



---

Anthropological Writings On Urban Turkey: A Historical Overview

Author(s): Hande Birkalan-Gedik

Source: *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development*, Vol. 40, No. 1/2, Anthropological Studies on Turkey (SPRING, SUMMER 2011), pp. 1-66

Published by: [The Institute, Inc.](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41291337>

Accessed: 15-03-2015 17:34 UTC

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*The Institute, Inc.* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

# Anthropological Writings On Urban Turkey: A Historical Overview

Hande Birkalan-Gedik  
Department of Sociology  
Yeditepe University

**ABSTRACT:** The area of urban studies in Turkey constitutes an important corpus. It emerged in Turkey long before urban anthropological studies, embracing a variety of fields: urban planning, architecture, history and sociology, and including the involvement of diverse agents such as state officials, municipality representatives, and academics at universities. Considering the long history, yet the underrepresented nature of the "urban sphere" until recent years, I aim to set out the general context of anthropological research in/on Turkey by locating anthropological studies within the broader context of urban studies. I look at the determinant discourses, approaches, and forms of writing created by scholars in Turkey and from abroad, while considering the methodological relationship with neighboring disciplines. In the 1950s, Turkey suffered from a failing agricultural reform, which caused villagers to migrate to various metropolises: Istanbul, Ankara and İzmir. Following villagers into the cities was emblematic of Turkish research on the impact of modernization. This approach studied the *gecekondular* (roughly translated as squatters' settlements). Urban anthropology of Turkey in the 1960s and 1970s focused on particular issues such as kinship, modernization, and traces of rural life in urban space in the context of migration. Many field studies that are extensive

in urban studies in Turkey support the fact that the years between 1950 and 1980 are widely accepted as a period of chain migration. New causes of migration to the cities emerged in the 1980s, with the result that urban anthropology in Turkey considered various approaches to network research. In the 1990s, anthropology *in* cities versus anthropology *of* cities became the primary framework for research, through which urban anthropology in Turkey was able to move from traditional forms of ethnographic research designs and forms of writing to embracing different approaches to the study of emergent issues.

## Introduction

Yael Navaro-Yashin's *FACES OF THE STATE: SECULARISM AND PUBLIC LIFE IN TURKEY* (2002) begins with a description of Taksim Square, the famous demonstration site in Istanbul, where an Atatürk Memorial has been erected. Her book is among many recent studies that are emblematic of the growing interest in city life, shedding more light on Istanbul and focusing on the "political" in the public life in Turkey. In her book, she is particularly interested in looking at the relations between state and society. Although she does not classify her work as particularly "urban," Istanbul stands out as an icon for public life and the city. In fact, considering the public life in Istanbul both as a site and as a subject of anthropological inquiry, the work sets out social and cultural categories to understand Turkey in the late 1990s. This period was emblematic of an accentuated political turmoil between the Kurdish Workers Party (PKK) and the Turkish state. Furthermore, the scandalous Susurluk event<sup>1</sup> revealed the dark and deep relations within the state; and last, the Islamist Welfare Party's victory in the local elections in 1994 was a turning point. All these events were felt through the "pulse" of Istanbul, Turkey's greatest city.

In addition to this sociopolitical framework, Navaro-Yashin's work can be approached from a different, disciplinary angle, demonstrating a dramatic shift in anthropological stud-

ies from rural, and at times “tribe/nomad” oriented village studies, which characterized the earlier years of anthropology in Turkey for the study of complex societies. The interest in the rural can be considered both as a natural and national response to the ideals of modernization of the newly founded Republic. And ideologically speaking, the modernist discourse determined the approaches taken to the study of the rural, as the anthropologist’s and other social scientists’ response was similar to that of the state. Theoretically speaking, the structural-functionalist approach seemed the best way to study the topic. How, then, was the obsession with modernization, Westernization, and village studies replaced by the study of the urban and *in* the urban? What kind of political, theoretical, and epistemological frameworks worked vis à vis anthropology in Turkey in such a way that today, urban life has become an important topic for anthropological research, reflecting approaches from a variety of disciplines such as sociology, urban planning, geography, and many more. Yet, these studies fall short of producing an urban anthropological theoretical framework in the anthropology of Turkey.

