

Yayın Geliş Tarihi: 03.05.2018
Yayına Kabul Tarihi: 19.09.2018
Online Yayın Tarihi: 12.11.2018
<http://dx.doi.org/10.16953/deusosbil.420693>

Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi
Cilt: 20, Sayı: 3, Yıl: 2018, Sayfa: 381-396
ISSN: 1302-3284 E-ISSN: 1308-0911

Derleme Makale

NEO-LIBERAL TOUCHES TO THE TOWN: READING LIFE IN ISTANBUL ATAŞEHİR THROUGH BOURDIVIN THEORY

Lerzan ARAS*

Abstract

After 2000 the neo-liberal policies caused a huge investment in Istanbul. This new entrepreneurial freedom created an irreversible profit arena in construction sector. Ataşehir was one of the high spots with its localization and instant connection to the down town. Soon the contractors started with luxurious branded houses, with gates around them, very secure but also alienated. Before they started, the area was already full with several apartments either constructed by TOKİ, or free contractors and they mostly addressed to middle income class. Now, the whole area seems to have lost its identity, as two different classes try to sustain their daily habits. According to Bourdieu's field theory, against the dominance of 'economic capital', there is always a 'symbolic capital' which can make a difference. This study aims to put forth the resistance and quarrel of 2 different classes in the area, their habitus and questions whether a symbolic capital can be superior over an economic power when 'life' comes into question.

Keywords: *Ataşehir, Bourdieu, Branded Houses, Neo-liberalism, Social Distinction.*

KENTE NEO-LİBERAL DOKUNUŞLAR: İSTANBUL ATAŞEHİR'DE YAŞAMIN BOURDIEU TEORİSİ ÜZERİNDEN OKUMASI

Öz

2000 yılı sonrasında, neo-liberal politikai İstanbul'da çok büyük yatırımlara sebep olmuştur. Bu yeni girişimci özgürlük inşaat sektöründe geri dönüşümü olmayan bir kar alanı oluşturmuş ve Ataşehir, konumu ve kent merkezine hızlı bağlantılarıyla önem kazanmıştır. Kısa sürede markalı, lüks ve duvarlar arkasında ama çevreye yabancılaşmış konutların inşaatına başlanmıştır. Bu inşaatlardan önce de bölge, ya TOKİ ya da serbest müteahhitler tarafından yapılmış çeşitli apartmanlara sahiptir ve yapıların çoğu orta gelir

Bu makale için önerilen kaynak gösterimi (APA 6. Sürüm):

Aras, L. (2018). Neo-Liberal Touches to The Town: Reading Life in Istanbul Ataşehir Through Bourdivin Theory. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 20 (3), 381-396.

* Prof. Dr., European University of Lefke, Faculty of Architecture, Department of Architecture Lefke, Northern Cyprus TR-10 Mersin, Turkey, ORCID: 0000-0002-0130-751X, laras@eul.edu.tr

grubu için hedeflenmiştir. Şu an her iki farklı sınıf kendi gündelik yaşamlarını sürdürmeye çalıştığı için bölge kimliğini kaybetmiş görünmektedir. Bourdieu'nun alan teorisine göre, 'ekonomik sermaye' baskınlığına karşın her zaman fark yaratabilecek bir 'sembolik sermaye' mevcuttur. Bu çalışmada; bölgedeki iki farklı sınıfın direniş ve çatışması ve habitus'larını ortaya koyarak, söz konusu 'yaşam' olursa 'sembolik sermaye'nin bir 'ekonomik sermaye' üzerinde üstünlük kurup kuramayacağı sorgulanmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Ataşehir, Bourdieu, Marka Evler, Neo-Liberalizm, Sosyal Ayrım.

INTRODUCTION

When Harvey describes neo-liberalism, he clarifies the role of the state as to create and preserve an institutional framework appropriate to practices by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills (Harvey, 2005). The liberating policies of the government can give opportunities especially to certain sectors for improving their contribution to the national development, such as housing construction. As long as it brings profit to private sector, and supply demand chain is established carefully, the system will continue and affect the city shape, which happened in Istanbul especially after 2000.

