RETHINKING GENTRIFICATION: THE ANALYSIS OF ARTISTIC SPACE AND VIOLENCE IN ISTANBUL

By

Behice Pehlivan

Submitted to

Central European University

Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Supervisors: Daniel Monterescu

Judit Bodnar

Budapest, Hungary

2011

Abstract

This study focuses on a violent event that took place in Istanbul; by analyzing this specific case, it aims to offer a new reading of gentrification and right to the city. Unlike most of the gentrification studies, analysis of this event presents a revanchist neighborhood that is actively preventing other's right to the city. In this context, gentrification uncovers the deep rooted disputes and intolerance, resulting in a sudden outburst of urban violence. Through the reading of various arguments and debates on this case, this analysis shows that urban space is a difference machine that produces intolerance and violence.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

On September 21, 2010, an exceptional event took place in Istanbul, Turkey. Everything was ready for an opening event at an art gallery in Tophane, İstanbul which is the European Cultural Capital of 2010. However, instead of the celebration of high culture and art spirit, the opening turned into a battleground because of the attack of the angry local people of the neighborhood. They put several people in hospital with various injuries from knives, batons, pepper spray and smashed the windows of the gallery. The event quickly turned into a big national puzzle which everyone tried to make sense of. Some tried to understand this sociological problem in the context of religion/secularism dichotomy while others tried to solve this surprising event by introducing the concept of gentrification to Turkish society for the first time. Countless arguments have been made about this strange phenomenon by various experts from city planners to politicians, and yet the problem seems to remain unsolved.

In Istanbul, the city of multiple ongoing processes of gentrification under the official name of "urban renewal", the destination of continuous migration, the location of increasing ghettos and gated communities, the meaning of the lived/perceived/conceived space is in flux. One of the biggest, most crowded, globalizing cities, Istanbul has become the battleground of the social tensions between people with different identities that are exploding at the intersection points of different living spaces. Different social groups that were living in their enclosed neighborhoods now forced to contact with each other, penetrate in each other's spaces. This study analyzes a violent confrontation between two distinct groups of people who have to live together at such an intersection point, Tophane which is the last phase of an ongoing gentrification process in Beyoğlu district, the heart of the cultural and artistic activities of Turkish intellectuals and artists. The conservative, religious and traditional locals are forced to witness different lifestyles that were alien or nonexistent to them before.

1

This paper examines this specific event and the public discussion around it that made large populations to think about gentrification and the dangerous consequences of careless urban renewal projects may be for the first time in Istanbul. The undeniable gentrification elements and secondary motives behind the violence are being discussed. By the analysis of different arguments from diverse discourses, this study shows the complex nature of gentrification and its problematics when its basic assumptions turned upside down like in Tophane. It is an investigation of an event in which the principle elements of classical gentrification literature being reversed. The newcomers become the victims of the revanchism that is targeted to them. In this almost fascistic violence, there is a question of the right to the city, but this time it is not the local people's, it is the newcomer's.

Lefebvre's concept of the right to the city and Engin Işın's theory about city being as a difference machine are the basis for my analysis. Also Neil Smith's revanchist city draws the general framework for this study. On the other hand, Bourdieu's theory of symbolic/cultural capital, habitus and distinction along with its criticisms will be essential to analyze the basis of the tension and conflict between locals and the newcomers.

In the first chapter, I will try to analyze the gentrification elements and the gentrification argument that have been made about this specific event. On the other hand, in the second chapter, I will examine the other side of the story and other elements like art, gender and symbolic capital.

METHODOLOGY

In this study, to see the different arguments, narrations and sides of this event, I mainly used the method of content analysis. Basically, I analyzed the recorded communications in the form of newspapers, articles, magazines, blogs, and so on. Because of the mediums that I am mostly looking at, it can also be called as a media analysis. I was mostly interested in the basic questions of content analysis method such as "who says what, why, to what extent". Although the general way of making a content analysis is only looking at the manifest contents, I also looked at the latent meanings in order to understand the basic rationales behind the system of thoughts. What I tried to find in these records was the comments, interpretations, arguments about the incident as well as everyday experiences of some people at Tophane.

Another method that I used is the in-depth interviews that I made with the artists and gallery owners. With my questions what I wanted to learn was their daily experiences at Tophane, their ideas about the causes of the event, whether or not they see themselves as gentrifiers or not, their personal thoughts about the relation between art and the gentrification process, and so on. I must say these interviews were incredibly successful and rich in content, and gave me many ideas to think about.

Chapter 1. The Gentrification Debate

1.1 Main Aspects in the Literature

Gentrification has become an inseparable part of the contemporary urban life that is marked by constant movement of populations and spatial changes. Although it was originated in Britain and then in United States, gentrification as a term to explain the postmodern urbanism is now immensely popular in academia as well as the language that is used by media, politicians and even ordinary populations. Today, it is hard to think about a single country in which gentrification has not entered into the public discourse. The quick popularization and institutionalization of gentrification in social sciences is not surprising when considering the complex nature of the concept. Gentrification as a phenomenon is at the intersection of global and local forces and makes the social disputes crystal clear for the researcher to observe. As the spatial boundaries between different social groups blurred due to the gentrification process; deep rooted social clashes come to the surface and become visible. It is no surprise that such a popularized and widely used word loses its meaning in time and starts to become extremely broad in meaning. After nearly 50 years and countless numbers of studies, it is almost impossible to agree on a single definition. That is why I feel the need to clarify what the term means in this study by simply returning to its roots. The British sociologist Ruth Glass first named this phenomenon and introduced the term gentrification to the academic world.

> One by one, many of the working-class quarters of London have been invaded by the middle classes—upper and lower. Shabby, modest mews and cottages—two rooms up and two down—have been taken over, when their leases have expired, and have become elegant, expensive residences. Larger Victorian houses, downgraded in an earlier or recent period—which were used as lodging houses or were otherwise in multiple occupation—have been upgraded once again…. Once this process of "gentrification" starts in a district it goes on rapidly until all or most of the original working-class occupiers are displaced and the whole social character of the district is changed. (Glass 1964:xviii)

Glass' simple but to the point explanation summarizes the essence of the gentrification. It is a process that transforms the whole character and soul of a certain space and puts it into a different context that is defined by different socio-economic and cultural elements. Or, in Neil Smith's and Peter Williams' more concrete words, the broadest and most encompassing definitions of gentrification is "the rehabilitation of working-class and derelict housing and the consequent transformation of an area into a middle-class neighborhood" (Smith and Williams 1986: 1). The many issues in gentrification has being discussed in and outside of the academia for nearly half a century now, and many scholars tried to explain this phenomenon from different perspectives by pointing out different characteristics. Smith and Williams identify the main themes in gentrification discussions under five points such as production-side versus consumption-side, emergence of a post-industrial city, importance of social structure and individual agency, the new middle class and its role, and finally the costs of gentrification (Smith and Williams 1986: 4). These major themes vary in their accounts from explaining the gentrification process by changing consumption choices of the middle-class to the connection with the decline of industrial production and the rise of the service sector in the urban environment. While certain accounts have Marxist inclinations with the attempt to explain social changes with economic transformations that changes the urban patterns and landscape, other scholars especially from the liberal theory emphasize the significance of the social structure and individual agency as the main cause of the gentrification. In other words, it can be said that there is a tendency to perceive gentrification either an economic or a social process.