Urban studies in Turkey constitutes an important corpus. It emerged in Turkey long before urban anthropological studies, embracing a variety of fields: urban planning, architecture, history and sociology, and including the involvement of diverse agents such as state officials, municipality representatives, and academics at universities. In this article, I aim to set out the general context of anthropological research in/on Turkey by locating anthropological studies within the broader context of urban studies. I look at the determinant discourses, approaches, and forms of writing created by scholars in Turkey and from abroad, while considering the methodological relationship with neighboring disciplines. As such, the article outlines the broad developments in the urban field that emerged. I organize the paper in a tripartite structure: first, I look at the development of urban studies outside the discipline of anthropology, which

nevertheless contributed to it; second, I examine the contexts of anthropological research in Turkey and the ways in which the initial focus on the “rural” changed to that of the “urban”; and third, I scrutinize the recent studies on the urban sphere, where we face a set of multidisciplinary understandings of which urban anthropology is one integral component. Linguistically, I will limit myself to the work in Turkish, English, and to a degree in German and French, as there are two important (one German and one French) research centers (*Oriental Institute* and *Institut Français d'Études Anatoliennes*, respectively) that focus on Turkish studies with a strong emphasis on urban research. Due to space limitations here, the writings I examine are also limited to those published in books and journals. As such, I do not evaluate theses and dissertations, except for those written by anthropologists who pursued a further career in the discipline. I exclude work on urban historical archaeology, urban linguistics, and urban economics, which are “less focused” topics; I also exclude studies on urbanization because that is the “most researched” topic, especially among architects and urban planners. Throughout the article, I am particularly attuned to the social, political, and historical contexts in which the study of urban within and outside of anthropology have come forward.

İlhan Tekeli, a renowned scholar in urban planning, evaluated the development of urban studies in Turkey from the 19th century to the 1950s in three phases (Tekeli 1986: 241-243): 1839-1876; 1876 to the 1930s; and the 1930s to the 1950s. Each of these periods was interrupted by significant regime changes: the Tanzimat Era, the Era of the Second Constitutional Monarchy, and the beginning of the multi-party system. The significance of the first period is that port cities grew tremendously, creating a capitalist process, as the first municipality in Pera (today's Beyoğlu) was established in Istanbul. In this period, the forms of the city began to change and urban transformation took place.

Although developments in the social sciences in the 19th century were mostly limited to urban planning, the disciplines of history and geography also considered the city. There are many "local histories" focusing mainly on the imperial cities, formerly imperial cities, or the port cities (see Tekeli 1986). However, the first sociological study on the urban is by Clarence Richard Jackson, then a professor of sociology at Robert College, titled *PATHFINDER SURVEY OF CONSTANTINOPLE* (Tekeli 1986: 251). In this period, important studies also focused on social-geographical aspects of cities, while historical studies continued. When the establishment of the Republic in 1923 brought about an interest in modernization, the focus of the studies shifted to "urban planning" and "urbanization." As such, the period between 1930 and 1950 was marked by the first important attempts in defining the scope of urban sociology as well. Sociologist Hilmi Ziya Ülken's writings had a historical aspect, where he mostly attempted to define the area of urban sociology for the first time in Turkey (Tekeli 1986: 263). And to this date, the scope and objects of "urban anthropology" (and sociology to a large degree) in Turkey have not been adequately discussed. In part, this has to do with the relationship between Turkish scholars, many of whom are not conversant with major works in languages other than Turkish, and foreign scholars, many of whom are not conversant with works published in Turkish.<sup>2</sup>

### **The 1920s-1930s: Theories and Frameworks of "Anthropology at Home"**

One of the first major frameworks of the development of anthropology in Turkey is the political relation of the discipline to the state ideology, widely understood as Kemalism. Although many anthropologists in Turkey might argue that

Turkey never had a colonial anthropological heritage, I argue that anthropology in Turkey was subject to a certain degree of hegemony in its own context. The early years of anthropology in Turkey displayed a “local/other” approach, which was contrary to the “mainstream” colonial anthropological traditions of scholarship in other countries that were interested in “non-western” populations (Birkalan-Gedik 2005: 74). Anthropology in Turkey, instead, designated another category for the “other”: the peasant, who at the time of the foundation of the Turkish Republic, comprised more than 80% of the total population of Turkey and whom it was thought was to be westernized through reforms.<sup>3</sup> Anthropology approached people as “objects to be developed,” while creating an “internal domination” over the people through the idea of “progress.” This meant, in the larger framework of *mission civilatrice*, to impose so-called “western ideas” onto people; modernizing the village and the villagers; and “Turkifying” the non-Turkish groups, whereby a “national progress” and a “national unity” could be achieved. Therefore, like most anthropological traditions of Europe and America, “ideology” became a key word in the formation of anthropology in Turkey as well. The idea that anthropology can and should help nation-building shaped the approaches taken to the study of primarily rural cultures. Furthermore, with the anxiety of the nation-state’s establishment based on “biological-cultural” foundations, anthropology was recognized as promoting the Turkish race, an idea which was then considered customary. As a result, the foundations of anthropology in Turkey were shaped by the national, neo-evolutionist, and modernist paradigms. To a large degree, the “*etatist*” ideology is still valid among some anthropologists and the approaches they take toward the study of anthropology in Turkey today,<sup>4</sup> as the topics, approaches, and groups have been conceptualized in the official discourse. If we are to evaluate the centrality of “village” and “villager,” we must remember the importance of “folk,” as it was understood in the framework of romantic-

nationalism, something which determined both folklore and anthropological studies in Turkey since the 1920s. As an extension of state policy that started with the establishment of the Republic, the national policy in the villages was spearheaded by Atatürk himself, and it constituted an important part of the modernization project.<sup>5</sup>

