Understanding the Logic of Gentrification in different Geographies: a comparison of five regeneration projects in Ankara, Turkey

1. Introduction: Geographies of gentrification

Gentrification literature is focused on demand- and supply-side discussions. Demand-side discussions (Ley, 2003, Hamnett, 2003) rest on the existence of a new middle-class responsible of gentrifying some inner-city neighborhoods thus referring to a structural change involving a demographic and social transformation redefining the status of the area within the general layout of the city.

Ley (2003) sees the roots of gentrification lying in the changing industrial structure of major cities from manufacturing to financial, cultural service-based industries and a change in the occupational structure from manual working class to white collar professionals, managers and technical workers which are concentrated in major cities thus relating gentrification with a new middle class, to be called 'gentrifiers'. Ley and later Butler argue that as a result of these changes in class composition, there have also been changes in cultural orientation and preferences predisposing these people to living in the inner city (Hamnett, 2003). At this point Ley (2003) points out to the place of aesthetic disposition in formulating the impact of cultural preferences on gentrification and he pays attention to a high percentage of artists and others shaped by their proximity to the aesthetic disposition of the artist such as intellectuals, journalists and educators in gentrifying neighborhoods.

At the other end of the spectrum according to the supply-side discussions, Smith (2002) argues that the driving force behind gentrification is not the new middle class but the growing rent gap between property values and underlying land values in the inner city. This gap has been exploited by the actions of property-based capital, estate agents, developers and the like and gentrified under valued inner city housing for profit.

Thus according to Smith gentrification is the outcome of the capitalization of urban land in the hands of not the gentrifiers but the developers for profit making. Hamnett (2003) says Smith in fact doubts the existence of this class. However Smith does not reject the place of a new class formation but he refers class and its attitudes on urban space, which Ley argues is reflected by class preferences, as shaped by economic developments. In other words, it is the restructuring effects of economic capital that formulates the place-specific attitudes of the urban class strata. So Smith does not refuse the existence of a class component of gentrification but he refuses to give it a major role in explaining the roots of gentrification.

Smith (2002) also supports the idea of gentrification as an evolutionary process. By examining the development of gentrification in a historical perspective in New York, Smith has explored three phases of gentrification as sporadic from the 1950s to the 1970s, anchoring in late 1970s until 1989 and generalized following 1994. The first phase is bound with the rehabilitation efforts mostly in the hands of small investors, first in major advanced capitalist cities such as New York. In the anchoring period, gentrification is a major place-specific reinvestment in the center with an unprecedented capital flow into inner city land and property by the developers. This was followed by an increasing role of the municipalities and financial investors. Coming to the 1990s, gentrification supplied the housing for new generations of young, upwardly mobile professionals operating the global city's financial, corporate and myriad related enterprises and gentrification is generalized in city scale and with the second waves of gentrification in more central districts.

Thus gentrification is also evident in more unlikely centers down in the urban hierarchy. Lees (2000) follows Smith's ideas and she argues that it is not only in these so-called global cities that gentrification has been proceeding apace. Further down the urban hierarchy in cities, inner city neighborhoods are being redeveloped and revalorized.

At this point Smith pays attention to the regeneration policies as a driving mechanism for the spread of gentrification across national boundaries as a means of global urban competition. Smith argues that gentrification to differing degrees by the 1990s evolved into an urban strategy for city governments in the name of urban regeneration policies, in consort with private capital in cities around the world expressing the particularities of the place in making of its urban appearance (Smith, 2002).

So most of the gentrification researchers come to the point that appearance of the already formulated origins of gentrification are time and place-specific. Gentrification is an evolutionary process and through its evolution from the late 1950s as a result of an increasing rent gap, sporadic and small in scale or from the 1970s with the invasion of the inner city by the gentrifiers and/or a new middle class to the 2000s opening up new discussions on the increasing effects of government policies in addition to the appearance of a new class of young and high-income, educated white collar professionals, different preconditions have brought different logics and outcomes of gentrification in different geographies. The first diversity originates from the class explanations of gentrification taken as a driving mechanism by itself or as an effected body of capital formulations.

Lees points out to the fact that the notion of urban community has changed (Lees, 2000, p. 402) with the profound transformation in advanced capitalism: the shift to service industry and the associated transformation of the class structure. Gentrification emerged as a spatial component of this transformation (Sassen,1991). In Smith's words (2202), it increasingly implies new restaurants and shopping malls in the central city, waterfront parks and movie theatres, brand name office towers alongside brand name museums, cultural complexes and the like all the signs of a new life style not only rich in cultural capital but in economic capital as well.