Istanbul is a worldly metropolis with its culture, history and as it happens in all metropolises, the consumer culture and social inequalities forces the city to change the urban pattern and causes certain impacts on the flow of daily life. As Turkey passed through a globalization process after 1980, the city became more differentiated, segregated, and in fact more fragile. Not only had the booming in construction sector caused this, but also the migration from villages and small towns created isolated areas with invisible walls. Soon the revitalization and gentrification process started in almost every region. Besides disrupting the physical fabric of the city, an enormous social inequality and chaos came also to the scene. Changing the social space together with the increase of commercial and housing areas started to re-shape the city. Although the liberal system after 1980 allows new opportunities and benefits to the citizens, this movement within the construction sector is stepping out of the boundaries especially after 2000. The ideal neighborhoods seem to be disappeared in certain areas; and the city has moved itself to the suburbs with mostly high rise-apartments. While the gap between the low income and high income increases rapidly, soon the periphery starts to boom and different types of houses for each economic class become visible at the same environment. The periphery of the city appeared so artificial, that the real Istanbul seemed to have lost its original culture and even ties to history as well. What remained at the core is just nostalgia for the past...These new settlements, also called 'branded houses' or 'gated communities' soon became the face of the city. Today, as being the driving force of the Istanbul's housing market, they do not only address the demands of upper income families but also the demands of middle income families (Levent and Gülümser, 2007). The standards

and benefits can vary from 'super lux' to 'average'; but at the end everyone has the intention to possess one of these houses according to their income.

The whole periphery of the city is actually surrounded by these branded houses, but Ataşehir has a high spot. This part of the city has its origins as being one of the largest settlements of mass housing many years ago. It was a satellite city project in 1990s, by the effects of globalization as well; but it has become a focal point of investors and land developers in the concept of multi-storey residences and office buildings in recent years (Okumus and Eyuboglu, 2017). The area is full of vertical and horizontal designed branded houses; some belonging to TOKİ (The Prime Minister's Housing Development Administration), some to free contractors and construction companies. According to data provided by TOKİ, the urbanization rate in Turkey is 78%. It is suggested that the urbanized population, which is about 60 Million will be 71 Million in 2023. In this context, there is housing pressure caused by the low income groups (TOKI, n.d.).

As Istanbul is one of the biggest cities of Turkey with a huge migration rate, it is obvious that the city needs an intervention when it comes to supply of healthy and legitimate housing for its population. On the other side, there is great turnover in the construction business for high income, and the populist approaches promise a house for everyone. These houses are marketed as 'dream houses' with every resourceful facility in it. Some of them are high technology used high rise buildings, some of them traditionally constructed houses; but with their walls and isolated gates they try to show their dominance and power to the other. At that point it comes to the 'rights to the city'. Harvey describes it as the right to change ourselves by changing the city. It is, moreover, a common rather than an individual right since this transformation inevitably depends upon the exercise of a collective power to reshape the processes of urbanization (Harvey, 2008). In Ataşehir the individual social spaces and houses are changing according to the income; but the distinction between two groups prevents the area to find its real character. It is the main question then of how the citizens should use this collective power as Harvey states, and how do they choose their contribution to the reshape process.

We are supposed to sustain our cities, and develop future scenarios based on the well-being of our children. What could be consequence of disregarding the neighborhood qualities and start constructing walls around houses, or most importantly when it comes to common rights, which dominative power will stand for it?

This study wants to examine how the distinction between these groups is reflected at the neighborhood in terms of social lives, and how the dominant power shows itself which is based on Bourdieu's field theory.

THE SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION OF ATAŞEHİR FROM PAST TO NEO-LIBERAL TIMES

Neo-liberalism as a phenomenon and distinctive ideology goes back to the 19th Century. Although it has a rather political background, this study is more concerned about its sociological aspect and its influence on the people's life and choices.