Another framework influential in the anthropology of Turkey was the impact of western theories, which also worked hand-in-hand with the idea of "progress" inherent in the state ideology. In the homemade development of anthropology in Turkey, continental approaches and theories heavily influenced the field until the Second World War. On the theoretical level, Durkheim's and Le Play's ideas in particular influenced anthropology in Turkey until the 1950s, creating a "sociological-ethnographic" school.<sup>6</sup> (See Birkalan-Gedik 2005.) This situation is apparent in the application of western theories in social sciences, at times without critically questioning the validity or applicability of western theories to non-western contexts. It is clear that in the study of urban anthropology, the Western theories of urbanism determined the Turkish scholars' approach in such a way that these theories left no room to accommodate the alternative understandings of social patterns.

The U.S. impact of anthropology became more apparent after the Second World War, when the U.S. became a "universal" power in the world system. The influence of U.S. anthropology, in the years to come, was first seen in the translations of the writings of American anthropologists, and later on through the works and teachings of the U.S.-educated Turkish anthropologists and sociologists who returned home. On the theoretical level, Durkheim's and Le Play's ideas in particular influenced anthropology in Turkey until the 1950s, creating a "sociological-ethnographic" school<sup>5</sup> (Birkalan-Gedik 2005). Starting with the 1950s, the impact of the Chicago School became more important. The Chicago School in the U.S., especially the writings of Wirth (1938) and Lewis (1959), impacted urban studies in

Turkey (Türkdoğan 1977, on the “application” of the culture of poverty approach; Karpat 1976, criticizing the applicability of the concept in *gecekondu*; Hart and Saran 1969 and Erman 1998, on the idea of “the village” in the “city”; Kıray 1964; Güneş-Ayata 1990; Erder 1997, 1999, 2002, 2006, on village migrants’ survival in the city and the importance of their networks). These works considered villagers as the kernel unit, later moving to analyzing village migrants in the city within the framework of “urbanism” and “urbanization.” In addition to this main category, the units such as “transhumant tribes” and “nomads” were also undertaken, but they were not treated with as much importance as the unit of “village” and the “villager” at the time.

### Different Anthropological Schools in Ankara and Istanbul

The Turkish Anthropological Institute in Turkey was established in 1925 at the Istanbul University Faculty of Medicine because it was primarily physical anthropology in the European tradition. In order to provide the necessary human resources for the Institute, Şevket Aziz Kansu, then an assistant in medicine, was sent to Paris to study anthropology, becoming the first professional anthropologist in Turkey. The curriculum of the Institute at the Istanbul University, although it had a few courses on ethnology, mainly targeted an education in physical anthropology (Kansu 1940). The newly established department focused primarily on physical anthropology and paleoanthropology, and devoted itself to research and publication during the period between 1925 and 1929.

Much later, Nermin Erdentuğ’s conducted research in the villages of Hal and Sün-Elazığ, Eastern Turkey on the “social and cultural structure of the Turkish villages” under the title of “ethnological research.” Erdentuğ’s work (1956, 1959) displayed qualities of structural-functionalism in which cultural

units were understood as parts of a greater unit, with a focus on family and kinship relationships in those villages. Erdentuğ received her Ph.D. with a dissertation about the agricultural change that nut cultivation created in the village (Erdentuğ 1973). Another figure at the department was Zafer İlbars (1975, 1981, 2000), who after her dissertation, focused on the “classical” topics of anthropology such as family and kinship, both in rural and urban contexts. Her work, however, did not methodologically distinguish between different environments.

In Ankara University’s Faculty of Language, History and Geography, a wave of Turkish researchers returned from the U.S. with an education in sociology and anthropology and introduced theoretical understandings of the Chicago School to Turkey. When we talk about the urban research mainly from the perspective of sociology and anthropology, an important name is Mübeccel Kıray, who forms a particular example of the intersection between urban anthropology and sociology.<sup>7</sup> In her work, one can find traces of the functionalist approach, as she sees the historical aspects as secondary. On the other hand, Niyazi Berkes established a link between the field situation and theory, especially leaning towards a theoretical understanding of “conflict,” influenced by Marxist approaches. Behice Boran, a pioneer in rural studies, argued for a *qualitative* [emphasis is mine] development of the villages to the level of the cities. Her urban research was very much rooted in the anthropological tradition.