A glorious, charming life style of the new professionals expressed in elegant restaurant, home décor and designer boutiques, "from sushi bars to gucci stores", urban amenities from bars to restaurants and museums in order to be bohemian in a fashionable way or to live trendy in the regentrified or supergentrified (as used by Lees, 2000) neighborhoods of the financial centers of global capital. This is an aesthetic way of life enriched with the peculiarities of high-income and high perception of cultural opportunities in the inner city.

The preconditions that are accepted to occur before a place to be subject to gentrification are shaped within the place-specific development processes of urban settlements. This process can not be simplified within the concept of middle class or gentrifier and financifier as Lees (2000) has developed to define the new professional class gentrifiers, because none of them emphasizes the role of this class's life style, already shaped by the logic of capital using and/or affording the rent gap in inner-city areas, in shaping the urban environment whatever the origin of gentrification is in this specific geography. This new class of the 21st century is more powerful on shaping space in accordance with a life style formed with the power of economic capital thus more reflects the logic of capital. In other words it reflects Smith's logic of capital which has gained more power with the globalized interests within the aura of their cultural and life style preferences. So it is worth to argue that this new class should not be missed with the 1970s' middle class gentrifiers.

Thus it is worth to discuss the logic of gentrification in different geographies. If we give the name of gentrification to all invasionary attitudes of the upper classes, we will conclusively be trapped in the major cities. However if we can develop different phases for different periods of gentrification redefining its logic in different development patterns, we will more likely to understand its time and place specific appearances.

2. Gentrification as a means of global urban competition

Up to the late 1970s, gentrification was initially understood as rehabilitation of decaying or low-income housing by middle-class outsiders in central cities (Sassen,1991). In the early 1980s however, it was becoming evident that residential rehabilitation was only one force of a far broader process linked with it and gentrification was emerging as a visible spatial component of a profound transformation in advanced capitalism that was evident in the efforts of regeneration for gaining a role in global urban competition.

As a matter of fact, the recent round of capital restructuring has rearranged the form of cities for the interests of global capital. The only way that cities can compete in an increasingly unpredictable and globalized economy is by pursuing specific strategies designed to secure competitive advantages over their perceived competitors (Hall and Hubbard,1998). Thus, more attention has been devoted to the transformation of the image of the city for the global capital within the process of "selling cities". One face of this process is the rise of new immigrant and gentrified neighborhoods (Beauregard,1991) reflected on space as high-profile prestige property projects with an increasing element of private investment on public land.

Smith (2002, p.4) describes this phenomenon as follows,"One way or another gentrification is welcomed by urban boosters as a potential sign of cultural and economic reversal after decades of apparent urban decline. Seeing the increasing benefit in inner city areas, first corporate developers and then the financial institutions showed a greater willingness to invest in areas they had previously avoided and once blighted neighborhoods soon became more systematic targets."

Thus resting on the idea of geographical mobility of capital, Smith (2002) explains gentrification as a major place-specific investment in the center in the name of urban regeneration policies. In this sense gentrification is seen as a positive and necessary environmental strategy involving a major colonization by the middle and upper classes with the help of large-scale regeneration projects adhered to the rules of the global market that shape transformations in urban centers.

2.1. State-led gentrification: Urban regeneration policies

As reinvestment picked up in the late 1970s, an unprecedented amount of capital flowed into land and property and municipalities to take advantage of the devalorised market there (Smith, 2002). Conclusively, the local state became centrally involved with new public programs with generous subsidies followed by professional developers into a residential component of a wider economic, social and political remarks of urban space. Thus by the end of the 20th century gentrification marked a systematic partnership of public planning with public and private capital (Smith, 2002).

Here the implication is that the strategic gentrification of the city is actually a natural process although the whole language of gentrification is absent from European regeneration agenda. Smith (2002) suggests because the language of gentrification tells the truth about the class shift

involved in regeneration, it has become a dirty word to developers, politicians and financiers. However gentrification has been associated with considerable levels of displacement and homelessness, yet this central result of regeneration is loudly unconsidered. As Butler (2002) points out nobody is in favor of gentrification and even those local authorities which wish to change their social mix of housing and population refer to it by any other name. Yet much of the academic study of gentrification has been on the displaced working class (Atkinson, 2001, 2002) reflecting displacement as an unprecedented outcome of regeneration. Nonetheless displacement is gentrification itself, it is the natural outcome of any renewal effort given the name rehabilitation, redevelopment or regeneration. As a matter of fact gentrification is an outcome of state-led urban regeneration policies as a reflection of global urban restructuring with the incentive of land and property capital more than being a result of a class-led invasion of urban land.