When we look at the housing problem before the neo-liberal period it can be stated that the huge migration from the East Anatolian to Istanbul created a kind of squatting areas until 1980's.

After that period, the law of property ownership allowed constructors a new way to build and sell, without considering any architectural quality in particular. These undeveloped systems created a huge among of housing stocks (Görgülü, 2016). Not only had the neo liberal policies, also the new laws catalyzed this development. After 2000 a new form of capitalism came into the scene. When we consider the historical background and politically instable fluctuations before 1980, this system seemed to have balanced many aspects. It had its basis on power resources from the governing party and also from the cartels especially in construction sector. (Karadağ, 2010). The new forms of urban segregation started during that period when Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi (Justice and Development Party –JDP) opened the market to private capital. With the JDP in power, Turkey seems to have experienced a successful re-embedding of capitalist social relations into a new moral framework, centered on principles of Islamic charity (Buğra/Keyder 2006).

It was also the time when the government started to intervene to construction sector through TOKİ (Housing Development Administration of Turkey). Due to neo-liberal polices, middle and high income groups have benefited more than the lower income groups from government funds served by TOKİ (Housing Development Administration of Turkey). Although TOKİ has provided and still provides a general increase in urban housing stock, eligibility criteria have excluded and exclude the real urban poor and create houses that are expensive to buy and to live in (Çamur, 2007).

Ataşehir as one of the biggest counties of Kadıköy is located on the Anatolian side of Istanbul like Ümraniye, Üsküdar, or Kadıköy; but the nearby counties did not face a huge regeneration. Although the area experienced different renewals at different time intervals, especially 80's have constituted a unique progress in Ataşehir apartments. The proliferation of high rise apartments also gave access to supermarket chains, fast food chains, and several restaurants. Soon the main road of West Ataşehir was transformed into a vivid, crowded but also alienated city part, with the new comers of middle class. Beginning of 90's represents an era, where all the consumption habits and life styles started to change. The construction companies invested in large scale project, which could

address the globalization desires of the middle-class. These new and luxurious apartments were produced within international standards and imported materials and created isolation from the urban fabric (Keyder, 2000).

It was not only the beginning of a new continuing practice, but also a start for power wars; especially when the same area was occupied both with skyscrapers for upper-middle-class and multi-unit apartments for middle class. Bozdoğan describes this new aesthetics of the period as the gated suburban community or “site” as the preferred residential choice of middle-and upper-class Turks (Bozdoğan, 2013). They mostly contained facilities besides housing, which attracted people from upper-classes more. Behind the closed gates, all outdoor activities such as swimming pools, play areas, even parks for dogs are included to the settlements.

Picture 1: New Urban Fabric of Ataşehir



Source: <https://www.milliyetemlak.com/dergi/atasehirde-guncel-gayrimenkul-fiyatlari/> (accessed: 01.05.2018).

The demand to luxurious apartments increased so far, that the east of Ataşehir also faced large housing investment after 2000. These branded settlements are offered to the bazaar as safe, new, and technologically full equipped living opportunities, with their most branded names like My Towerland Ağaoğlu, Uphill Court, Ataşehir Residence, Varyap Meridian, My World Ataşehir, Sky Towers. Being branded was the key word here. As Serin described it was presented as a positive aspect of these projects, which strengthens the association of these territories as consumer products rather than neighborhoods, therefore, fostering their commodity character. These projects are presented as distinctive places that

are superior to other urban areas, which associate them with the notion of being better places to live than ‘normal’ neighborhoods (Serin, 2016).

Branding was not the only distinctive feature in the area. More than that, these luxurious new types created an invisible wall between the upper class and low-mid class, although they were living very close to each other. Both of them have their closed gates, and walls, even the outdoor facilities are serving to both classes; but eventually the face of the urban life started to change drastically. What has taken place around Ataşehir might also be termed as gentrification, as Topçu indicates (Topçu, 2014).

