big capital. Contrary to the vision supposing that national states lose their power in the new »borderless world«, the state appears as the most important actor in the urban scene of Istanbul as well as in the example of Karanfilköy. The state still has the capacity to develop and implement projects and form the physical map of the metropolis according to its vision.

However, the position of the locals in this power and »living space« struggle should not be described as the weaker part. On the contrary, the local appears in the urban scene as a very strong actor in the case of Karanfilköy. At first sight, it is seen as being against the pressure by the global activities in this part of the city. However, the local response to these activities and their consequences is the creation of local identity and holding on it strongly in order to gain the power in front of the other power holder. Furthermore, their mobilization was the result of very well prepared and supported kinds of conscious acts, which are realized by the possibilities that are again available with the global processes. They offer the solutions to the problems when the state fails to provide, they can easily react whenever the state politics do not match with their future vision. While doing so, they are also very aware of some mediums, which will help in order to reach a certain power. In other words, their resistance and mobilization are formed very strategically rather than being just a reaction. This helps prove the fact that localities are not closed communities and outside the logic of globalization. On the contrary, their localization was mostly possible because of the effects of the globalization of the neighborhood. In other words, they become separate entities being more than a *gecekondu* settlement, as the effects of globalization enabled them to stress more their locality in the changing, increasingly competitive urban life of the metropolis.

As Berner (2005) states, »the urban land in the strategic regions is always an important power source«. Because of the dominancy of global activities, urban land becomes very precious in this part of the city. Karanfilköy became a place, where everybody wants to gain a profit because of its important location. Today, Karanfilköy still holds one of the precious lands in Istanbul and they are even in the phase of initiating a project which is developed by the neighborhood itself, although it seems that they are not the real power holders in today's urban Istanbul. How the inhabitants of Karanfilköy, with their *gecekondu* identities which are treated as the others and poor, can keep the land and become quite strong in the core of all the global activities is a fact to be explained. What kind of power sources do they use against the global actors and the state elites in order to exist? What kind of struggle do they perform for their living space? The following section will try to show how powerful the locality can be for the urban life of the metropolis.

Locality – A powerful tool

As it was discussed above, Karanfilköy is connected to the globalization process through the power struggle over living space, as well as using

distinct strategies, possibilities and mediums in this process, which are possible again within globalization that can be characterized with their locality in their relation to globality. In the globalizing Istanbul, their everyday life, as well as their views and aspirations, are centred in the locality that primarily provides a long term and fairly secure access to the city and its opportunities and capacity to be part of power struggles over urban land. In this term, »everyday life« is important for locality, as well as for global interconnections, local resistances, trans-territorial flows, state politics, regional dilemmas, identity formations and so on are always already present. Everyday life is thus a transversal site of contestations rather than a fixed level of analysis« (Campell 1996 in Smith 2001). With their everyday practices, they become a strong locality occupying their own place in the globalization process. They are rather strong with their locality than any other identity attachment. Globalization process of the city stressed even more their attachment to their locality against the exercise of power by the nation state over their neighborhood.

According to Erder (2002) »locality means the inseparable mixture of spatial and social notions that is more beyond the physical space«. The construction of locality is possible when the inhabitants have a sense of belonging to the space, as well as social relations to the other participants of the locality. At first sight, Karanfilköy can be considered as a simple housing space as one of the *gecekondu* neighborhoods in Istanbul. However, it functions beyond simple sheltering needs. The housing spaces have more complicated characteristics and different attributes, which play a very important role in the lives of people who want to be in the urban scene.

First of all, there is a strong cohesion and neighborhood feeling in Karanfilköy, which is considered as one of the elements of creating the capacity to be organized and mobilized in urban life by Nelson (1979). All of the interviewees mention the fact that they are really happy to live in Karanfilköy because there are perfect neighbor relationships that they can't find anywhere else, especially in a place like Istanbul. They are proud of the fact that their cohesion in the neighborhood is not affected by the difference between the people in terms of religion and coming from different parts of Anatolia.

The social cohesion in the neighborhood also builds up a mutual support among the people who live in Karanfilköy. The mutual support was especially intensified during the demolition process in the neighbourhood. An attack from the outside accelerated the feelings of acting together against the action that endangers their existence.

At that point, it should be strongly mentioned that the land for the inhabitants of Karanfilköy has a different meaning, which is beyond only being a shelter for them. It is a step to become an urbanite in the metropolis. They strongly state that they have completed their urbanite process socially. However, since they still live in a *gecekondu* settlement, they are automatically and still seen as rural migrants. For them, holding and gaining the ownership of the land means they will melt into the urban life that they already completed their integration into the city. Their desire of becoming urban is strongly connected to the physical ownership of the place that they live on with their *varoş* identity, which is constituted in the minds of urban elites around them. What Şinasi Yalcın, the president of AKDER (Akatlar Culture and Cooperation Association), says very strikingly:

»We want to be a part of the city. We want to be urbanites. We want to be a community, which combines the values from our homeland together with the urban values here instead of only living with our traditional cultures. We want to be modern. However, we want to discuss what urban means in this respect. We are urbanites but our only deficiency is the partially physical problems of our living space. This is only because of our economical conditions, helplessness of us in the presence of problems during the period. If there was a fair income distribution in this country, people had good opportunities to make their living, they had enough money to buy a house, do you think that people would think about living a place which does not have any electricity, water, sewage system?[...]This settlement is a result of helplessness and bad circumstances. These people are not the ones who usurp the land«.³

It can be understood from this statement that they are already urbanites, but still live in a *gecekondu*, which is always labeled with being »rural«, »Anatolian«, »not civilized« people who could not adopt the lifestyles and values of modernizing-globalizing urban elites. If we look at the problem of land ownership in this concern, it can be understood how important to be recognized by, firstly, the state and, later, by the urbanites/urban elites in Istanbul, where ownership became one of the most important criteria of being an urbanite. When they become a part of the urban system, they believe that they will not have any problems in urban life because most of them have been already part of it. However, they also want to preserve the values from their homeland, which they believe are very precious, especially in the degenerated urban life of Istanbul. They try to be on the urban stage with their uniqueness about physi-

3 Interview with Şinasi Yalcın, president of AKDER, during the fieldwork in 2006.

cal and social characteristics of the neighborhood. There is a wish to become like urbanites but at the same, to be distinguished from them.

The locality in relation to their everyday life practices, the sense of belonging to the place and the social meaning of the land find their expressions through the organizations in the neighborhood. If the main characteristic of locality is related to group building, the existence of the organizations, according to the communal interest specific to the groups are self-evident (Berner 1997). Grouping around some organizations are necessary in order to be strong in the power struggles over the urban sphere. Berner (1997) also points out that since the poor are excluded from direct participation in politics and decision-making they cannot attach themselves to the existing organizations, they have to establish organizations in order to gain power in urban life.

Karanfildöy is a place where people try to exercise power and find their representation through local organizations. Aysel Zorlu who works actively in AKDER says: »Individual attempts are never taken into account seriously. However, being organized is always important and necessary for gaining power. We are so much aware of this fact«.

In this context, three local organizations whose fields of actions are different have been found in the neighborhood. These are AKDER, Mosque Organization and Akadlar Sport Association.

When these three associations are analyzed, it is self-evident that they are very specific to the neighborhood. In the interviews, it is mentioned that AKDER and Mosque Organizations have sometimes conflicting interests. However, it can be stated that they act together when it is necessary, for instance during and after demolition processes. This collective action enables them to supersede the lines of division, according to the place of origin and religion. These organizations constitute their power in response to the city. Being organized is also considered as a way to be modern and democratic in the neighborhood that is used as a very strong element to constitute their identity against/in the city.

Beside their resisting and lobbying actions, through these organizations, they also try to reject identities (of *varoş* or illegal occupants) attributed to them in the neo-liberal period. They have to produce their image again, independent from *varoş*, in order to obtain a different position between others.

»The inhabitants of Karanfildöy want to present an ideal model for Istanbul. Because of this reason, Karanfildöy founded Akadlar Sport Association, AKDER, the library open to the public, Mosque Association which manifests in

the religious field, park fields because it dreams of a city which respect to people and environment».⁴

When we think that the local relations and association are constituted through the interaction of space, political structure, the class structure of local and ethnicity (Erder, 2002), the elements specific to Karanfilköy can be described with the interaction of space and class structure, in relation to their position in urban life. It is self evident that the inhabitants of Karanfilköy constructed their relation to the city via their locality. If they did not form this locality, they would not be capable of showing themselves as a very strong actor in the urban scene and involve themselves in metropolitan life. Their locality gives security and self-confidence to the individuals who want to have a share in urbanity both physically and socially. They are strong only when they are inside this locality.

However, this locality did not come into being by itself. There are strong push factors to accelerate such a formation. In this paper, it is claimed that their locality became strong in order to resist the pressures from outside and to struggle over their living space, which is the result of the globalization process of the metropolis, changing the positioning of the relevant social actors within the new power constellations of a changing system. Locality, which started from the fact to work out solutions to the problems on housing and basic urban services, now, has advanced itself to the gaining the power in conflicts over the use of urban space.

Struggle over a living place and local identity

Power struggles between Karanfilköy and the Municipality

Karanfilköy was described as a locality that exists in the middle of a global place whose appearance recalls a village, a *gecekondu* settlement that seems to be not affected from the aggressive city development in the neo-liberal period of Istanbul. It is self-evident that during the dense global activities in this region, the land has reached extreme high values, leading to the power struggles over land rights. This situation is undoubtedly the result of the interests of many actors namely the state elite and big capital. The third interest group in this case is Karanfilköy itself, although it seems that it is a weak part of this story at first sight.

4 »Karanfilköy Explains Itself« – the declaration released by neighborhood.

At this point, it is very crucial to talk about the »annuity (rant)« struggles for urban land in Istanbul, intensively affecting the condition of Karanfilköy. In the neo-liberal period, the urban land turned out to be an important investment field that resulted in a situation where the urban land gained speculative value. According Şenyapılı (1998), the upper class who wanted to get rid of the negativity, which has risen because of the social distance from other urban classes, demands the urban land in order to create »villa ghettos«. On the other hand, the middle class also wants to claim the land in order to build some co-op buildings. At the end, the illegal lands that the immigrants hold are the perfect places for them to realize their projects. When big capital also enters into this competition, the picture is completed. In brief, immigrants, upper and middle classes and big capital groups come up against each other so that urban land becomes the concrete place where the power struggles between these actors are carried out.