2.2. Regeneration of inner-city squatter housing areas in Turkey: Urban transformation projects

Regeneration policies affected the Turkish economy and administrative system from 1980s onwards, parallel to extrovert economic development policies and global adaptation policies of different governments. Private sector has increased its partnerships with the foreign capital in order to enter global markets and to follow the technological developments. The number of branch offices of transnational corporations has been increasing in certain nodes as the points of integration to the global urban network. In the meanwhile the governments faced with an increasing demand of central locations for office space and high-quality residential areas as a reflection of the developments in urban restructuring policies. This has led to large-scale transformations on the physical space of some of the big cities in Turkey. In Ankara, the capital city of Turkey, municipalities are in a race to renew the urban areas within their boundaries. Squatter housing areas especially in central locations are the most appropriate for such renewal efforts (Dündar, 2002).

The squatter housing problem appeared as a result of unprecedented dimensions of rural-urban migration during the 1940s in Turkey. Migration was started by the transformation of agricultural cultivation technology and further stimulated by a rapid industrialization process and newly developing highway network. Although the governments and the industrialists supported migration because this population offered them cheap labor force, they could not provide housing in face of the ineffectiveness of the ways of legal housing provision in Turkey. So squatter housing, a form of make-shift housing, was rapidly built by the incomers and extended with the addition of necessary space in time and developed into extensive neighborhoods constructed on vacant or public land or on farms under absentee ownership surrounding the urban cores (Dündar,2001).

These neighborhoods were first met by a negative reaction and demolitions followed by the building of social housing instead. This approach was later followed by a series of amnesty laws which legalized the existing gecekondu neighborhoods but these areas were continued to be accepted as problem areas. Meanwhile, political approaches in favor of populism especially in the share of urban rent, have given this population power in the urban land market and squatter population gained a new status with the power of speculation. This attitude continued until the 1980s, by which time squatter houses covered almost half of the urban space, some of which located in central areas, gained a new meaning as sources of potential location rent (ibid).

Thus urban regeneration in the name of urban transformation projects in Turkey, has become the preliminary concern of Municipalities since the second half of the 1980s with the goal of

transforming the squatter housing areas into prestige areas to increase the physical and visual wealth of their city (ibid) within the rules of global urban competition.

3. Research: A comparison of five urban transformation projects

Urban regeneration as a local policy has started with two large-scale projects applied by the Greater City Municipality of Ankara. Later the first follower was the Municipality of Çankaya with an extensive layout of squatter houses covering almost 40 % of its municipal boundary mostly in central locations. Çankaya district is located in the most prestigious area of Ankara with the Presidential House, the residence and office of the prime minister, the supreme courts, the foreign embassies, universities, cultural centres and shopping malls and an upper-middle and upper-income urban population. Thus the Municipality of Çankaya has developed a new model in the name of GEÇAK (abbreviation meaning from squatter housing to urban housing).

Here five urban transformation projects developed with the GEÇAK principle, will be examined comparatively based on the results of a field research held in 2002, to reach to the diversities of gentrification in different geographies. The project areas are Koza and Küpe streets in Gazi Osman Paşa neighborhood, the most prestigious neighborhood of Ankara famous with its high-profile residential areas, restaurants and designer boutiques from DKNY to Cacharel. The other three project areas, Nimet street in Harbiye neighborhood, Sinan street in Osman Temiz neighborhood and Hınıs street in Metin Oktay neighborhood are located at the edges of inner-city sprawl with a decreasing income level from upper to middle. Thus the latter are less under the pressures of development.

3.1. "GEÇAK" model in urban regeneration

GEÇAK model was proposed by the Municipality of Çankaya with the aim of transforming the squatter houses built on the lands owned by the Municipality to urban residences with organized community action. This type of an active participation process which was thought to be the basis of local democracy would also prevent reactions to the project and so displacement. Thus three main groups were identified as participant parties; 1. The Municipality of Çankaya; 2. Private sector (construction companies); 3. Building cooperatives which would be established by the squatters.

In this project the cooperatives and the Municipality are the two parties coming face to face in all project discussions. The Municipality will undertake the provision of land, organization of squatters, the preparation and introduction of the development plan, handing over the project to the construction companies and playing a role of an intermediary body between the company and the squatters, the approval of the project. However the role of the Municipality will not finish after land assignments but continue until the all project participants settle into their houses. Cooperatives will solve the problems between property owners related with share differences, will remove the idea of gaining unfair rents from urban lands, will increase the demands for contemporary houses and environments and will increase the consciousness of being a citizen.