Now the area seems frozen, tense, and the 2 different classes both try to transform and architecturally re-shape the urban fabric, which is organized outside their closed gates according to their desires and needs. If the transformation, which is happened since 1980 is a gentrification, can we still talk about it after 38 years; or was it just an attempt of the city to adopt itself to the changing marketing strategies as a result of neo-liberal policies? Can neo-liberal systems take the citizens right to transform the city away from them; who has the most right in Ataşehir? These are obvious dilemmas in housing policies in Istanbul especially in large urban areas like Ataşehir. The transformation and the huge supplies of TOKİ, even the huge gap between the classes in the area are discussed in many mediums. But it seems that the main question is still not asked. Finding solutions to housing problems was always a challenging task. It was never about building sufficient houses. It was always about power, and shift of status.

‘THE VALUE OF YOUR LIFE IS HIGHER IN ATAŞEHİR’...

This was the motto of one of the major construction companies, which was used as a marketing tool for the targeted market. Of course the brand ‘Uphill Court’ was added to this motto. How can be life more valuable, how can we measure it? Uphill court is one of major branded sites in Ataşehir with 19 apartments, each including 1742 separate units. The whole system includes closed car parks for 3500 cars, 75.000 m2 green area, 6 open swimming pools+1 closed, 2 basketball courts, 1 tennis court, 4 children parks... in total 408.000m2 (teknik yapı, n.d.).

Of course the interior qualities are sustained in high level and equipment for each unit is also offered with high standards. You can have your dream home here, if you can afford it... It is obvious that there is luxury with extraordinary standards and the system seems to be self-sufficient.

Picture 2: Uphill Court- general view



Source: <http://www.gayrimenkulhaber.com/konut-projeleri/uphill-court-atasehir/> (accessed: 01.05.2018).

Another example is Varyap Meridian, which located near to Uphill Court on the main road of Atasehir. This highly big project contains 5 towers with 1500 housing units, 50.000 m2 office areas, a five star hotel, and a congress hall. With its 94.000 of green area the project has a LEED certificate. The housing units vary from 40 m2 to large penthouses (projopedia, n.d.).

Picture 3: Varyap Meridian- general view



Source: <https://www.e-architect.co.uk/images/jpgs/istanbul/varyap-meridian-e170913-n.jpg>. photo © Nikola Sarnavka. (accessed: 01.05.2018).

These are two major examples from the area, which shape the overall look of the urban fabric. With their high density, they create a kind of settlement which closes itself to the other parts of the environment, as they are presented for being self-sufficient, sustainable, and multifunctional. The marketing strategy behind them is based on luxurious consumption, and huge economic capital, which creates a struggle, inequality and field wars in the urban context. Vertical gated developments like Varyap Meridian or Uphill Court act like hotels with their services and make the life of their residents easier by creating a new world that is isolated from the city (Baycan and Gülümser, 2007). These new gated communities brought also new terms to the market. Bozdoğan describes these effective marketing points as pleasure (keyif), quality of life (yaşam kalitesi), and exclusivity (ayrıcılık) (Bozdoğan, 2013). When life in these ‘promised lands’ is offered as more than ‘normal’ and ‘ordinary’, the opposite terms also come to the fore for describing the close neighborhood just outside the tower walls like ‘being accustomed’, ‘good neighborhood relations’, ‘tranquility and serenity’. These are features, which are from their nature out of any economic comparison. Being ‘normal’ or ‘exclusive’ was always a dilemma for the mankind. Money can come with certain restrictions, like living exclusively and in higher quality, but in an artificial environment where you do not have any individual or collective right to intervene or contribute. Many celebrities, wealthy business executives, prefer the benefits of this privilege, without even noticing the unbearable lack of social relations. Outside these gates, the routine and modest life continues with different agendas in different social places. This difference is clarified by Bourdieu, when he relates to the social space as a symbolic function of different lifestyles belonging to different groups (Bourdieu, 1991).