In this debate about the causes of gentrification, Neil Smith's concept of "rent gap" is crucial. Rent gap theory is at the basis of the production-side theory and perceives the gentrification phenomenon as a purely economic process in which the movement of capital directly shapes the transformations of the urban space. Basically, it is the difference between the ground rent and the potential rent which changes due to the urban transformations.

5

> At the most basic level, it is the movement of capital into the construction of new suburban landscapes and the consequent creation of a rent gap that create the economic opportunity for restructuring the central and inner cities. The devalorization of capital in the center creates the opportunity for the revalorization of this "underdeveloped" section of urban space. (Smith and Williams 1986: 24)

Rent gap is the difference between the actual present price of a certain space and its potential price in "better hands". As the difference between the potential and the present rent gets wider, various agents start to take action and the property transfer begin in order to turn this potential into actual profit. In other words, gentrification is at its most basic sense is the movement of capital that finds itself a new profitable ground. This immediately reminds David Harvey's theory of 'accumulation by dispossession':

> The implication is that non-capitalist territories should be forced open not only to trade (which could be helpful) but also to permit capital to invest in profitable ventures using cheaper labour power, raw materials, low-cost land, and the like. The general thrust of any capitalistic logic of power is not that territories should beheld back form capitalist development, but that they should be continuously opened up. (Harvey 2003: 139) [C]apitalism necessarily and always creates its own 'other'. The idea that some sort of 'outside' is necessary for the stabilization of capitalism therefore has relevance. But capitalism can either make use of some pre-existing outside or it can actively manufacture it. (Harvey 2003: 141)

Harvey's theory about capitalism and its "other" is based on the concept of overaccumulation that defines one of the paradoxical problems of capitalism, which is the unbalanced state of the capitalist economy where no new opportunities of investment can be found for the overaccumulated money. In this case, the capitalist system should find an outsider of the system to stabilize the balance of the relation between money and investment. This outsider can really be an outsider of the capitalist system or the system can manufacture its own "other". The basic mechanism behind waiting for and preying on the "other" is to release its assets at low costs in order to the capitalist system can seize them and turn them into profitable investments for the overaccumulated money, in other words accumulation by dispossession. The chief principle is the transfer of the assets from their owners to the giants of the capitalist system. If we look at gentrification phenomenon from Harvey's point of view, we perceive it as nothing but "a redistribution of assets that increasingly favour the upper rather than the lower classes (Harvey 2003: 159). The neighborhoods that have remained relatively out of the system of capitalist urban development and at the same time have the potential to get into the system as a low-cost land, in

6

other words cheap raw material, becomes the 'other' that can be seized and turned into lucrative investments for the overaccumulated money in the hands of the middle and upper class. The natural result of this process is the dispossessed and displaced lower class, loss of affordable housing and increase in homelessness.

1.2 Istanbul as a City of Gentrification

As one of the world's biggest metropolises that are under the strong effects of capitalist globalization, it is not surprising that Istanbul has witnessed gentrification as a form of accumulation by dispossession. However, the main difference between its Western counterparts, the gentrification in Istanbul started more than three decades later due to the economic restructuring in 1980s. Tolga Islam connects this delay to the industrialization and urbanization after 1950s which led to massive waves of immigration from rural parts and their settlement in the abandoned minority neighborhoods at the center, their lack of resources to invest in the properties and the resulting physical decay that makes these old neighborhoods at the center perfect candidate places for gentrification in 1980s. (Islam 2005: 124)

> With the realization of these two necessary conditions for gentrification- the production of the gentrifiable areas and the potential gentrifiers, Istanbul experienced the first signs of gentrification in the early 1980s, around three decades later than the core cities, notably London and New York. This gentrification has taken place in three waves, each in a different region, each with a different motive. (Islam 2005: 127)

Tolga Islam analyzes the gentrification in Istanbul as a three-phased process. Accoding to Islam, the first wave happened early 1980s around Kuzguncuk, Arnavutköy and Ortaköy in the form of housing rehabilitation and reorganization by the local municipality; however, the gentrification around these neighborhoods has been limited and considerably gentle, partly because of the law that prevents any new construction around the coasts of the Bosphorus (Islam 2005: 127). In Islam's classification, second wave that began in early 1980s took place in Beyoğlu, namely Cihangir, Asmalımescit and

Galata. The gentrification in these neighborhoods mainly effected and enabled by the pedestrianization of İstiklal Street that intensified the cultural, leisure and commercial activities around the Beyoğlu district; however, in Islam's words "Gentrification proceeded very slowly and affected only a small track in Galata after almost fifteen years since the first signs of gentrification had been seen" (Islam 2005: 129). Third wave of gentrification belongs to the period that began in the late 1990s and the districts of Fener and Balat that are at the Golden Horn and iniated by the rehabiliation programme which was funded by the European Commission (Islam 2005: 130).

As it can be seen from Tolga Islam's analysis, gentrification is a relatively new concept in Turkey comparing to the US and Britain. Especially with recent gentrification processes around the Beyoğlu district and the related discussion about the minority rights of the Roma people who has been effected from this process the most, gentrification has become a very popular topic in Turkish academic circles. There are two Turkish words that are being used interchangeably for gentrification: *mutenalaştırma* and *soylulaştırma*. *Mutena* means exclusive and refined; and *mutenalaştırma* means making something exclusive and refined. *Soylu* means noble and higborn; therefore *soyluluşatırma* means making something noble. In other words, the perception of gentrification in Turkish language is more about changing face of the neighborhood and its culture rather than just an economic expansion.

If we return to our main focus of interest in the broad discussion of gentrification in Turkey, the Tophane incident, we see that it is impossible to analyze this issue without putting it into the gentrification context. In the immediate aftermath of the event, many scholars and columnists started to categorize this event as a violent outcome of an ongoing gentrification process. There are many ppositions to this categorization and the perception of this event as a direct result of gentrification along with the speediness of these quick analyses. These objections and the many points in this line of thoughts that seem inaccurate will be discussed in the next chapter.

The first hint that shows the gentrification connection in this specific event and the element that the commentators mostly point to is the initiative role of the artists in the gentrification process that has

been seen repeatedly in many other cases throughout the world. The classic scenario for a "standard" gentrification process is known as "First comes the artists, then gentrification". Mostly young artists who have limited and irregular income tend to find, work and live in urban places that have low rents, near to city center and artistically stimulating. The sense of "discovery" and "authenticity" is important here. As artists and creative professionals move to these authentic and pristine neighborhoods for economic and artistic reasons, the image of this neighborhood changes rapidly. This specific urban space becomes a center of attraction for artists, hippies, sub-culture followers, and so on. Eventually, this bohemianization process results in the arrival of the upper and middle class for whom the neighborhood is no longer an undesirable, poor neighborhood but a hot spot which is full of artistic activities and places. Trendy cafes, restaurants, hotels, bars, shops, boutiques and other leisure and commercial activity spots follows the artists and causes a dramatic increase in the property values and rents. At the end, the gentrification process that was started by the artists at the first place push them out of the neighborhood with skyrocketed rents.