In these power struggles, *gecekondu* areas seem to be the appropriate places for visions of these different groups. Moreover, *gecekondus* are, now, in the city centre, at very strategic points such as being so close to finance centre, airports or shopping centers. In this respect, the character of land in the *gecekondu* areas of Istanbul is changing itself, from being a residential area to becoming a commodity, with high financial value that sharpens the struggle over land (Akçay 2005). In addition, in the people's mind, these lands were always seen as commodities because of being illegally occupied by immigrants. The fact that they received their temporary title deeds did not mean that they were accepted by the city, but their existence was only tolerated. In other words, the immigrants were already out of the urban life of the metropolis that they couldn't have rights to be in structuring of the urban life. They should already be out of the game in the other urban classes' imagination. Mostly with the urban transformation projects, these lands are opened to the usage of the strong bodies in the metropolis.

Hence, Karanfilköy, as one of the *gecekondu* areas of Istanbul, should be examined in this frame; the reality of the annuity struggles between these actors and the automatic exclusion of immigrants from urban life in the other's mind. The neighborhood was always the centre of attraction for the municipality, as well as big capital, whose concrete expression is that Karanfilköy experienced demolitions two times in 1996, in order to implement a project called the »Akatlar-Alkent Settlement Project«, where high-qualified housing and some business centers were supposed to be built. In the same year, the building height allowances were increased from 6.5 storeys to 15.5 storeys, supporting the possibility of the project and increasing the interest of these actors even more.

Demolitions in the neighborhood

The first demolition was realized in July 1996 and the next one in September of the same year, in order to implement the project which was developed for this area by the Greater Municipality of Istanbul. This act finds its expressions in the declaration of Karanfilköy as it is:

»The Greater Municipality of Istanbul attacked Karanfilköy with 4000 police, 500 municipal police, armed combat car and many other types of equipment as if they were going to a war. This action is, in fact, a brutal »abolition operation« which is tried to ground on the act that »I have demolished apart-kondu. [...] Now, Karanfilköy is like a place after an earthquake. 17 neighbors took shelter in the houses of other neighbors, the rest lives in tents.«

In the first demolition 28 and 25 in the second, *gecekondu* have been destroyed. However, it was declared that renewal of the houses would be tolerated.

According to Arıkanlı, right before the elections in 1994, the mayor of the municipality declared that *gecekondu*s, which will be built until the elections, would be tolerated; however, the ones after the elections will be demolished. Although the title deeds would not be given to the people, they could build two storey concrete buildings. When there were some attempts in Karanfilköy to build more than this, the municipality found legal reasons to demolish the. According to the neighborhood, »the renewal and reconstruction of some buildings in the neighborhood was tolerated for a while in order to legitimize the demolitions and to provide appropriate conditions for it«.

In brief, these two facts (the new project and the construction attempt of Karanfilköy) reinforced the idea of demolition in the neighborhood. For the municipality, Karanfilköy wanted to gain profit from the urban land like the other *gecekondu* areas, which were converted into apartment buildings (*post-gecekondu*), so that they do not have any right to stay there anymore as invaders. However, the demolition was resisted by the inhabitants together and this even increased the existing solidarity in the neighborhood.

The role of the media

The experience of demolitions in the neighborhood was not the only obstacle for Karanfilköy. This action found a broad place in the media during a period that »the media, in their research for sensational events, bring forward those cases where *gecekondu* people have contravened the

law or protested against the political system» (Erman 2000). People from *gecekondu* areas gained a new title, *varoş* which »are elaborated upon as they have appeared in the media- since the public discourse on the *varoş* and *varoşlu* has been largely shaped by the media« (ibid.).

The demolition in Karanfilköy was also projected in the media during this period so that people living in *gecekondu* areas were introduced to society with this new identity, which carries very negative meanings. Under these circumstances, Karanfilköy was shown to the public as a place where the inhabitants wanted to gain profit from the land.

The media's interpretation of Karanfilköy claims that although the inhabitants of Karanfilköy, like most *gecekondu* inhabitants, seem to be »poor« and »helpless«, they are, indeed, quite rich because of their attempt to gain profit from the urban land. Furthermore, these people are also culturally degenerated in a way that they lost their human values and became money oriented. It is also indicated that they will become dangerous politically. This comment fits exactly with the new image of people from *gecekondu*; *varoşlu*. According to expressions in the media, Karanfilköy is not treated as the urban poor or rural people living in the city anymore. This is the image which finds its place in the urbanites' mind about firstly, *varoş* and then about Karanfilköy. With this image, which was attributed to the neighbourhood, the demolitions were somehow legitimized. The municipality has a right to demolish these areas where these people want to gain profit. The municipality and public treated the inhabitants of Karanfilköy with this mentality that they have become an inferior part of this story. A woman whose house was demolished comments about the role of media in this process that:

»We wanted to ask for a help from the media. We thought that everybody should know about this. They used our images, our crying, our misery and used them as an advertisement on TV near the image of Tayyip Erdogan. They did not care about the situation. They did not think that we are a part of this land and we worked hard to form it here as it is.«⁵

However, the same media was also an important means for Karanfilköy in order to construct their image and talk about the demolitions, their resistance and its reasons. The neighborhood released several declarations about their problems, sent these to several media institutions and started to build some support in the public arena. They appeared on some TV programs to explain their points and raised discussions about the general *gecekondu* and *varoş* problems. Since the inhabitants were quite aware

5 Interview during fieldwork 2006.

of the fact that they can repair their image with the same medium through which their bad image was originally promoted, they were trying to make the other people be aware of their problems in public. It can be concluded that they found a considerable amount of support, which made the state hesitate about its actions, as well as the bad image about the neighborhood constructed by the same medium.

Counteractions in the neighborhood

It seems that a weak picture of Karanfilköy has been formed until now, because of the dramatic experience of demolitions and its portrayal in the media. However, it should not be misunderstood that they are powerless and dismissed from this struggle. Karanfilköy had already built a strong cohesion with their everyday life experiences in the neighborhood. Especially with the demolitions and media's negative propagating to the public a strong solidarity and resistance came into being as a counteraction. Moreover, the action was not only resisted but also responded to very cleverly. In other words, they did not only stay and accept the role and position which had been attributed to them in urban life, but they started to make counteractions combining the collective action of the inhabitants and the other actors, who have influence on urban life.

After the first demolition, the inhabitants came together under the leadership of AKDER (Akatlar Culture and Cooperation Association) and started to lobby in different fields. They negotiated with the authorized people in the Greater Municipality of Istanbul 14 times in order to find a solution to demolition and future development of the neighbourhood. During this period, several declarations were released to the media, in order to explain the life and standing of the neighbourhood that they do not want to gain profit from the land and they even want to be a good example with their living approaches to the others in the city. However, in the end these acts were not successful as the second demolition could not be prevented.

After the second demolition, the inhabitants directed their actions to the public after being unsuccessful with the authorities, because it was clear that the municipality would not make any concessions about their plans. Their actions this time were to explain themselves as a locality with a different kind of life style and to deny the kind of images which were attributed to them in the media and to prove that they are not the ones who want to make a profit from this precious land. They were aware of the fact that they should develop their own public support and change their image that was presented in the media, as they believed that

if they can carry these demolitions and their problems to the public, it would become very difficult for the state to initiate a project with the exclusion of the inhabitants. For this reason, they started to act in different fields, which will reach out to other people to express themselves as a locality and their problems.

First of all, they organized the 1st Solidarity Festival, expressing their desire about being a part of urban life and announcing their basic rights to own their »living space« which they have been forming for 50 years. This festival took place in the neighborhood, with the participation of some scholars, other organizations, political parties and the supporters of the neighborhood. The 1st Solidarity Festival found its place in the declarations as:

»Today, the inhabitants of Karanfilköy explain themselves at the 1st Solidarity Festival, despite of demolition threats. Listen to us. We will speak about our solution proposals, the creation of our neighborhood and neighborhood solidarity, which becomes nearly a part of fairy tales of our grandmothers. We will explain that we are not helpless as it is thought, there can be also »other kind« of life, concrete is not a destiny and talk about what we have created and how we participate. We will talk about our obstinacy in participation in urban life«.

The next step was to invite some urban scholars to initiate a research project about the neighborhood, in order to ground the mobilization process in academic works. In this context, the Mimar Sinan University Sociological Research Club, with the support of urban scholars, started to make a field survey about Karanfilköy under the frame of »The Right to Shelter is the Right for Convivial Space« (Barınma Hakkı Dost Yaşam Hakkıdır) project, in order to constitute a support in academy and art terrains.

In the same frame of this project, Karanfilköy was involved in the 5th International Istanbul Biennale in 1997, with the »Kültür Research and Exhibition Project«, which »focused on issues of migration, urban politics and Istanbul's plan to become a global city«. Karanfilköy became a part of this art project so that an open-air night forum on urban politics was organized on city politics in Karanfilköy, together with civil organizations, an association of progressive architects and urban scholars. The final products, which have been created together in the neighborhood, were presented in the exhibition of the biennale. In this way, Karanfilköy, as a locality, became a part of an international (global) art event with its significance of being victimized by the global city scenar-

ios of globalizing city-Istanbul that finds again its existence because of the globalization process.