The houses proposed at the projects were designed with gross size of 100-150 sqms as determined by the stakeholders. The flats were allocated between the stakeholders and the remaining part was given to the construction company as 50 % of the total construction area. The projects were completed in the second half of the 1990s.

3.2. Diversities of gentrification

The first project area is a centrally located squatter housing area in Koza street. It is located at the southeastern part of Ankara City, approximately 50 meters from the upper-income neighborhoods. The project area occupies a space of 4,000 sqms in which almost 200 people reside and 47 families had been determined as the stakeholders. The second project area Küpe is located at the southern part of Koza project area, again close to upper-income neighborhoods and totally occupies a space of 9.33 hectares with a squatter population of 1200. Totally 221 squatter owners have been determined as the stakeholders. There are not such brief data for the other three project areas which are located in middle-income neighborhoods but it can be said that both the size and populations are similar with Koza project area. Approximately 60 families in Nimet street, 40 in Sinan street and 60 in Hınıs street had been determined as the stakeholders.

The original areas were characterized by 1-2 storey squatter houses on a geologically inconvenient land without sewerage and waste disposal systems. Most of the houses had two rooms in addition to a living room and a small kitchen. The toilets were mostly located outdoor. The population was employed as government staff, as doorkeepers with dramatically low monthly salaries (approximately 120 dollars) or as peddlers in marginal sector. The household size was mostly 5. The life was rural in character with immigrants living for 30-40 years in these squatter housing areas.

3.2.1. The level of displacement

Most of the authors put the fact of displacement as a concluding remark just to pay attention to the social negativity of gentrification on regeneration policies even by rejecting to use the word of gentrification. However I support the idea that it is a natural outcome of regeneration, both the governments and the developers wait and even want it to appear to reverse the declining character of inner city areas. Additionally, examining the displaced and replaced populations in their demographic, economic and social characteristics will provide data for the existence of a gentrification process in a neighborhood. So it is worth to discuss first the level of displacement in different project areas and secondly the degree of displacement with respect to the changing population characteristics in explaining the logic of gentrification in different geographies.

One of the principles of Geçak model is to preserve the squatters in their existing locations. According to the laws for squatter housing in Turkey (laws number 775 and 2981), renewal of squatter housing areas should suggest to give lands for the squatter population in an uprading area close to their current settlement areas. However, this could not be applied due to fact that the squatter population is devoted to their living environment, these places are the only ties to their rural-origin. When they migrate from a rural area, they choose to locate in an area together with their fellow countrymen and in 30-40 years they regenerate their previous lives in the city. So relocation causes social and physiological problems and prevents implementations in any scale.

In Koza street 89.5% and in Küpe street 93.3 % of the questionnaire population do not belong to the original project population and all of them are the owners. The tenant percentages of 10.5 in Koza street and 6.7 in Küpe street show that most of the original population preferred to sell the project houses. However the percentage of the new population decreases in Hınıs street to 61.9, in Sinan street to 60 and in Nimet street to 45.8 respectively. The percentage of tenant population on the other hand increases to 47.6 in Hınıs, 46.7 in Sinan and even to 66.7 in

Nimet. Gentrification brings a transformation in ownership patterns with an increase in the rate of owner-occupation. The newcomers mostly prefer to own a house instead of renting. Koza and Küpe projects show the signs of such a transformation by eliminating a tenant population from the project area.

It is understood that the population of the project areas in GOP neighborhood changed in a three years period following 1999 when the houses were given to the project participants but it is a fact that most left the area in 1999 immediately after the houses were given to them (93.4% in Koza and 96.5 % in Küpe). However in the other three projects, the percentages of displacement are lower. In Sinan 66.6 % has said that they had been living in this area since 1996, in Hınıs the constructions finished in the first half of 2001 and 85.7 % has said that they had been living there since 1996 and lastly in Nimet the constructions finished in the second half of 2001 with a percentage of 30.4 living there since 1996. Meanwhile 61.9 % in Hınıs and 45.8 % in Nimet of new population just in the year of construction are very high still showing the signs of an incoming gentrification. Looking at their plans for the future of the project houses on the other hand, 13.6 % in Nimet said that they would sell the project houses. So the percentage of the newcomers at present and in the future reaches to 59.4 %.