The perception of the Tophane event as "an inevitable result of a gentrification process" comes from this general idea about the artists as the vanguards of gentrification. It is not only because artists and artistic activities transform the neighborhood and start its bohemianization, but also they form a creative community, which, according to Richard Florida, forms a higher lever of economic development. Florida asserts that "The rise of the Creative Economy has altered the rules of the economic development game" (Florida 2010: 346) and the creative class/ high bohemians, namely artists, technology workers and homosexuals shows a higher economic growth. By attracking more creative people, the more lively and dynamic urban environment that creative class creates promises a higher level of economic achievement.

> The bottom line is that cities need a people climate even more than they need a business climate. This means supporting creativity across the board-in all its various facets and dimensions-and building a community that is attractive to creative people, not just to high-tech companies. (Florida 2010: 346)

Florida suggests that the urban planners and developers should demand and help to develop a creative community in order to achieve a long-term economic success in the urban environment. In other words, cultural capital is something that can be turned into economic capital and profit when it comes to urban development. What this means for gentrification is that it supports the general perception of the artists as the harbingers of gentrification. The localization of the creative artistic community in one specific urban area changes this area both culturally and economically. At the end, the neighborhood becomes so full of commercial activities and flourishes economically that the core of the creative team, the artists have to move out.

In the aftermath of the event, Besime Şen from Mimar Sinan University was one of the scholars who emphasized the gentrification aspect of this act of violence. In her article that is published on the internet website bianet.org, she claimed that gentrification is not just the act of opening a gallery at Tophane; in fact, the very act of perceiving Tophane as a place for the artists can open a gallery is the essence of the gentrification. She asserts that the decisions about Tophane's "urban renewal" and its "new face" were made by the authorities long before the arrival of the individual artists to the neighborhood. According to Şen the political decision mechanisms decided to turn Tophane "somewhere else", thus the good or bad itentions of individual artists are rather irrelevant or ineffectual (Bianet, 2010). This is an important point, because it enables us to see the big picture beyond the local artists versus the neighborhood dilemma and the general conception that the artists are vangurds of gentrification. For Şen, the artists and the art galleries are not initiators of the gentrification process. The decision makers who own the political and economic power decided to recreate Tophane long before the artists decided to move there. In other words, there is no other option than to be gentrified for Tophane when it was surrounded by various projects such as Galataport, Istanbul as the European capital of culture, Istanbul Modern Art Museum among many others that have the transformative power to change the urban environment they are in. According to Şen, these artistic activities do not have the same meaning for the locals; they are not a matter of art, artistic reflection or aesthetics, they are the

ominous signs of inevitable increase in rents and their resulting departure from the neighborhood (Bianet, 2010). In his comments about the attack on artists in Tophane, Tolga Islam from Yıldız Technical University mentions the impossibility of not being gentrified as a place in the middle of various urban renewal projects and art centers that have the transformative power on the urban environment. According to Islam, the gentrifiers prefer Tophane for his closeness to the cultural and entertainment centers, relatively low rents in comparison with other gentrified areas like Cihangir, and its authenticity; and he connects the attack to the lack of dialogue between the gentrifiers and the local people. (Haberturk, 2010). Ferhat Kentel from Istanbul Şehir University goes one step further and accuses the art galleries in question for being the missionaries of the ruling government to produce capitalistic relations, demand and increase in the value of a certain piece of land. He even claims that the assault was in fact an act of resistance and defense, not an attack. (Marsist, 2010)

These interpretations from Turkish scholars about the Tophane incident brings the earlier arguments about the gentrifiers being postmodern version of urban pioneers and the dichotomy between wilderness/savagery and civilization to mind. The common conception of these scholars and other commentators who put this event solely in the gentrification context see the artists as the missionaries of the urban frontier who use art for "taming" the uncivilized parts of the city. In Neil Smith's words "In the end, and this is the important conclusion, the frontier discourse serves to rationalize and legitimate a process of conquest, whether in the eighteenth-and nineteenth-century West, or in the late-twentieth century inner city" (Smith 1996: II). Gentrification is not a simple transfer of the properties between different groups of people, but it is also an ideology about what kind of places and what kind of people are desirable in the urban environment. There is an undeniable involvement of normative language of aesthetics in the system of thoughts behind gentrification. "Ugly", "authentic" or "neglected" is being used as a form of distancing. The places that seem promising for accumulation by dispossession are being labeled as "urban wilderness", the homeground for crime, disorder and danger. Therefore, these neighborhoods that are the "social malaise" and

"pathology" of urban environment should be conquered.

> Today the link between economic and geographical expansion remains, giving the frontier imagery its potency, but the form of that connection is very different. Economic expansion today no longer takes place purely via absolute geographical expansion but rather involves internal differentiation of already developed spaces. At the urban scale, this is the importance of gentrification *vis-à-vis* suburbanization. The production of space in general and gentrification in particular are examples of this kind of uneven development endemic to capitalist societies. (Smith 1996: 19)

As Smith explains, economic expansion depends on the internal differentiation in the urban environment that defines certain places as the urban jungle that should be civilized and tamed. This taming process can be named in various ways such as revitalization, recycling, upgrading, healing, urban renaissance, and so on, but one thing is clear that it implies a physical and psychological struggle for both sides. According to Neil Smith this process brings back the revanchist city in which the opposite sides see each other as the external enemies who tries to steal each other's land.

> This revanchist antiurbanism represents a reaction against the supposed "theft" of the city, a desperate defense of a challenged phalanx of privileges, cloaked in the populist language of civic morality, family values and neighborhood security. More than anything the revanchist city expresses a race/class/gender terror felt by middle- and ruling-class whites who are suddenly stuck in place by a ravaged property market, the threat and reality of unemployment, the decimation of social services, and the emergence of minority and immigrant groups, as well as women, as powerful urban actors. It portends a vicious reaction against minorities, the working class, homeless people, the unemployed, women, gays and lesbians, immigrants. (Smith 1996:207)

Revanchism basically comes from the desire to reverse the territorial losses of a specific group of people. In the context of urban environment and spatial relations, revanschism means a class struggle over a certain urban space. Kentel's interpretation of the Tophane event as an act of defense derives from this certain concept of revanchism of the middle and upper class. From this perspective, artists who use art as a romantic taming device of uncivilized masses show an effort to "retake the city" from the enemy within. In this context, art becomes nothing but an instrument of war that has the function to change the symbols and semiotics about a certain urban space, to justify the operation of remaking the landscape without its previous owners.

Chapter 2. The Other Side of the Argument

2.1 Structural Magnification at Tophane

In his influential essay *Structural Work*, Marshall Sahlins explains how microhistories become macrohistories and how petty disputes between small groups at local level turn into world level historical events. Analyzing various events from peasant disputes in Cerdenya to the Gonzalez case between the USA and Cuba, he arrives to the conclusion that these petty, small, even mundane interpersonal events turn into inter-governmental big events that can lead historical consequences like wars or treaties by "nationalizing the personal relations" and "personalizing the national relations", or in other words "giving collective identities to local relationships" and "local identities to collective relationships" (Sahlins 2005: 6).