Since there were intensive attempts from the inhabitants that Karanfilköy and its demolition process found its place in the public broadly, the project that was being planned was withdrawn. The neighborhood resistance prevented the further visions serving as a disadvantage for the inhabitants. However, this resistance was planned in way that it tried to solve the problems and produce future perspectives about the neighborhood, together with the support of urban scholars, artists and people from other NGOs that made them even stronger in the minds of the urbanites. Their resistance was not a pure reaction to the physical attack on the neighbourhood, but they constructed their image again and legitimized the struggle for their living space in the public arena. Their actions can be named, firstly, as a resistance and, then, a countermove to prevent the further demolitions and to solve the most important problem of land ownership in the neighborhood. The resistance is also commented by Mehmet Yıldız from Beşiktaş Municipality:

»Tayyip Erdoğan has raised the building permit until 5 storey building blocks and prepared a plan for Karanfilköy aiming at removing people from this land. However, this project could not be realized because of the strong resistance by the neighborhood. People in Karanfilköy are very well organized and they have a great sense of their locality. They had even negotiations with the construction companies which would implement the project there. The project stopped because of their pressure on the government and private interests.«

The collective action of the inhabitants is not limited only to these activities. They continued with lobbying for gaining the property rights of their houses, under the umbrella of AKDER. Especially, the successful resistance to the demolitions has raised the belief that through their power the organization gained a capacity of dealing with the problems and processes in their relation to the other actors exercising power.

Counter-discourse

In order to make further attempts to gain their rights, the inhabitants needed to create a discourse that represents them and identifies their existence, in this part of the city, to the state elite, as well as to the urbanites in Istanbul. First of all, it should be proved that the image of *varoşlu* is not valid for them, although they were presented to the public as such. They promote an image about Karanfilköy that they are very different from the other *gecekondu* neighborhoods with their understanding of

life, their culture and their consciousness about urban life. In their press releases and declarations, the traces of this discourse can be easily found. It is quite often stressed that Karanfilköy is different from the other *gecekondu* areas in terms of being conscious of their environment and social and urban life. It is claimed that they have already constituted a different kind of living, which is concentrated on the cultural and social activities that are practiced with different organizations, focusing on distinct fields.

The same observation can be made according to the result of the interviews. All of the interviewees think that Karanfilköy is relatively different from other *gecekondu* neighborhoods. They believe that they have already completed their integration to the city life and that they should not be seen as rural in the city. Moreover, they are also culturally very different from *varoşlu*. Aysel Zorlu as one of the inhabitants points out:

»Karanfilköy is quite different from the other *gecekondu* areas. We completed our urbanization although we live in *gecekondu*. Since we are the very early comers to Istanbul, we have already completed most of our needs physically as well as culturally. Most of the children of families studied. I think that Karanfilköy is also different culturally. When it is compared to Sultanbeyli and Esenyurt, I consider this here as a place where well educated and open-minded people live. I am proud of living in *gecekondu* but I think that Karanfilköy advanced itself when it is compared to the others.«

Stressing the difference from the other *gecekondu* areas, physically as well as culturally, means that they want to change their position in the urban life of the metropolis. They declare that they are not so different from the urbanites in Istanbul and even, in some cases, they are more advanced with their consciousness about urban life. If it is so, they should gain their rights to the land, which is a prerequisite for being a part of the metropolis.

Creating this discourse definitely helps them to hold a position in the view of the state elite. In fact, the reason for the creation of such a discourse is a desire to obtain a strong position in the view of the state elite. The image – which does not carry the characteristics of *varoşlu*, but an image of inhabitants who have completed their integration into the city, and who are modern and well-educated – is necessary for them to be legitimized spatially and socially by the state elite. They do not insist on keeping their *gecekondu* identity, but they are ready to integrate into urban life as urbanites. They are not confrontational; on the contrary, they are ready to compromise to solve their problems. With this image, there is a high probability of being taken seriously so that most of the legiti-

mized reasons for their removal (making profit from the land, ignorant and with backward culture) from the area are no longer valid. They appear as a strong locality, they are very conscious of their collective actions and aware of ways to defend and promote themselves in front of the state elite.

Integrating into the urban network – Being urban in the metropolis

The actions of the neighborhood starting with resistance to the demolition continued to solve the real problem of property rights in Karanfilköy. Until today, they have been lobbying for the neighborhood in different institutions with the help of people from the academy and some NGOs. Some meetings were held with the Beşiktaş Municipality where the necessity for a solution to the problem were explained several times. Finally, a year and a half ago, informal negotiations started with the Beşiktaş Municipality in order to make a proposal for the neighborhood and present it to the Greater Municipality of Istanbul, which is the final decision maker.

During the negotiations processes, Karanfilköy always presented their difference and their understanding about how an urban transformation should be. In other words, they were well equipped in presenting their standing about the condition and future of Karanfilköy. It seems that it was not a pure demand in a way that »we want our property rights«. On the contrary, it reflects a well-prepared, conscious kit of proposals reflecting their approach to urban transformation, relations between different actors in this process, rights to the urban land and life. Şinasi Yalçın, president of AKDER explains what they understand from an urban transformation project:

»This project (the project developed by the municipality and ended up with demolitions) was called an urban transformation project aimed at cleaning and bulldozing all the *gecekondu* areas in Istanbul. Some amount of money is paid to the people who have been already living there and they are sent to the outer parts of the city. People living in the *gecekondu* areas are sent away and other people are settled instead of them that is called an urban transformation project. However, this cannot be an urban transformation project for us. Urban transformation should increase the living standards of the people, develop the neighborhood in order to attain modern living conditions...For that reason, we have decided to develop a project for 1.5 years in order to solve the problem of Karanfilköy with the technical help of architects and urban planners.«