At the other end of the spectrum, considering the fact that in both Koza and Küpe projects percentage of displacement has reached to 90 just in the year of construction, there is a different explanation for the gentrification process occurring in a longer period of time in other project areas. This may be explained by the differences in locational prestige. In a prestigious neighborhood such as GOP, both the percentage of displacement and the percentage of owner population are very high just in the year of settlement. However in less prestigious areas of middle income neighborhoods the percentage of displacement falls under 50 % with an increasing percentage of tenant population without the pressures of urban restructuring. This is due to two facts; first developers do not find it profitable to invest in less prestigious areas. Thus regeneration can be achieved in a long period of time mostly in the hands of local governments. Secondly, in more prestigious locations developers are in a race to invest in and to transform the area to be more profitable in the short-run. These efforts of both the municipalities and the developers to increase the physical wealth of project areas, pull an upper-income population, more mobile in their life-style preferences and ready to gentrify these areas and push a lower-income population ready to use the rent gap produced by regeneration. Thus transformation can be achieved in a very short period of time.

3.2.2. Demographic structure

Proving the fact that the original squatter population was displaced from the project area, another hypotheses waits to be discussed as the new population is structurally different in its social and economic terms than the original population thus this area is subject to gentrification. The household size was 5 for the squatter population. Currently the families in Koza are composed of 2 (52.6%) or 3 (47.4%) persons. There is no data about the other project areas so I can not make a comparison with respect to the family structure.

Most of the male population in Koza and Küpe were graduated from a university (84.2% in Koza and 90 % in Küpe) and 79% in Koza and 80 % in Küpe speak a foreign language. 57.9% of the female population in Koza and 56.7 % in Küpe were graduated from a university and 36.8% and 36.7 % respectively have high school degrees. Again 52.6% of the female population in Koza and 53.3 % in Küpe speak a foreign language. However the percentage of university degree in male population decreases to 29.2 % in Nimet, 20.0 % in Sinan and 18.2 % in Hınıs. For the female population, only in Nimet 8.3 % has a university degree. These results show that the

education level of the newcomers is very high in Koza and Küpe with respect to the other project areas showing similarities with the squatter population composed of people who are illiterate, only literate and having primary school degree (a total of 75.0%) (Erder, 1996: 95). So it is relevant to conclude that the physical characteristics of any regeneration policy can be effective in shaping the new populational structure of the area. A prestigious area with the peculiarities of luxury on space, defines an upper-income population as the gentrifier although a less prestigious area brings middle-income gentrifiers. The former is open to a second-wave in the near future.

3.2.3. Economic structure

It was stated above that the original squatter population of project areas was mostly employed as government staff, doorkeepers with dramatically low monthly salaries (approximately 120 dollars) or peddlers in marginal sector. However the existing male population in Koza and Küpe is composed of mostly managers (89.5% and 72%) working for the private sector (89.5% and 85.7 %). On the other hand only 42.1% of the female population in Koza and 43.4 % in Küpe work and 60% in Koza and 70 % in Küpe are employed as the government staff. 57.1 % of the working females in Küpe and 25 % in Koza are managers as well. These percentages provide a differentiating pattern as well considering the high percentage of housewives and women working for the marginal sector in the squatter population. The percentages of the managers decreases to 57.1 % in Sinan 78.6 % working for the private sector, 54.6 % in Nimet 82.6 % working for the private sector and to 38.9 % in Hınıs 81 % working for the private sector with increasing percentages of tradesmen (67 %) and marginal jobs (13.4 %) in Sinan for instance. The female population in these three areas show similarities mostly housewives (86.4 % in Hınıs, 87.5 in Nimet and 80 % in Sinan) and with marginal jobs (4.5 % in Hınıs).

These discussions prove the fact that the new populations of Koza and Küpe show diversities in economic and social status with an increasing percentage of professional population and a decreasing percentage of tradesmen mostly owning a real estate agency, market or a carpet store and of marginal jobs such as drivers as it has been stated by the newcomers in project areas.

3.2.4. Origin-destination of gentrification

Urban transformation projects create two inner-city migration movements; first the movement of original project participants from project areas to the other squatter housing areas in the city or to peripheral residential areas with lower values of housing; and secondly, from middle-and high-class residential areas to the project areas with the increasing prestige of these locations. On the other hand, the areas they left behind are settled by the middle-income groups.