> By inclusion or segmentary relativity, feuding local groups assume the identities of larger collectivities and thereby engage these collectivities in their own petty issues. The structural effect is a chiastic pattern of affinities and enmities, as the greater entities also enter the lists against the lesser factions of the other side. In the upshot, the local causes are prosecuted as larger oppositions, and the larger oppositions as local causes. (Sahlins 2005: 24)

Sahlins calls this as the elementary form of structural amplification, by which the small scale oppositions aggravate into big scale antagonisms. By this "structural magnification", for example, a family issue about a child named Elian Gonzales turned into an international crisis. According to Sahlins' theory what really happened there is intensification of an interpersonal issue with mobilization of various political ideologies and "the combination of universalistic ideals with particularistic interests" (Sahlins 2005: 25).

The violent attack on the artists that happened at Tophane can be perceived in light of Sahlins' theory. It can be claimed that the groups who are in dispute over a certain space were able to mobilize different ideologies and discourses in order to intensify the argument and bring the big players into the game. However, a better interpretation for this specific case would be the magnification of a relatively

micro level dispute by the macro level oppositions by localizing the national relations. The reason is that the Tophane incident was so rich and complicated with variety of different motivations and elements from diverse discourses that intensifying the battle and aggravating the antagonisms offered a good chance to discuss several deep rooted national level disputes. That is why the Tophane incident grew out of its proportions and suddenly became a media sensation over which the tension between larger collectivities become crystal clear.

A small dispute about a local neighborhood got articulated by grand political and cultural ideologies, and these local problems became abstract. All of a sudden, interpersonal tensions got collective identities, and a local matter amplified to a degree that it became the center of oppositions about gentrification, capitalism, urban development, gender, religion, art, ethnicity and identity politics. One can wonder how can such a small scale local event between very limited number of people have any effect on social processes on a macro scale. However, as William Sewell claims, social processes can always be altered by local level changes.

> Big and ponderous social processes are never entirely immune from being transformed by small alterations in volatile and local social processes. "Structures" are constructed by human action, and "societies" or "social formations" or "social systems" are continually shaped and reshaped by the creativity and stubbornness of their human creators. (Sewell 1996: 272)

The Tophane incident shows the power of human action and agency to transform the social processes and how volatile environments like an urban space that is in the early phases of gentrification an cause small alterations that can turn into big transformations.

In the first chapter I analyzed the gentrification debate and several discourses about the gentrification phenomenon that has been mobilized by small and big actors after the event. In this chapter, I will analyze other aspects and discourses that has intensified the battle and turned it into a a bigger fight that invoked other antagonisms.

14

2.2 The Question of Network and Identity

In her article that is published in a magazine called Bir+Bir, Ayse Cavdar relates her experiences and observations as a scholar who lives at Tophane. She defines one of the main differences between the newcomers and the local people as the way they construct their identities. The newcomers, it is also possible to call them as gentrifiers, define themselves by their choices of lifestyle whereas the local people mostly construct their identities on their biological relationships (Bir+Bir, 2010). This is a crucial point to see the main underlying causes of conflict. As Cavdar observes the local people who has been living there for a long time and the newcomers who are fascinated by its authenticity, its pristine nature and close proximity to the city centre differ from each other at their identity formation and networking. Sema Erde's work on localism and networks in Istanbul gives valuable insights about this issue.

> While the departure of the non-Muslim population had signaled a degree of homogenization and the official discourse began to talk about a Turkish and Islamic city, the recent urban social movements (since the 1980s) seem to be organized along the lines of new ethnic and confessional solidarities, such as Laz, Kurdish, and Alevi...Their mobilization reflects both the frustration and the demands of the newly urbanized, whose integration into the city is achieved through their own initiative and through informal networks and who, consequently, suffer various kinds of inequality, especially at the level of access to municipal services. (Erder 1999: 163)

Tophane where the majority of the non-Muslim minorities were replaced especially by migrants from eastern Turkey has many religious and ethnic solidarities that have a very strong effect on the neighborhood's general atmosphere and characteristics. As Erder states these solidarities that is formed according to religious or kinship bonds function as a help the migrants to relieve the anger that comes from the difficulties of the adaptation to urban life and get access to the required resources in the urban environment. Also these solidarities help to provide a sense of community that can form a political or

ideological body, in Erder's words "Despite, or because of, the loose and flexible structure of these networks, they may also constitute bases of mass mobilization when needed" (Erder 1999: 169).

For the immigrants in Istanbul, ethnic and religious solidarities seem to be the way to exist and build their own identity. At the end, "The most important assets that immigrants bring with them are their family and kinship relations" (Erder 1999: 166). Therefore, blood and religious ties become a kind of capital that can be transformed into economic gain especially in the lack of any other kind of capital like economic, cultural or symbolic. In the case of Tophane, small religious sects, ethnicity and place of origin play an important role in identity formation. From the very first moments after the event, the local people including Hüseyin Dormen who spoke at the press conference on behalf of several civil associations at Tophane while accusing the newcomers and the art galleries said that Tophane has been a peaceful neighborhood that embraces different religions and ethnicities like Jewish, Armenian, Greek and so on (İHA, 2010). However, this explanation which aims to show how tolerant Tophane community alone exposes the underlying tendency to construct the identity of themselves and others' by taking the ethnicity and religion as the basis.

In the same press conference, Dormen relates the local people's dissatisfaction with the newcomers and foreigners staying at nearby hostels at the neighborhood for their explicit sexual behaviors and alcohol habits. One can easily point to the obvious contradiction of claiming to be extremely tolerant and accepting to all kinds of diversities and at the same time stating hatred towards certain people who have certain lifestyle choices. However, rather than being a contradiction, this point uncovers the question of frame of reference. It is clear that for Dormen and other locals from Tophane, the frame of reference is the kinship, homeland or religious ties. The "tolerated" or "accepted" differences only come from these frames of reference. In this sense, the argument about being a peaceful community that is tolerant to Jews, Armenians, Greeks, Christians, gypsies, Kurds, and so on

somehow makes sense; because these are the identities that are meaningful and can be understood and recognized in this frame of reference.

However, the newcomers who construct their identities around their life choices (profession, gender, political ideology, and so on) do not present a meaningful difference to be tolerated. In other words, these newcomers use the world as the frame of reference rather than blood and religious ties or any locality. We can define this new way of constructing one's identity in the urban environment divorced from territoriality, nationality and religion as the cosmopolitan citizenship. Although it is rather complicated and broad concept, it can be defined as a "rejection of citizenship and loyalties based upon the nation" (Binnie et al. 2006: 5). Stripped from territorial loyalties the cosmopolitan citizenship revolves around consumption and universality. Kimbely Hutchings's explanation of the roots of the cosmopolitanship is helpful here.