Thereby these two different and diversified groups have different lives in the same environment. A detailed discussion on class boundaries is not in the frame of this study; but the common nominator is ‘house’, and the whole urban area is surrounded by houses. So, when it comes to the desperation and losing hopes for an ordinary neighborhood, the power of status quo should be identified under some direct or indirect power relations between these groups.

Is the question ‘*whether these artificial living environments are a real solution to housing problem in Istanbul?*’ as a matter of fact rhetoric without any possible predictable answer; or *can it reflect the possible new tendencies in housing demands?* As long as the neo-liberal policies dominate the market, different groups of people will emerge, who would like to show off their economic capital within all their capacities and limits, even though it will cost them a natural living environment; they will cause diversification, but also a legalization of status quo.

Picture 4: Ataşehir with its modest apartments

Source: <https://www.zingat.com/atasehir-gardenya-bloklarinda-2-1-110m2-2300tl-evyaptan-1149942i>. (accessed: 01.05.2018).

READING ATAŞEHİR THROUGH BOURDIVIN THEORY

When the neo-liberal freedom of the government which is given to the construction sector ended up with huge amount of apartment blocks -the so-called residences (the frequently used term *rezidans* in Turkish) - in Ataşehir, soon several questions came to the fore. The main question was about the 'social ownership' of the environment. Who had the most right for equipping the social environment: The low class or the upper class, what would be the indicative for this?

In sociological terms, Bourdieu's reference to social space can shed a light. When he phrased the social world as equal to a symbolic system, which creates its logic from differences, he referred to status and style (Bourdieu, 1990), which also brought power. This social space would present itself in different forms. These forms tend to visualize themselves within the dominance of '*economic power*', and '*taste*', which are reflected in architectural appearance. Bourdieu defines the word '*taste*' in its duality. For him it is a faculty of immediately and intuitively judging aesthetic value, and at the same time inseparable from taste in the sense of the capacity to discern the flavors of foods which implies a preference for some of them (Bourdieu, 2010).

In Ataşehir this duality appeared in reality. Many fast-food chains, small restaurants, patisseries, traditional food houses or takeaways are opened in the area, which addressed the middle class for 'taste' but also serves to the upper class. It soon became a 'field' for all the 'actors'. The structure of the symbolic space is organized and revealed itself within his formula:

$[(\text{habitus}) (\text{capital})] + \text{field} = \text{practise}$ (Bourdieu, 2010). The area where the game is played is the field. Of course a play must have its players, who try to have something beneficial from this game. Bourdieu defines these expediencies as *illusio*. *Doxa* represents the rules, and in a sense the built-in order of the field and the leverages which the players have in their hands is the capital in the real world. (Bourdieu, 2006). The capital enables the players to be accustomed to the play, and in time they create certain habits, and patterns. These patterns are more collective than individual. Bourdieu calls these affinitive wholes as *habitus* (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2003). *Habitus* expresses a kind of domination and at the same time the way how the play and the life is shaped. In our real lives we all have our *habitus*, and a field where we play.

In Ataşehir the shiny and luxurious apartments with their social facilities introduces us one field, whereas at the same area another field appears with more modest and less equipped systems. Each field is intersecting each other, but a strong resistance is visible. Each field is trying to impose its own *doxa* to the other, and the whole area is failing to sustain itself. Bourdieu examines the social order beyond economy. The classical Marxist tendencies to link the existing order to specific economic orders are not enough for him. He is mostly preoccupied with the power of the field, and how this field is associated to other fields. The field needs *habitus* for its existence; which according to Bourdieu is the product of the incorporation of objective necessity; and which the individuals or groups try to transform. For him this social action is guided by a practical sense, by what he calls 'feel for the game' (Bourdieu, 1988).

In Ataşehir, although the boundaries of these fields seems to be mostly described by the economic power, the effects of culture and education and their reflection to taste is more able to perpetuate the existing class system. Where the line could be drawn is a difficult task and a fuzzy image because these boundaries do not contain any legality.