73.7% of the existing population in Koza and 76.6 % in Küpe were migrated from middle-and upper-income residential areas of Ankara with the reasons of better life quality (36.4% in Koza, 43.3 % in Küpe), better environmental conditions (31.6% in Koza) and owning a house (31.6% in Koza). 61.1% of Koza population keep the other houses, 27.8% rented them. Only 38.9% said that they sold the houses they left. In Küpe however, 53.4 % rented and 26.7 % sold the houses they left. This proves the fact that the new population in Koza belong to an upper-income group as they own more than one housing units.

However the percentage of the populations migrating from middle-income neighborhoods are 20.9 in Nimet with mostly economic reasons (33.3%) and because the area is central (37.6 %) and 13.3 % in Sinan with the reason of centrality (46.7) and because it was more economic (20

%). All of the population of Hınıs was migrated from low income neighborhoods with economic reasons (36.2 %) and because it was close to their previous living environment (31.7 %). The findings show that the reasons of choosing the project areas can be classified into two; better life quality in a higher status area in Koza and Küpe and economy and centrality in Nimet, Hınıs and Sinan. So two different groups in economic and social status, have migrated from different income neighborhoods with different reasons to reside in five regeneration projects differentiated in their logics of gentrification although subject to a unique regeneration policy.

4. Conclusion: Gentrification revisited in different geographies

The explanation of gentrification has largely been associated with major cities until recently but some discussions (Smith, Butler, Dutton, Lees, Lyons) suggest the idea that this process is mobile and adaptable at all levels in the urban hierarchy even across countries. As Butler and Robson (2001) argue gentrification cannot in any sense be considered to be a unitary phenomenon, but needs to be examined in each case according to its own logic and outcomes originating from three inter-related or integrative driving mechanisms together with the diversities of displacement to be classified in accordance with the levels of integration. Gentrification is a multi-dimensional process subject to both economic and social forces, it is the outcome of the reconstruction of the inner-city (Uzun, 2001) within the rules of urban restructuring.

1. Demand-side discussions: Class formations
Fundamental to all explanations is the existence of a class formation. Once described as a new middle class gentry, it has evolved to form new classifications in itself. First gentries of the 1960s and 1970s mostly composed of an artist population and its high cultural capital-low economic capital followers are currently non existent in the regentrified neighborhoods of London and New York. But they have not disaapeared. They are displaced by a new class who is responsible from the current invasionary movement. This constitutes to a new class structure with the realities of the capitalization of global interest. The gentries however now would gentrify a new neighborhood possibly in a lower-income area. So displacement in its broader meaning continues with the gentrification of lower-income areas in most of the cities down in the urban hierarchy in first-wave gentrified areas. Thus demand for gentrification in differing structural formations has evolved in all geographies with its diversities on space.

Findings of the research prove the fact that there is effective demand on inner-city locations in Ankara. However, demand-side discussions in research areas bring two groups of demand-creator gentrifiers; a newly developing professionals ready to invest on property with all the signs of prestige as in Koza and Küpe and the middle-income gentrifiers looking for the ways of improving their living standards within the limits of their economic powers as in Nimet, Hınıs and Sinan. Demand coming from the former is more powerful on shaping the space thus in gaining from the rent gap already produced by development and later increased by the regeneration policy. Demand coming from the latter on the other hand is mostly shaped by the regeneration policy itself. Thus they are the ingredients of the regeneration project that will shape the physical space to be effective on the gentrification process.

2. Supply-side discussions:
    1. Increasing rent-gap: Smith's rent gap rests on the idea of centrality of shortage of land. Because of a rapid concentration of both the residents and businesses in the core of global cities over the past 20 years, this explanation has come to be closely linked to our understanding of global city spatial dynamics. But shortage of land is not restricted to major cities. The more important supply-side factor is that there should be a shortage of housing which

conforms to mainstream ideas of acceptability at a time and place where demand has developed (Lyons, 2002)

The shortage of affordable housing in the 1950s' Turkey with an increasing impetus of rural-urban migration was the reason for the birth of squatter housing. Later this illegal housing stock has been seen as the ready supply for a more institutionalized demand in the hands of the governments faced with the shortage of central location. There has been an increasing rent gap in Turkey especially since 1950s with the pressures of a rapid urbanization process taking place in the same period of industrialization. Thus in a country with limited financial resources, all was devoted for the development of industrialization leaving urbanization to procede within the mechanisms of a speculative urban land market . Not surprisingly, an increasing rent gap has been highly predictable and mostly desirable for the local governments looking for the ways of improving the living standards in their municipal boundaries by sharing the rent. The research shows that locational prestige and/or profitability originating from an enlarged rent gap is the key factor in determining the demand coming from municipalities thus in choosing the area to be regenerated.