> There are three intelinked aspects to the cosmopolitan thinking of the enlightenment. The first aspect, deriving from the natural law tradition already encountered in the discussion of citizenship, makes the claim that humans share a common moral identity and are subject to a common moral identity and are subject to a common moral law. The second aspect builds on the presumption of human moral commonality to argue for trans-state, international or global economic and political institutions and government, thus replicating the Lockean move from natural to political right at a global level. The third aspect draws on the presumption of human moral commonality and the rational accessibility of the moral law to argue for a common universal or cosmopolitan standard of judgment by which to assess actual political arrangements. (Hutchings 1999: 11)

The idea of the existence of a universal morality that goes beyond borders of nation-states and institutions is the basis for this universalistic frame of reference. The highly educated gentrifies who do not feel any belonging to any locality but assume a global identity and citizenship do not confirm to the categorization of the local people for whom the citizenship and morality is bound to the borders of the local institutions. There is a chasm between these two systems of thoughts that give different meanings to difference, morality and judgment. As a form of citizenship that takes its rationale and power from the globalized economy and information systems, cosmopolitan citizenship tends to see the world as a one small village and any part of this village can be discovered and be lived in as long as it conforms to

17

global capitalistic and moral rules. While the locals try to impose a set of rules that is derived from a local morality, the newcomers have the difficulty to conform them since this morality does not come from a universal rationale.

2.3 Habitus and the Symbolic Capital

What we refer as the difference in frame of reference can be also interpreted as different habituses from Pierre Bourdieu's perspective. What Bourdieu tried to do can be summarized as connecting social action and practices to structure and individual agency. He combines power centered economic views and paradigm of Marx with Weberian understanding of legitimization, authority and domination. In his theory, structure determines the actions but it is also a function of individual agency and history. In his work, dialectic between the mental and the material can clearly be seen. By examining the social classes, he developed theories of distinction and capital. He tried to find a third way outside of functionalism and structuralism with his attempt to synthesize the determinism and free will. His theories can be defined as dialectic of strategies in social game, but much more dynamic one which allows room for individual agency, rational choice, creativity, and improvisation. He especially focused on social classes and social stratification. He developed the concept of capital and analyzed social, cultural and symbolic capital, and reached his most famous theoretical element: the habitus.

> The structures constitutive of a particular type of environment (e.g. the material conditions of existence characteristic of a class condition) produce habitus, systems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles of the generation and structuring of practices and representations which can be objectively "regulated" and "regular" without I any way being the product of obedience to rules, objectively adapted to their goals without presupposing a conscious aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary to attain them and, being all this, collectively orchestrated without being the product of the orchestrating action of a conductor. (Bourdieu 1977: 72)

According to Bourdieu, habitus is nothing but a mode of production. It is the conceptual abstractions which yield practice between objective structure of class and arbitrary conjecture. It is where the social

life practices are generated and regulated. Individuals absorb the patterns of behaviors that are accepted in a certain social group through language, bodily manners, gestures, and so on. Therefore the habitus is prediscursive. It is the practical knowledge before the symbolic one, it is below the surface. Rather than thinking the habitus as something in a vacuum, Bourdieu perceives it always in connection with the notion of capital in a specific field which is used by Bourdieu instead of the term social class to describe a certain structured social space. Habitus, therefore, is a system of dispositions mediating the outside and inside, operating in a certain field. In this field, the externalities are internalized through habitus. Building on Marx's concept of capital, Bourdieu analyzes the symbolic capital as the partially ignored but equally powerful as the economic capital. It can be described as the source of the power, the required and learned knowledge to play the "social game", to make the necessary and accepted moves in a certain social space. It is just like the codes of behavior that seem appropriate in a certain urban environment. We know how to behave, what to say and when to do inside our habitus. We absorb patterns of behaviors which are "structured structures that are also structuring". These customs and actions that we take for granted are the pure conditionings that present themselves unconditional. These set of arbitrary practices have been objectified by the people who forms the structured social space which is called by Bourdieu as field.

What we see in Tophane is the clash of two distinct habituses that drive from two different frames of reference. It is not just a cultural difference of customs in two different communities, but an essential disparity between the structures of meaning and language. The habitus as the sum of structuring structures that makes its inhabitants to learn to play the social game, also exclude the others from outside, stigmatizes them with their lack of certain social or symbolic capital that are specific to this habitus. In the specific case of Tophane, we have two distinct group of people who do not play the social game according to the same rules although they share the same social space. While one group operates on the local basis the internalized externalities come from ethnic solidarities or religious sects,

the other structures around the cosmopolitan conditionings. It is important to note that although the local community is not quite homogenous and consists of many diverse solidarities, the externalites and the cultural and the symbolic capital that are required are more or less similar in these habituses that derives their structures from ethic and religious solidarities because they use the same frame of reference. However, the newcomers with the global world and cosmopolitan values as their frame of reference have completely different habitus that consists totally unfamiliar symbolic and cultural capital.

2.4 The Artistic Space

This difference in habitus and frame of reference also show itself in the aesthetic perception of the neighborhood. The different value systems render the same buildings authentic and historic to one group, and old and shabby to another. The educational and cultural capital that the newcomer artists possess enable them to spot the places that have the potential to be turned into artistic and then economic capital. At this point, Sharon Zukin's extensive analysis about the lifestyle in loft buildings is helpful to recall. Although Zukin's work is definitely about a different phenomenon in a different time period (1980s) and in a different region (the United States), it is a very influential work because of her explorations about the relation between the gentrification and art world. Zukin defines the artistic space of lofts as paradoxical and complex. "Because it represents both home and work, hedonism and domesticity, and public and private space, loft living is paradoxical. Its success in the urban housing market demonstrates that at this time paradox sells" (Zukin 1982: 60). Although art gallery is different than the loft living of the artists, the paradoxes that are stated above and the tension between public and private are also visible in the concept of the art gallery. Also the romantic and nostalgic flavor that the old buildings serve to the newcomers from the artistic world is very similar to the case that is the focus of this analysis.

20

> The changing appreciation of old lost buildings also reflects a deeper preoccupation with space and time. A sense that the great industrial age ended creates melancholy over the machines and the factories of the past. Certainly such sentiments are aroused only at the end of an era, or with a loss of function. As a perspective observer of "eccentric spaces" points out, "We visit the docks in London but not in Rotterdam because commerce is romantic only when it has vanished." Only people who do not know the steam and sweat of a real factory can find industrial space romantic or interesting. (Zukin 1982: 59)

The artistic space in a gentrified area definitely forms a different relation with the space and time than the purely residential apartments for the middle class. "No longer a mere work place, the artist's studio had indeed become "the scene". It was in the studio that the artist constantly re-created his self, and by transferring that moment to canvas, represented everyone's favorite angst" (Zukin 1982: 80). The art gallery also becomes a scene in which art creates life and vice versa. The modern artworks that have a variety from installations to video art projects, open an alien dimenson in the neighborhood that is not familiar to this kind of artistic valuation of space. Both the authenticity of the buildings and the art itself are in the eyes of the beholder and what is seen in there depends on the habitus that one belongs to.