While expressing their demands and possible proposals about their neighborhood, they claim that they also have a different approach to conflicts. For them, negotiating through the local organizations with the municipality and showing them that they are also important and strong, shows their difference from the other *gecekondu* neighborhoods. Their consciousness about this makes them an important actor in the view of the state elites. This approach has also been strengthened with the counter-discourse, which has been discussed before. They claim that they are not the weak side of the overall picture but they can be strong with their local capacity and their already changed profile of the inhabitants, which became skilful in urban life. Şinasi Yalçın explains what kind of approach they developed for dealing with their problems with the state elites:

»In Turkey, the traditional relation between the local/national government and the *gecekondu* areas are always problematic and based on fight. In other words, one side wants to demolish and the other side always resists with a reaction. Using the power on this field creates tension in the society and at the same time it does not solve the problems. In this process, we see suffering, crying of people, and demolition of houses. Therefore, we tried to explain to the people who do not take this neighborhood so seriously because of being a *gecekondu* district how this situation would be.

[...] our children attain the ›urban culture‹. This neighborhood became a place full with urbanites so that the approach which underestimates people's capacity here and thinks this place as a simple *gecekondu* neighborhood is not valid anymore...Now, it is time to solve the problem of Karanfilköy after all these sacrifices without any fight with the government. We tried to find a solution and make a proposal for the municipality with the technical help of some architects and planners [...].«

Finally, after the negotiations with the Beşiktaş Municipality, Karanfilköy started to prepare the details of the project. In this process, the Municipality of Beşiktaş is working as a negotiator between the inhabitants and the Greater Municipality of Istanbul. They also provide technical support, such as finding experts on the urban transformation of *gecekondu* districts for the neighborhood. Together with the inhabitants of the neighborhood, some people from the municipality and experts and architects, the project has been prepared.

Conclusion

Case study findings

Karanfıköy is a very good representative example for understanding the position of the local in the global restructuring process of Istanbul, which has aimed at becoming a global city. Thus, the urban politics and strategies of the city have been set according to the overwhelming criteria which global city discourse offers. In order to see the concrete results, projects were implemented to transform Istanbul as a showcase in the global arena. The very concrete result of this thinking is that the decaying, dying and unrepresentative areas started to be converted into places of prestige. Karanfıköy's position can be described with these facts in a way that it has a very strategic location, that is extremely close to the finance centre, gated communities, shopping malls, and prestigious neighbourhoods. Furthermore, it is supposed that Karanfıköy with its *gecekondu* identity should not exist in this very special position physically as well as socially. These facts create certain struggles in order to obtain the land in this part of the city. In these power struggles over the land, the state, and big capital in the certain period and the locals themselves are the conflicting actors. From the state point of view, Karanfıköy is just one of the *gecekondu* neighborhoods that wants to make a benefit from the land due to the commodification of the *gecekondu* neighborhood in the neo-liberal period. However, from the Karanfıköy's point of view, it is observed that the situation is more complicated. First of all, the neighborhood is the living space of inhabitants where they constructed very close social ties, a place where they are connected to the city through their locality, a body that gives self-confidence to the individuals to participate in urban life. Furthermore, in the last 2 years, it has become a medium which they can reconstruct their image and integrate into urban life. As all these factors are considered, the actions and mobilization of Karanfıköy means more than a struggle for land, it is a struggle for being legitimized in the urban life spatially and socially.

The first main concern about Karanfıköy is to explain how they manage to gain power in order to have a capacity to deal with the problems that have arisen in the neighborhood. The investigation showed that the neighborhood serves beyond the housing needs and it plays a very important role in the construction of locality. In the neighborhood, a strong sense of social cohesion and sense of belonging to space have been found that is a first step to the sense of belonging to the city. In order to be strong in an urban field, they had to form their locality and re-

define it according to the social, political and economic changes during distinct time periods. Thus, their locality gives security as well as self-confidence to the individuals who want to have a share in urbanity, spatially and socially.

Along the same line, the land for the inhabitants of Karanfılköy has a different meaning, which is beyond only being a shelter for them. It is rather a step to become an urbanite in the metropolis. Their desire of becoming urban is strongly connected to the physical ownership of the place where they live with their negative *varoş* identity that is constituted in the minds of urban elites. This conclusion is very crucial in order to understand the importance of struggle over their living space as it is also related to a desire for attaining a higher urban class and getting rid of the negative image attributed to them in during neo-liberal period.

The existence of the local organizations as an indication of their strong locality in Karanfılköy is also very important for their mobilization and their search for a right to the city. Furthermore, grouping around organizations is crucial in order to be strong in the power struggles as the poor are excluded from direct participation in politics and decision making in the case of Istanbul. In order to compensate for this exclusion, they had a tendency to establish organizations.

The concrete expression of these struggles was the demolitions in the neighborhood. However, this »intervention« directed to the neighborhood has been resisted with the well-prepared set of strategies and actions that make the neighborhood different from any other local group in Istanbul. These series of actions determine the distinctness of the neighborhood when the local-global interrelation is considered.