2. State-led/Developer-led gentrification: With the development of a competitive environment of global urban adaptation policies, norms and expectations have spread across the borders with the main emphasis being given to strengthening the role of the private sector of the economy and limiting the role of the public sector, particularly that of local authorities.

It is in fact impossible for local authorities themselves to undertake large-scale schemes of house building and regeneration in inner-city areas especially in Turkey with limited financial resources. So a combination of land and financial subsidies has been used to attract private developers to inner areas. The outcome has been the growth of more entrepreneurial approaches with an increasing element of public-private partnerships with the goal of sharing the increasing rent gap in inner-city squatter housing areas most appropriate for large-scale regeneration and thus to achieve gentrification at the first instance to reach to a total economic and status upgrading of the area in the long-run. Especially Ankara is a good example for such a regeneration pressure with its inner-city squatter houses. Thus the inner-city squatter houses are waiting to be regenerated as a gentrifiable, in fact 'to be gentrified', housing stock. Geçak principle defines the rules of regeneration in squatter housing areas in Çankaya district.

Thus developed under the agenda of regeneration, urban policies of decaying city centres have the goal of not only to improve the conditions of the poor but to attract middle-class housing as well. It is a fact that urban regeneration provides better living environments thus increases the elements of urban quality however these are point-specific interventions which are chosen with the check of the landscape for profitable reinvestment. These processes in fact promote displacement.

3. Displacement: A natural outcome of gentrification
In addition to these three driving mechanisms of gentrification (Lyons, 2002), displacement appears to be a natural outcome and/or the necessary condition for the betterment of decaying areas in the name of regeneration, is not restricted to major cities explained as the invasion of a low-income/status area by an upper-income/status group or as displacement, direct/indirect (Lyons, 2002), as replacement/displacement (Atkinson, 2000) or voluntary/involuntary. Thus taken as displacement of gentrification, the spatial characteristics of displacement deserve attention in different geographies. Yet there are striking variations even within national boundaries.

Urban transformation projects in Turkey, in fact, bring a more contemporary, more livable urban environments in physical terms but experiences prove the fact that displacement is a necessary cost.

Recent discussions on squatter housing neighborhoods in Turkey are concentrated on two subjects: First, the necessity of these areas' transformation which are seen as the problem zones of the urban land but which also become prestigious because of their locations in central areas, by also bringing solutions to the economic and social problems of their inhabitants in the way to solve an important urban problem. Secondly, urban transformation projects provide new possibilities with a goal of renewal especially in first generation squatter housing areas which are within the extended urban macroform (Dündar,2001) without displacing the original population.

The Vice-Mayor of Çankaya Municipality in 1996 was claiming that Geçak model was a successful one because they were sure that project participants would not sell their houses because they had made a lot of meetings, 2-3 times a week in order to make these people to be devoted to the project as in the case of their former living areas. They considered the social aspects of planning and this was reflected on the area with the help of cooperatives. On the other hand the municipality gave them a share from the transformed area in order to prevent displacement. But the research shows that this could not be achieved in the long-run and the project participants preferred to leave the project areas.

Displacement in the case of urban transformation projects, can be classified into two as voluntary and involuntary. Taking gentrification as a procedural development beginning with the approval of regeneration project, there appears four phases of displacement some occurring voluntarily and some involuntarily. In all of the projects first the tenant population and secondly the ones who constructed their squatter houses before 1984 in accordance with the laws, were not considered as the stakeholders and so an important number of people have been dismissed from project areas involuntarily.

Later, as the project areas were centrally located so had locational rent, they gained prestige with the new projects and both the land and flat values increased to two-three times. So the new prestigious areas have been gentrified by pulling a higher class of people, adding one more level to the speculative value of the project areas. Thus, a second group of people sold or rented their houses with speculative reasons voluntarily.

One of the project participants explains his reason of selling the house as to continue his son's education. He says he could both buy a house in another neighborhood of the city, within legal housing stock but not in a prestigious area and save money for the education of his son. In fact, the project participants who left the project areas mostly choose squatter houses again to resettle, first because they are cheaper, secondly because squatter housing offers them the life they get used to. Squatter housing is more affordable so they can use the rest of the money for other reasons. Moreover squatter houses reflect their own cultural formations to be the continuation of their rural lives in the city.