2.5 The Question of Gender

In the general context of gentrification, it can be said that the Tophane incident has a special place. Although it has a definite potential of outburst of violent behavior between groups who have to face each other because of the gentrification process, the examples of such visible aggression between gentrifiers and the gentrified is not that common. What turns the usual gentrification anger into a full blown assault in this particular case is the clash of different symbolic structures that construct, identify, produce the space and determine the proper lifestyle in it. In this sense, understanding the unusual violence here is possible by looking at the small details that can elude the observation while focusing on the big problem of gentrification, like the ones about how the incident started according to some

local residents who spoke to the Hürriyet Daily News & Economic Review:

> Local residents who spoke to the Hürriyet Daily News & Economic Review on Thursday all said the incident started with a verbal confrontation between some gallery visitors who were smoking in the street, drinks in hand, and a woman wearing a chador. Some of the visitors allegedly insulted the woman and the local youth reacted, residents said. When asked how a group numbering in the dozens could gather, armed with batons and pepper spray, within a matter of minutes, Fatih Aras, the owner of the teahouse across from the Outlet Gallery denied the group had such weapons and said the incident was not organized. (Hurriyet 2010)

Also, during the press conference while defending the local people and the attackers, Hüseyin Dormen relates the cause of the attack as the assault of a local woman by a gallery visitor (İHA 2010). From these statements, it is difficult to determine whether or not the incident really started that way. From the level of organization and the obvious preparation, it can be said that it is a planned attack unlike the statements of the local people. Also, although all the local people tell this story, they always state that they did not see the event but heard from someone else. These points raises suspicions about the truth of this story and the probability of this story being a speculation that is used for motivating the local crowds comes to mind. However, whether it happened that way or not, this story is particularly important in order to show us the general perception of the locals about the artists and the space that they live in. Even if such an insult to the woman wearing chador has never taken place, the very idea of this insult and its power as a legitimizing excuse for their attack in the eyes of these local people worth analyzing in order to understand how space is constructed in the symbolic structure.

While male is universally associated with power, virility, public, state, abstract, rationality, transcendence, culture, and so on, one can claim that the neighborhood and space can be perceived as masculine bodies in the symbolic order since it is the public one in relation to the state and authority, the field of rational behaviors and collective culture. However, the female is generally associated with reproduction, private, pollution, irrationality, emotionality, subjective, body, concrete, nature, and so on. It is the one who is responsible for the basic level conversion from the nature to culture. In this

sense, the space that we live in, our neighborhood which is a part of the nature that surrounds us like a womb and nurtures us, converse the most intimate and local to the public and general is closer to the area of femininity. Although, the outside, public space is the realm of men under the masculine authority, the neighborhood, especially in more traditional settings, is the extension of the private space which is mostly perceived as the primarily feminine area. The neighborhood, in this sense, is just the continuation of the private feminine space of the house.

In this case, we see the age-old perception of the land as the female body. The soil, the space, the land is something to be invaded, penetrated, possessed. It is no coincidence that a story about a woman's body and virtue is got involved in this case, either in reality or in imagination. But either way, we see this ancient metaphor is still relevant and in use. The reason why the locals needed a story of a female body in danger is to create the ultimate excuse for the violence. However, what they related to the reporters between the lines of their story is how they see the newcomers: the intruders, the ones who tries to enter, who tries to penetrate and spoil the bodily unity of the space. Therefore, attacking the intruders was simply a self defense, an honorable act in order to protect the female body of the neighborhood which is not strong enough to protect itself.

On the other hand, there are more details in this real or made up story that tells us how space in constructed and what it is associated with. The metaphor of the invasion of the female body should not prevent us to see that there are strong elements of religious and economic difference at the roots of this anger. We cannot dismiss the fact that the female body in the story needed to be dressed in a chador and the harassers have to be the drinking, smoking and ill mannered "libertines". These details which are almost absurdly explicit tell us that this space of the neighborhood is not only a female body, but also chaste and religious one. The intruders are also not aliens or barbarians from an unknown world; they are carrying the signs of the secular, modern, high educated and westernized class. Although the harassment against a woman who dressed in seemingly modern and westernized way in a religious neighborhood is more common, in this story we see the reversal of this common pattern. As if trying to

23

disprove this general perception, this story portrays the neighborhood as a female victim who is under the perverse attacks of the immoral "elites".

It is interesting to notice how this incident and the statements of the attackers seem to combine art and economic superiority, indicating that they are signs of the same thing. In fact, this ambiguous thing, the villain of the story, this familiar but yet distant enemy who harasses the innocent and virtuous female body is nothing but the symbolic and cultural capital that one group possesses and the other does not. This almost mythical story alone hints us that what is clashing here is not people but different habitus in Bourdieu's sense. According to him "art and cultural consumption are predisposed, consciously and deliberately or not, to fulfill a social function of legitimating social differences" (Bourdieu, 1984:7). He does not take art and high culture as individual elements in life, but rather a function of economic inequalities. In Tophane incident, the art gallery and the unusual anger that it created is a perfect example for Bourdieu's perception of art and cultural capital. It is the conceptual abstractions which yield practice between objective structure of class and arbitrary conjecture that causes the irritation and resentment towards the newcomers. The art gallery with all the artworks inside which are the examples of the contemporary art with all its allusive, abstract and "incomprehensible" nature becomes the clear signifier and boundary to a specific social class with its particular habitus. It is where a different type of social life practices from the surrounding neighborhood are generated and regulated. The description of the locals of the newcomers as "some gallery visitors who were smoking in the street, drinks in hand" is actually revealing the anger towards these particular individuals who has absorbed the patterns of behaviors that are accepted in a certain social group through language, bodily manners, gestures, and so on, in other words the habitus. The locals' anger is towards the externalities that are so different from theirs and towards the individuals who internalized these externalities through their particular habitus. Although the economic gap between the locals and the visitors of the art gallery is not necessarily huge, what separates these two communities is something as powerful as the economic capital, it is the symbolic capital. The main source of the separation and the

24

resulting anger is this symbolic capital as the source of the power, the required and learned knowledge to play the "social game" in this certain artistic space of the gallery, to make the necessary and accepted moves in this certain social space. Therefore the art gallery can be defined as a certain structured social space which is situated and encompassed by a very different social space with different symbolic structures and externalities.

2.6 Right to the City

What we see here is a certain space that has become a medium through which different social structures and groups clash and try to identify one another. The space seems to be a dynamic entity that gains life and individuality in this struggle, a mechanism that creates structures and restructures the social game. In his book *Being Political: Genealogies of Citizenship*, Engin Işın defines the city as a difference machine which "relentlessly provokes, differentiates, positions, mobilizes, immobilizes, oppresses, liberates" (Işın 2002: 50). According to him, the city is neither a background nor the foreground for the struggle for domination, it is the battleground. It is literally the case in the Tophane incident in which a certain space became the battleground on which different social groups are fighting in order to dominate the space. Different symbolic structures try to take over the certain area in which they can rule their domain and while doing this it is important to differentiate, position and exclude "others" in order to define themselves. In Henri Lefebvre's words "If there is a production of the city, and social relations in the city, it is a production and reproduction of human beings by human beings, rather than a production of objects" (Lefebvre 2000: 101). What is produced at the end is the exclusion, differentiation and tension that can easily turn into violence as in the case of Tophane.

According to Işın, categories such as "strangers" or "aliens" should be understood as the natural consequence of the creation of the concept of citizenship. Işın claims that exclusionary strategies and creation of negative, oppositional alterities are not preexisting; rather they are crucial to the formation

25

of the citizenship and created with this concept. On the other hand, being political starts when these "insiders", "outsiders" or "strangers" become conscious about these categorizations, strategies and technologies of citizenship and start to constitute themselves differently from the hegemonic images that are given to them. It is the time when one become capable of making judgments about the social structure that he/she is in and taking responsibility for the judgments he/she make. Citizenship, in this sense, is completely about being/becoming political and in this context the urban space becomes the ultimate medium through which the citizenship and its alterity can be materialized. Different groups differentiate themselves using the urban environment and space, "groups cannot materialize themselves as real without realizing themselves in space, without creating configurations of buildings, patterns, and arrangements, and symbolic representations of these arrangements"; in other words, "space is a condition of being political" (Işın 2002: 43). Space as "an arrangement of objects" and a configuration is defined as a machine in Işın's analysis.