Beside demolitions, the media was also a very important actor who has a position about these power struggles and its reflection on society. With the media, the demolitions and Karanfılköy's resistance were projected to the public arena. While the image of *varoşlu*, which has been also created by the media, was employed in the case of Karanfılköy, the same media was also an important medium for Karanfılköy in order to reconstruct their image and discuss the demolitions, their resistances, its reasons and possible solutions. The inhabitants were quite aware of the fact that they can repair their image with the same medium by which their bad image was promoted.

The distinctiveness has also increased with the creation of a counter-discourse, which was used in their representation to the public. They promoted an image about Karanfılköy, which stresses their difference from other *gecekondu* neighborhoods. With the new image, they present themselves to the public as a strong locality who are very conscious of their collective actions, aware of ways to defend and promote them-

selves in front of the state and urban elites. It is observed that this image creation worked very well and has changed their position, especially in their relation to the state elite.

In the end, the mobilization of Karanfilköy starting from the resistance to the further actions on rights to the city resulted in a way that they will be able to acquire their property rights with the urban transformation projects initiated by the neighborhood itself, which is one of the rare examples when Turkish cities are considered. Consequently, they have accomplished their aims because of their careful and conscious attempts to defend and present themselves.

In brief, their actions starting with the resistance are a search for a right to the city. They want to be legitimized by the state and urban elites legally as well as mentally. They reject the identities (*varoşlu*, occupants, backward culture) that have been attributed to them. Their power comes from their locality, not from being a *gecekondu* neighborhood due to their will of being connected to the city. The way that they mobilize is the concrete visualization of their strategic approach to the problem. Their effort to represent themselves in the media, organizing a festival to describe the neighborhood and its demands, involving themselves in the 5th International Istanbul Art Biennale, contacting scholars to initiate academic works about the neighborhood and cooperating with other NGOs, finally endless lobbying and negotiation attempts with the government point to very conscious and powerful organization of the neighborhood drawing its power from its locality. All these actions allow them to be more capable of dealing with the problems that they have been faced with during the process. In other words, they learnt how to represent themselves, developed solidarity, political consciousness and organizational infrastructures within the process. Karanfilköy gained capability of mobilizing that their resistance has turned to an organized action in order to gain their rights in urban life.

Shifting boundaries of locality

Hopefully, with the case study, the changing characteristics and position of a locality have been discussed in its relation to globalization. In a globalizing city like Istanbul, weaker urban groups are generally victimized in the further development of the city and its desire to be connected to the global network. These groups are expected to be generally the passive side of the struggles because they do not have enough infrastructure and opportunities for exercising power. Furthermore, as the dominant globalization discourse supposes, localities tend to be shown either as passive receivers or completely oppositional to the global restructur-

ing of society and space. However, the example of Karanfilköy shows that opposite fiction is also possible. Karanfilköy is a place taking its power from its local everyday practices; however, it also interacts with the outer developments. Karanfilköy as a locality has adapted to the changing life of the globalizing city and tried to take an active part in the structuring of urban life. In the case of Karanfilköy, deeper intentions were found more than only attaining the title deeds of the land. In other words, a high desire to integrate to the urban system has shown that these struggles indicate more than a struggle for property rights. This is all related to the redefining of the position of a locality within cultural, social and economic changes in the context of globalization.

Furthermore, the way of mobilization in the neighborhood also shows very well that the borders of locality have been changing. As it is discussed in detail, Karanfilköy was always attempting to redraw its image with the mediums that can reach out to the public arena. Taking part in the media and involving themselves in the International Art Biennale, contacting urban scholars are the examples proving that they want to go beyond their terrain and represent themselves in their relation to the other actors. For this reason, it is necessary to »reproblematize the local/urban/global configuration by articulating different kinds of localization and their relationship to difference, power, conflict and possibilities for oppositional politics« (Hamel/Lustiger-Thaler/Mayer 2000).

The relation between distinct groups has also changed itself different from the national development period in a way that the localities have become separate entities, which do not operate within the values and rules set by the state anymore. There are rather other interest groups in the city positioning themselves according to the changes in social, economic and politic environment. However, the state still emerges as the strongest entity which can form the physical space of the metropolis, but it is changing its structure and orientation that does not imply the »end of state« as the dominant globalization discourse supposes. This time, the state should bargain with other groups, which are supposed to be weak like in the case of Karanfilköy. Since they can find their solutions in other mediums that are very influential on the public, the state does not appear as the only and absolute solution in order to attain their demands in urban life. This implies that different social groups including the state are re-organizing themselves in intricate and complicated ways that open new possibilities.

In this sense, the representative example of Karanfilköy does not seem a closed and embedded locality. It is rather a place that brings resources, meanings and knowledge from outer and global settings. Their actions, especially resistances seem to be oppositional to the global re-

structuring of the city, as they have been influenced by the policies directly. However, when the overall picture is contemplated, they became an important and powerful group due to their openness to the outer scene, their adaptation to the ongoing processes and have benefited from the opportunities that have appeared in the globalization era. In other words, the power of localities is accelerated by globalization. Localities are, now, an inseparable part of globalizing metropolises; they are »complex, contingent and contested outcomes of political and historical processes, rather than as timeless essences, also challenges the theoretical framing of locality as an inexorable space of resistance to globalization« (Smith 2001).