In the hierarchical societal order all fields are competing, and it would not be sufficient to assume that the economic capital is irreducible, but at the same time its accumulation is distinct from other capitals. So, there are different power fields. According to Bourdieu, these power fields are principally economic capital, cultural capital, and social capital, as well as symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1991); whereas the symbolic capital creates itself within the combination of the others. In Ataşehir the economic capital also represents a power, but it is not adequate to define a class according to its economic power. Bourdieu comes close to Weber when he presents the cultural capital (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2003). In this

context Weber's statement about 'economy and society' is worth to mention. Weber is primarily interested in the more differentiated associations and their relationship to religion; law and politics, and not economic action (Roth and Wittich, 1978) and conceived sociology as a comprehensive science of social action.

Although the term symbolic capital is very abstract, the semiotics behind it helps the player to have the right on the field. The relationship of these four capitals with each other and their distribution do not only determine the social order, it also determines the dominant class. As happens in some societies there is a contradictory relationship between economic and symbolic capitals. The same is applied to Ataşehir example.

We can refer to a group with lower symbolic capital with the dominance of economic capital; whereas at the same time, we can mention another group with the dominance of both cultural and symbolic capitals over economic capital. The first group prefers to live in extremely high buildings, where the use of high technology systems and excessive opportunities for outdoor activities are considered more important than the literal square meter of individual living areas.

With high security and 7/24 camera surveillance systems and technical support, indoor and outdoor sports activities, leisure areas, playgrounds, swimming and decorative pools, even dog walking private gardens, these branded and luxurious sites exhibit themselves as being superior than others, which is generally identified as 'normal'. So, they try to protect their *illusio* within the power of economic capital. But the symbolic capital is missing. The second group is trying harder to protect its own *illusio*, and to clarify its symbolic capital. Of course all people stand in some relation to each other, as it is a must of life; but they have different wants, desires, needs, and goals so they can reflect on these and alter their actions as they will, and the main idea is to understand the world from the point of view of the individual (Stevens, 1998). Understanding them may help to comprehend the symbolic touches all around the area where the social space and the social life realize itself.

Expensive restaurants, traditional food houses, small shops, or chains of fashion brands or fast food chains are located together on the same long axes of Ataşehir. With the contribution of big shopping malls like Palladium, Brandium, Novada, AVM 216, or the famous Brassier 'Divan' and the market 'Migros' for high income level, the area is trying to equip itself for all necessary requirements, and in a way closes itself to the core of the city.

Across the high branded apartments, the axis brings us to more modest apartments with small gardens. These buildings with their traditional outlooks and conventional construction techniques invite us to another field, where the non-standard arrangements like swimming pools, sports activities closed parking areas, or 7/24 security systems disappear, and the gates only serve for entrance. This

modesty can be perceived in the close environment with the appearance of small traditional shops and small cafes, Turkish style patisseries and breakfast salons. The field starts to change, with its authenticity, and taste; the economic capital seems to fade, and the symbolic capital starts to rise. The first group is willing to interfere to this field, as inside their closed gate, they cannot create their social spaces according to their wish. This attempt of amalgamation is of course not mutual, a social and economic exclusion is very obvious. This fact is free of individual choices and preferences. It mostly states a common and unalterable reality.

Housing was and always will be a challenging issue. Except the after-war and hard times, it was never about 'sheltering'. It was always about representing the dominating power in terms of capital. As a result of neo-liberal developments and governmental policies housing supply is exceeding the demand; concurrently the consequence of amalgamation of social groups in regard of creating a functional urban sprawl is neglected. Istanbul had a tough gentrification experience and the TOKİ houses were built so far from the central core that these mixed societal structures could be prevented. But Ataşehir is one of the rare examples where a contradictory structuring is visible. 2 different groups with 2 different 'habitus' are trying to sustain their 'illusio' and it seems, that the everyday life tries to find its way on his own. The question of which power will dominate the other will still remain as a rhetorical question.