> The city is a difference machine insofar as it is understood as that configuration that is constituted by the dialogical encounter of groups formed and generated immanently in the process of taking positions, orienting themselves for and against each other, inventing and assembling strategies and technologies, mobilizing various forms of capital, and making claims to that space that is objectifies as "the city". (Işın 2002: 49)

Thus, being political is created and only possible in the city. It is about constituting the identity, taking positions, making the claim about the right to the city using certain strategies and technologies. Furthermore, this right is not a simple visiting right in traditional sense, it is the right to live, create, constitute, construct and reconstruct in the city. Because human beings have social needs and "creative energy" that is to be spent in the urban environment. They "need for the oeuvre (not only of products and consumable material goods), of the need for the information, symbolism, the imaginary and play" (Lefebvre 1996: 147).

This creative energy and the needs that Lefebvre talks about is what construct the symbolic structure that is built around the urban spaces. The outburst of violence in Tophane art gallery is the

aggravated version of the usual struggle between different social groups about their right to the city. Different structures that are shaped by different types of creative energy, in need of different kind of information, symbolism and imaginary are trying to materialize themselves in space in Tophane. While doing this, different exclusionary strategies, such as solidaristic, agonistic and alienating, are being used to differentiate the "others" by the opposing groups. Because, as Işın claims, it is impossible to be a citizen and rightful owner of a space without alienating, even criminalizing others as unworthy and unwarranted. Both the locals and the newcomers, the gentrified and the gentrifiers need to claim and secure their right to the city by creating their alterity.

In the Tophane incident various practices of strategies and mechanisms of space and group formation can be clearly seen. While the local people and the newcomers form solidarity among themselves, they tend to alienate the other group and build an agonistic relation in between. Different types of capital are mobilized in order to secure the right to a certain fetishized space which is even erotically charged in the symbolic order and gained a feminine individuality. The creative energy and symbolism that Lefebvre talks about can be clearly seen in the aforementioned story that the local people related to the reporters. All three strategies of group formation are put into action in this story of the barbarous strangers harassing the innocent woman. The impulse that is required in creation of this story come from the fact that ownership and citizenship only comes with exclusionary behaviors and tactics. As it can be explicitly seen in the Tophane case, the urban space is the object of a severe war between the opposing groups who want to materialize their domination through space. Thus, as Işın claims, space becomes the political machine and what it produces is difference, animosity and even violence in the urban environment.

2.7 Gentrification, or Not?

So far, we have seen many dimensions of the Tophane event including the strong gentrification arguments. Here, I want to analyze the other side of the debate. The too quick analysis about this

27

specific event and labeling it instantly as a natural consequence of the gentrification process caused an anger and frustration in many commentators in Turkey. The argumentations about the gentrification portrayed the gallery owners and the artists as capitalist intruders and oppressors although they were the ones who were the real victims of this specific case. Many commentators including Tuncay Birkan from Birikim magazine (Birikim, 2010) and the gallery owner, Azra Tüzünoğlu with who I made an interview mentioned an important point about this gentrification dilemma. While many scholars and columnists try to analyze this event from the gentrification perspective, a kind of celebration of segmentation and ghettoization appeared between the lines. One columnist, Ali Şimşek from Birgün newspaper went even further and captioned his column with a headline saying that the ones who want art should go to Şişli (another district which is famous for its rich, bourgeoisie neighborhood, Nişantaşı) (Birgün, 2010). This can be called as a gentrification trap that most scholars can easily fall into. Should the artists and gallery owners be confined in one neighborhood and not mingle with "other" people? Does every encounter between people who are form different class or group always create an act of violence? These questions are rather important and beg for a satisfactory answer. It should be noted that while analyzing gentrification and its consequences, it is very easy to confuse opposing the gentrification with celebration of the segmentation.

Another aspect that needs a close attention is the capitalistic relations that are involved in the case. The point most scholars and commentators ignored is that the galleries and the artists that were being attacked were independent initiatives who were free from any big sponsorship. One should be curious about the likelihood of this kind of violent attack if there was a big corporate name or a capital owner were involved in this artistic event. We have to be careful about the fact that the ones who posses the symbolic and cultural capital of the high culture and upper class, in othe words the "people of taste" do not always need to have the accompanying economic capital with them or the socio-economic conditions do not always favor the symbolic/academic/cultural capital. Michael Grenfell finds Bourdieu's theory of art and culture and how they can create discrimination among societies a bit

28

outdated in his critique:

> In many ways, culture has been democratized. Museums and art galleries are in some ways no lonfer at issue. The paradox is, of course, that democratization of institutions of education and culture simply leads to a redefinition of strategy to maintain privilege. Cultural content is reconfigured and redefined in order to reassert existing social differentiation and distinction. Certainly, in the second half of the twentieth century, traditional cultural imperatives were somewhat eclipsed by the growth of technological mass media-television and the Internet. (Grenfell 2004: 91)

As Grenfell claims, art galleries have been relatively more democratic and undiscriminatory places for a long time now. Also, the urban environment certainly reconfigured itself in order to emphasize the social differences and hierarchy. Therefore, automatically assuming that art and the artists are the sources of social discrimination is not a good sociological reflex. As in the case of this specific event, the artists became extremely vulnerable and defenseless to the attacks when they are stripped off of any power of the patronage of the capital. Therefore, we can conclude that the symbolic and cultural capital that the art galleries possess may not as powerful as Bourdieu would suggest.

This violent attack attracted the attention of the media and the public the most, however this is not the first criminal reord of the neighborhood. The protestors of May 1, 2009 and the protestors who are protesting the IMF in October 6, 2009 also got beaten up and almost lynched by the local people of Tophane (Sendika.org, 2010). Among other things, Azra Tüzünoğlu related many horrific events that they witnessed during their stay at Tophane including a young gay man beaten to death by some locals. While relating these experiences she recalled the concept of the social contract and related that she felt that this contract was no longer valid in that neighborhood, at least in the interactions between them and some locals. According to Hobbes, in its natural state, human life would be "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short" and the lack of a social contract leads to a "war of all against all". There is an inevitable chaos awaiting the mankind. This surely very much sounds like Tophane during all these violence and lynching. It is not a coincidence that many writers used the term "fascism" for these attacks and said that it reminds the Madımak massacre, (1993) in which radical Islamists set a hotel in

29

which many intellectuals were staying for a local festival on fire and killed 37 people, and the treatment of art in Hitler's Germany. What happens in Tophane seems like the normalization of the violence. The culture of terror and fear seem to be unleashed against the strangers/others/foreigners who cannot be identified by the local frame of reference and do not conform to the local moral rules. Many scholars fell into the aforementioned gentrification trap by implying or explicitly saying that the artists should have not gone Tophane at all and should have opened an art gallery in a neighborhoods that are already full of art galleries and similar places instead. In other words they implied that the artists deserved the violence by going and disturbing the established order.