Multi-dimensionality of globalization

Hopefully, the case study points to the slippery terrains and borders of some assumptions, which have been drawn very concretely by the dominant globalization discourse. Even one example can indicate that globalization is not a singular process ignoring the nature of the concept and different dimensions of the cultural and political life specific to the globalizing cities. Furthermore, it is also illustrated that globalization resulted differently when global flows have entered very specific local contexts although some common patterns can be found in the life of metropolises. Furthermore, it is observed that the nation state is still the most dominant actor exercising power, the new urban cultures have emerged in the neo-liberal period and even some of them have been invented that all these unevenness affected the urban life of Istanbul. These changes prove that affinities and processes vary according to different economic, social and cultural contexts as well as different local and historical characteristics of the space where globalization is performed or experienced. They interact with each other in different circumstances, which develop unsymmetrical and variable consequences and effects. In other words, the global processes do not end up with one and unique result but »present a set of discourses and practices that are juxtaposed in complex ways in local contexts« (Ghannam 1997).

The case of Karanfilköy should be examined according to this frame; first placing globalization in case of Istanbul and then its uneven and heterogeneous results in the specific local context. In order to understand the complexity of the problems, deeper investigation in the real life of globalizing cities is necessary rather than accepting an approach that is scoped from above; that is what this paper intended to do.

References

- Akçay, E. (2005): »The beginning and end of politics: The case of Istanbul«. The text was presented at the conference »Beginning and Ends of Political Theory« in University of California, Berkeley in 2005. <http://criticalsense.berkeley.edu/akcay.pdf>.
- Appadurai, A. (1990): »Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy«. In: Appadurai, A, Theory, Culture & Society, London, Newbury Park and New Delhi: Sage.
- Berner E. (2005): »Metropol İnkilemi: Küresel Toplum, Yerellikler ve Manila'da Kent Arazisi İçin Yürütülen Mücadele«. In: Öncü/ Weyland (ed.), Mekan, Kültür, İktidar: Küreselleşen Kentlerde Yeni Kimlikler, İstanbul: İletişim
- Berner, E. (1997): Defending a Place in the City: Localities and the Struggle for Urban Land in Metro Manila, Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Dicken, P./Peck, J./Tickell, A. (1997) »Unpacking the Global«, Lee, R. and Wills, J. (ed.), Geographies of Economies. New York, Arnold.
- Erder, S. (2002): Kentsel Gerilim- Enformel İlişki Ağları Alan Araştırması, Ankara: um:ag Vakfı Yayınları.
- Erman, T. (2000): »The Politics of Squatter (Gecekondu) Studies in Turkey: The Changing Representations of Rural Migrants in the Academic Discourse«. Urban Studies, Vol 38, pp. 983-1002.
- Featherstone, M. (1995): Undoing Culture: Globalization, Postmodernism and Identity, London: Sage Publications.
- İşık, O./Pınarcıoğlu, M. (2002): Nöbetleşe Yoksulluk- Gecekondulaşma ve Kent Yoksulları: Sultanbeyli Örneği, İstanbul: İletişim
- Jessop, B. (1995): »Regional economic development and strategies in post-sociologist societies: contexts, constraints and conjectures« In: Europe: Central and East. Montreal, Quebec, Canada: Black Rose Books.
- Kalaylıoğlu, M. (2006): Representations of Gecekondu in Mainstream Print Media- From Housing Question to Varoş. Unpublished master thesis: METU.
- Leyshon (1997): »True Stories? Global Dreamers, Global Nightmares and Writing Globalization«. In: Lee and Wills (ed.), Geographies of Economies, Arnold: New York.
- Long, Norman (1996): »Globalization and Localization: New Challenges to Rural Research«. In: Moore H. (Ed.), The Future of Anthropological Knowledge, London and New York: Routledge.
- McGrew, A. (1998): »The Globalization Debate: Putting the advanced capitalist state in its place«, Global Society, 12(3), pp. 299-321.

- Marcuse, P. (1997): »Glossy Globalization: Unpacking a Loaded Discourse«. In: Droege (ed.) *Intelligent Environments, Spatial Aspects of the Information Revolution*, Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Nelson, J. M. (1979): *Access to Power: Politics and Urban Poor in Developing Nations*, Princeton University Press: Princeton.
- Öncü A./Weyland P. (1997): *Space, Culture and Power: New Identities in Globalizing Cities*, London and New Jersey: Zed Books.
- Robertson, R. (1994): »Globalization or Glocalization?«. *The Journal of International Communication* 1(1), pp. 33-52.
- Smith, P. M. (2001): *Transnational Urbanism, Locating Globalization*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schuerkens, U. (2004): »The Sociological and Anthropological Study of Globalization and Localization«. In: *Global Forces and Local Life-Worlds: Social Transformations*, London: Sage.
- Şenyapılı, T. (1998): »Cumhuriyet'in 75. Yılı, Gecekondu'nun 50. Yılı«. In: *75 Yılda Değişen Kent ve Mimarlık*, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.