Bourdieu's "structural homology" between the field of social classes and the space of lifestyles creates an aesthetic disposition in its "distant, detached or casual disposition towards the world of other people" (Bourdieu, 2010). Bourdieu based this argument on the fact that the dominant class would develop a taste of freedom. In Ataşehir the dominant group is the middle class; and although the new owners of the 'gated communities with high rise apartments' try to legitimate their status, the existing social arrangement is not changing. This actually strengthens the general meaning of symbolic power. Bourdieu and Passeron associate the autonomy of fields with the concept of symbolic power. As cultural fields grow in autonomy from political and economic power they gain in symbolic power; that is, in their capacity to legitimate existing social arrangements (Bourdieu and Passeron 1977). The oppositional structures in the environment try to reject other's existence, but still create the urban fabric. This rejection is not a simple reaction to the existence of 'other', but as it comes to a dispositional definition of the dominating class; their relationship appears in strictly described social spaces. Exposing the symbolic power of domination is not always easy, as normally dominant-class tastes are legitimated in that they appear to originate from qualities of charisma, knowledge, rather than from necessity (Swartz, 1997).

In Ataşehir this domination is moreover visualized by the social spaces around the entire environment, which is mostly reflected by the 'traditional food

houses'. Almost the whole area is full with small breakfast salons, or takeaways for traditional Turkish food.

Picture 5: Van Breakfast Salon



Source: http://www.socimage.net/user/atasehirvankahvaltisalonu/1996259869/1489680821186742435_1996259869. (accessed: 01.05.2018).

Even the existence of the big shopping malls with different kind of shops and restaurants do not change this dynamic. People prefer to use the bazaar. Ironically it is known as the 'high society' bazaar, which reveals the fact that the area hosts users from another social status.

Picture 6: Ataşehir 'High Society' Bazaar



Source: <https://www.haberler.com/atasehir-e-konforlu-kapali-pazar-alani-5525354-haberi/>. (accessed: 01.05.2018).

For many years space, and especially house was seen as a field for class struggles; and the group with the higher economic power always presented house as a life insurance, prestige and a good investment; as on the other hand the opposite group declared it as 'home', 'place of memory and habits' and a 'sacred living area'. All individuals in the area are trying to put forward their habitus as a tool of domination; but it seems that the economic power is struggling to position itself in the dynamic of social life. Terms, like 'neighborhood', 'habit' 'vernacular' are dominating powers over 'luxurious', 'exclusive' and 'super secure'.

CONCLUSION

Almost in every town the transformation is a tough and painful process. The generation of housing facilities should be handled with care and the solutions should include positive attributes for a constant daily life and infrastructure.

As Istanbul went through a globalization process after 2000's due to the neo-liberal freedoms, the boom in the construction sector created a huge housing demand and supply. Every single family from every class was encouraged to buy a house, which was preferable in a gated community. According to TOKİ's declaration the target with 500.000 housing units was met as of 2011, and the expected target would be 1.200.000 in total for 2013 (TOKİ, n.d.). As it is seen, the city will continue to be reshaped.

This frenzy period was accelerated by gentrification processes, and the city experienced a shift to the periphery. Although these areas were for the low income at the first step, there were some blind spots in the calculations like Ataşehir. The area was already urbanized since 1970, and far from a gentrification plan, its location to general arteries and to the downtown was significant. So, the construction market shifted the investments to the non-built areas between the urbanized environments. It was never intended to integrate both housing facilities, and both classes; but it was aimed to create a vivid and healthy housing environment with all social spaces around. Unfortunately the area shut itself down to the city core, and an artificial life was created behind the gated walls; and soon individuals from different fields with different illusions put forth two different daily lives; and via their capitals they insisted to sustain their habitus. This opposition obscured the daily flow, static even unbearable. The whole area was surrounded with breakfast houses or traditional food courts, where the art of presentation as well as the representation was not appealing for the upper class; but indeed they wanted to experience it, as their social life behind the walls was only a dictated illusion to them. Habitus needs space, and a constant flow of daily life. It can reveal itself in forms of spaces. In all cases the space is the best tool consolidate the status. Normally house as in terms of living area can serve for this purpose alone. But when two equal powers confront, then something more is needed. In Ataşehir struggle for power expresses itself not only by house types belonging to the middle

class, also with the routines of the daily life and the social spaces attached to it. Although the houses for upper class supply a distinguished space to their owners; outside their territory the area seems to belong to the middle class with their dominating habitus.