So, here we have a case that completely reverses the gentrification literature who have focused on the rights of the locals. The Tophane event brings the question of the "right to the city" and the "revanchist city" not from the local's but the newcomer's eyes. "The right to the city cannot be conceived of as a simple visiting right or as a return to traditional cities. It can only be formulated as a transformed and renewed right to urban life" (Lefebvre 1996: 158). According to Lefebvre, human beings have social needs and "creative energy" that is to be spent in the urban environment. They "need for the oeuvre (not only of products and consumable material goods), of the need for the information, symbolism, the imaginary and play" (Lefebvre 1996: 147). In Tophane case, what is in question is the the artists' right to spend the creative energy and transform the urban space. Therefore, the dilemma here is to satisfy two distinct groups' desire and need for information, symbolism, imaginary and play in a certain urban space.

CONCLUSION

In this analysis, I tried to show different sides of the same story, the Tophane incident. I tried to look deeper into the gentrification debates around this topic with the help of the vast literature of gentrification worldwide. At the same time, I investigated the other side of the story by focusing on various topics like art, gender and migrant networks. To remind this once again, I have to say that I do not try to determine which side of the story is right or wrong. Rather, what I tried to do is to go deeper and look beyond the current discussions and find the system of thoughts behind the arguments. As it can be clearly seen, there is no black and white in this story. Therefore, reading this event by simply applying the gentrification theories that are mostly built on the Western core cities can be misleading. There is no simple opposition of innocent locals versus middle class gentrifiers here. Rather, we see the right to city and revanchism turned upside down. Clash of different belief systems and symbolic structures turn this neighborhood into a volatile space where even the social contract between citizens is no longer valid.

Like the Cuban child or the peasants of Cerdenya, the people of Tophane neighborhood including the locals and the newcomers amplified the argument to the macro level by employing the grand oppositions around the topics of gentrification, capitalism and secularism. It seems like after this process of magnifying the debate, the newcomers and the locals can not return to their initial status of formal yet minimal peaceful interactions. Mobilization of grand narratives and coorparation of individuals in oppositions against each other made it impossible for them to reconcile afterwards. It is certain and inevitable that Tophane is going to be gentrified considering the big projects of the government about the area. However, considering this violent attack and other cases of obvious intolerance to "others", Tophane may become one of the most problematic spots in the world in the context of gentrification. That is why it needs more and more future researchers who will spend long

periods of time in the neighborhood to go beyond quick and superficial analysis. Tophane with its volatile environment that has the multidimensional hatred that can be directed to any type of "others" at any moment seem like the future of many urban environments all around the world as the fierce capitalism takes over the cities and turns them into several battlegrounds.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Binnie, J., Holloway, J. J., Millington, S. and Young, C. (2006) "Introduction: grounding cosmopolitan urbanism. Aproaches, practices and policies" Pp.1-34. in *Cosmopolitan Urbanism,* edited by J. Binnie, J. J. Holloway, S. Millington and C. Young (Eds), London:Routledge.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction, a Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste 1979.* Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge: Harvard University.

Erder, Sema. 1999. "Where Do You Hail From? Localism and Netwroks in Istanbul" Pp.161-73 in *Istanbul Between the Global and the Local*, edited by Ç. Keyder. Rowman &Littlefield.

Florida, Richard. 2010. "Building the Creative Community" Pp. 345-55 in *The Gentrification Debates*, edited by J. Brown-Saracino. Routledge: UK.

Glass, Ruth.1964. *London: Aspects of Change.* London: Centre for Urban Studies and MacGibbon and Kee.

Grenfell, Michael . 2004. *Pierre Bourdieu, agent provocateur* . MPG Books: Cornwell.

Harvey, David. 2003.*The New Imperialism.* Oxford, Oxford U.P.

Huntchings, Kimberly. 1999. "Political Theory and Cosmopolitan Citizenship" Pp.3-35 in *Cosmopolitan Citizenship*. Macmillan Press: London.

Islam,Tolga.2005. "Outside the Core: gentrification in Istanbul" Pp.121-37 in Gentrification in a Global Context. Routledge: UK.

Işın, Engin. 2002. *Being Political: Genealogies of Citizenship*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lefebvre, Henri. 2000. "The Specificity of the City." Pp. 100-117 in *Writings on Cities*, edited by Kofman E. and Lebas, E. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sahlins, Marshall. 2005. "Structural Work". *Sage Publications* 5(1):5-30.

Sewell, William H. Jr. 1996. "Three Temporalities: Toward An Eventful Sociology." Pp.245-280 in The Historic Turn in the Human Sciences, edited by Terrrence J. McDonald. Ann Arbor: University Of Michigan Press.

Smith, Neil. 1986. "Gentrification, the frontier, and the restructuring of urban space" Pp.15-34 in *Gentrification of the City*, edited by N. Smith and P. Williams. Boston: Allen & Unwin.

Smith, Neil. 1986. "Alternatives to Orthodoxy: invitation to a debate" Pp. 1-12 in *Gentrification of the City*, edited by N. Smith and P. Williams. Boston: Allen & Unwin.

Smith, Neil.2005. *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrificaion and the Revanchist City*. Routledge:NY

Zukin, Sharon. 1982. *Loft Living*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bir+Bir. 2010. "Tophane'de ne oldu?". Retrieved June 11, 2011 (http://euv-frankfurt-o.academia.edu/AyseCavdar/Papers/323418/Tophanede_ne_oldu)

Bianet, 2010. "Tophane'de Kimi Dövsek?" Retrieved June 11, 2011 (http://bianet.org/bianet/siyaset/125001-tophanede-kimi-dovsek)

Birgün. 2010. *Sanat İsteyen Şişli'ye Gitsin*. Retrieved June 11, 2011 (http://www.birgun.net/actuels_index.php?news_code=1285315243&year=2010&month=09&day=24)

Birikim dergisi. 2010. *Tophane Saldırısı Sonrası: Mutenalaştırma "Tahlilleri"*. Retrieved June 11, 2011 (http://www.birikimdergisi.com/birikim/makale.aspx?mid=667&makale=Tophane%20Sald%FDr%FDs%FD%20Sonras%FD:%20Mutenala%FEt%FDrma%20%22Tahlilleri%22)

Haberturk. 2010. "*Bu saldırı mahalleli için mağlubiyetle sonuçlandı!*". Retrieved June 11, 2011 (http://www.haberturk.com/gundem/haber/555060-bu-saldiri-mahalleli-icin-maglubiyetle-sonuclandi-)

Hurriyet Daily News. 2010. *Gentrification posited as motive for attack on Tophane art galleries*. Retrieved February 09, 2011 (http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/n.php?n=tophane-attack-on-art-galleries-more-than-meets-the-eye-2010-09-23)

Marksist. 2010. "*Ferhat Kentel ile Tophane Olayı Üzerine*". Retrieved June 11, 2011 (http://www.marksist.org/dosyalar/2076-ferhat-kentel-ile-tophane-olayi-uzerine)

Sendika.2010. *Tophane Saldırganları Yabancı Değil*. Retrieved June 11, 2011 (http://www.sendika.org/yazi.php?yazi_no=32883)