Most of the new population belongs to a higher class of people, 73.7% of the existing population in Koza street was migrated from middle-and upper-income residential areas of Ankara. The Vice Mayor was also stating that they tried to give houses to the participants and to the developers side by side to prevent ghetoization. The people from different income groups with different social and cultural backgrounds would be neighbors and live together. However recent experiences show that different social groups can not share their living environments. On the

contrary the contradictory elements of ways of life between the original and the new populations push these people into different sides. Butler (2002) explains this occasion as follows: Gentrification has not so much displaced the working class as simply blanked out those who are not like themselves: they don't socialize with them, eat with them or send their children to school with them. Thus, a third group of people has been displaced from the project areas involuntarily this time.

Additionally, inaffordability of the maintenance costs of the new houses has led to the dismiss of a fourth group again involuntarily. So approximately 90 % of the original populations are displaced as a total. I do not want to use replacement because replacement as an action emphasises a controlled mechanism in the hands of government or developers. However in the case of urban transformation projects in Ankara the local government seems to be surprised, nobody was expecting such a change in the population structure of project areas. I do not want to use direct-indirect as well because such a distinction brings gentrification originating from the project itself. Some may be originating from the project itself but some appears in time with the side effects of project developments. An increasing speculative value the projects bringing not only to the project areas but to their districts adds one more level to the existing rent gap thus pushing people to gain from this by leaving the area voluntarily. Today, Koza Street is one of the most prestigious residential areas of Ankara. Thus, it is a fact that the Municipality of Çankaya has reached one of its goals. The new Koza Street offers all the signs of a contemporary life style with its 4-storey apartment buildings with car parking places in front. Furthermore the construction company built very high apartment blocks nearby the project houses on the lands they gained as 50 % from the project area and these provided more luxury on space. Both Koza and Küpe areas have been gentrified to reach the economic and social status of their neighborhood.

References

Atkinson, R. (2000) "Measuring gentrification and displacement in greater London", *Urban Studies*, Vol.37, No.1, pp. 149-165.

Beauregard, R. (1991) "Capital restructuring and the new built environment of global cities: New York and Los Angeles". *IJURR*, Vol.15, No.1.

Butler, T. (2002) "Gentrification and its others: Some recent evidence from London", paper presented to the conference, Upward Neighborhood Trajectories: Gentrification in a New Century, Glasgow, 26-27 September.

Butler, T., Robson, G. (2001) "Social capital, gentrification and neighborhood change in London neighborhoods", *Urban Studies*, Vol.38, No.12, pp. 2145-2162.

Dutton, P. (2002) "Exporting forms of gentrification: understanding the ınfluence of the global city of london on the gentrification process in Leeds", paper presented to the conference, Upward Neighborhood Trajectories: Gentrification in a New Century, Glasgow, 26-27 September.

Dutton, P. (2003) "Leeds calling: the influence of London on the gentrification of regional cities", *Urban Studies*, 40, no.1/2, pp. 2557-2572.

Dündar, Ö. (2001) "Models of urban transformation, informal housing in Ankara", *Cities*, Vol.18, No.6, pp. 391-401.

Dündar, Ö. (2002) Patterns of inner-city migration in Ankara, In C.A. Brebbia, J.F. Martin-Duque, L.C. Wadhwa (Eds.) The Sustainable City II, The Regeneration and Sustainability, pp. 207-216, Southampton, Boston: WIT Press.

Erder, S. (1996) İstanbul'a bir kent kondu Ümraniye, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Hamnett, C. (2003) "Gentrification and the middle class remaking of inner London", *Urban Studies*, 40, no.1/2, pp. 2401-2426.

Hall, T., Hubbard, P. (1998) The entrepreneurial city and the 'new urban politics',in T. Hall, P. Hubbard (Eds.), pp. 1-26, West Sussex, England: John Wiley and Sons.

Lees, L. (2000) "A reappraisal of gentrification: Towards a 'geography of gentrification", *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 24, No.3, pp. 389-408.

Ley, D. (2003) "Artists, aestheticisation and the field of gentrification", *Urban Studies*, 40, no.1/2, pp. 2527-2544

Lyons, M. (2002) "Gentrification: the pebble in the pond", paper presented to the conference, Upward Neighborhood Trajectories: Gentrification in a New Century, Glasgow, 26-27 September.

Smith, N. (2002) "Gentrification generalized: from local anomaly to urban regeneration as global urban strategy", paper presented to the conference, Upward Neighborhood Trajectories: Gentrification in a New Century, Glasgow, 26-27 September.

Sassen, S.(1991) The global city, New York, London, Tokyo, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Uzun, C.N. (2001) Gentrification in Istanbul: a diagnostic study, Utrecht: Faculteit Ruimtelijke Wetenschappen, Universiteit Utrecht.