REFERENCES

Baycan-Levent, T. & Gülümser, A.A. (2007). Gated communities in Istanbul: *The new walls of the city the fondazione eni Enrico Mattei series index*: <http://www.feem.it/Feem/Pub/Publications/EURODIVPapers/default.htm>, (accessed: 15.02.2018).

Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J.C. (1977). *Reproduction in education society and culture*. London: Sage.

Bourdieu, P. (1988). Vive la crise!: For heterodoxy in social science. *Theory and society*, (17) 5, Special issue on breaking boundaries: social theory and the sixties, 773-787.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *In other words: Essays towards a reflexive sociology*. Matthew Adamson (trans. by). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L. J. D. (2003). *Düşünümsel bir antropoloji için cevaplar*. Çeviren: Nazlı Ökten, Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Bourdieu, P. (2006). *Sanatın kuralları: Yazınsal alanın oluşumu ve yapısı*. Çeviren: N. Kamil Sevil, Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Bourdieu, P. (2010). *Distinction*. New York: Routledge.

Bozdoğan, S. (2013). Residential architecture and urban landscape in Istanbul since 1950. in P. Pyla ed. *Landscapes of Development*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press 118-141.

Buğra, A. & Keyder Ç. (2006). The Turkish welfare regime in transformation. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 16: 211–228.

Çamur, K. (2007). Does the new millennium mean new hopes for housing the urban poor? Does strategic approach ensure pro-poor housing strategies in developing countries? Case of TOKİ / Turkey: 43rd *ISOCARP Congress*, pp.1-11.

Görgülü, T. (2016). The Apartment typology from past to present: The transition from rental apartment to residence. *TÜBA-KED*, (14) 166- 178.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harvey, D. (2008). The right to the city. *New Left Review* (53) 23 – 40.

Karadağ, R. (2010). Neoliberal restructuring in Turkey: From state to oligarchic capitalism, *mpifg discussion paper* 10 (7). Köln: Max-Planck-Institut für Gesellschaftsforschung.

Keyder, Ç. (2000). *Enformel konut piyasasından küresel konut piyasasına, İstanbul küresel ile yerel arasında içinde*, Derleyen Çağlar Keyder, İstanbul: Metis Yayınları

Okumus, D. & Eyuboglu, E. (2017). Healthy environments or high prices? Residents' perspective to the urban regeneration projects in Atasehir, İstanbul. *Current Urban Studies*, (5) 444-465.

Projepedia. (n.d.).
<https://www.projepedia.com/sirket/varyap/projeler/varyap-meridian,783.html>,
(accessed: 02.03.2018).

Roth, G. & Wittich, C. (1978). *Max Weber, economy and society, an outline of interpretive sociology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Serin, B. (2016). The promised territories: the production of branded housing projects in contemporary Turkey. *European Journal of Turkish Studies* 23. URL : <http://ejts.revues.org/5383>, (accessed: 15.02.2018).

Stevens, G. (1998). *The favourite circle: The social foundations of architectural distinction*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Swartz, David. (1997). *Culture and power*. London: The University of Chicago Press.

Teknikyapı. (n.d.).
www.teknikyapi.com/Projeler/TamamlananProjeler/Uphill-Court-Atasehir,
(accessed: 02.03.2018).

TOKİ, (n.d.). <http://www.toki.gov.tr/en/background.html>. (accessed: 21.02.2018).

Topçu, Ü. (2014). Urban transformation: Effects of large housing investments on nearby property values in Ataşehir İstanbul. *Journal of Urban Regeneration and Renewal* 8(1):45-51.