Istanbul University’s Department of Anthropology, on the other hand, was structured according to an understanding of urban anthropology with a particular emphasis on applied work and social problems in the 1960s. This understanding is first due to the period’s interest in “solving” problems and the ways in which the discipline of anthropology could possibly contribute to these solutions. Second, it owes a debt in its evolution to its founder Charles William Merton Hart, an Australian born, naturalized U.S. citizen, who upon receiving

his education at Chicago University and the University of London, taught at Toronto University and Wisconsin University. He represents a continuity of the Radcliffe-Brown tradition as well as a U.S. anthropological heritage. The mission of the department was presented as "in the 20th century [in Turkey] the discipline of anthropology has a unique approach and perspective, which scrutinizes human beings with their main and sub-cultural milieus" (Saran 2009). The department treated anthropology as a tool in the mission of social problem solving, showing an affinity in terms of approaches taken to the study of the city by the Chicago School. As such, Saran and Akkayan focused on the transportation system in Istanbul (especially on *dolmuş-minibüs* system)<sup>8</sup> and discussed a particular methodology employed in their research (1981). The research was supported by the International Development Research Center. Another important work of the two authors is on the working youth population in relation to social problems (Saran and Akkayan 1988).

With the establishment of anthropology at Istanbul University in 1960, the first field research was conducted in Zeytinburnu-Istanbul. It is also Saran's first fieldwork on urban anthropology which she translated and published in Turkish (1969). The importance of the Zeytinburnu study is that it aims to show students of anthropology research methods on social problems, and to illustrate the founding causes of the *gecekondu* phenomenon (roughly translated as houses "built overnight") through actual fieldwork. Saran continued to work on the *gecekondu* in later years, however, the striking point in her research is the use of an alienating language when she talked about the people of *gecekondu*, reflecting an attitude of the "educated elite" (1974).<sup>9</sup> Saran's previous training in law, before she came to anthropology, is evident through her work on juvenile crime in the urban context. She implemented a project of four years in duration beginning in 1962, which resulted in a book manuscript, the first Turkish anthropological work on youth

and crime (1968). The influence of urban sociology, especially the impact of Robert K. Merton's "anomie," borrowed from Durkheim, is clearly seen in her work. Saran's monograph (1975) focused on university youth especially between 1968 and 1971, until the military memorandum of 1971. The research was a joint collaboration with the students in the department, aiming to evaluate the student events from a political perspective. Although she first began work in urban anthropology, Saran later on moved to rural studies where she also maintained an understanding of team fieldwork, ethnographically examining social structure, life ways, and social change (Saran 1984). Among the anthropological studies at Istanbul University, Akkayan's work on migration and change (1979) was heavily influenced from the sociological perspective, where he underlined that he particularly avoided historical context, as his focus is the *spatial* structural and cultural change *from* rural to urban [emphasis is mine]. Certainly, Akkayan's monograph is not his only work on urban anthropology. He also studied rural-urban migration and published his findings as articles (1971, 2003); he followed this with a publication on migration and security (1986). In his later work, he focused on small towns as well (see Akkayan 1983, 1990).

Methodologically speaking, it should be noted that studies on migration broadly framed in terms of *gecekondu* determined the "field" of anthropology at the Istanbul University Department of Anthropology. Situated at the rural-urban paradigm, data collection and analysis later incorporated demography in order to determine the magnitude of migration and the cities favored in the migration process. In addition to demographic methods and the use of surveys, procedures mostly borrowed from sociology, the department required participant observation as the primary anthropological method. As such, the studies on *gecekondu* at the department focused on the reasons for migration, the changing family and work structure, and educational opportunities for migrant families. The theme of

“cultural change” was brought into the foreground between 1963 and 1968. As Saran notes, the research also had a social mission “to show the half how the other half lived” (Saran 2009). The fact that the research was supported by the Ministry of Development and Housing is an example of state-academia-society relations in the near past that was once prevalent during the formative years of the Turkish Republic.<sup>10</sup>

### **The 1930s-1950s: Rural-Urban Transformation**

In the 1930s and 1940s, village studies, in which the contemporary anthropological approaches were used, were the most favored topics of the educated elite. Ağdur-Geçrek notes that Mediha Berkes was a pioneer in the writings on rural Turkey (Ağdur-Geçrek 1998: 265). Niyazi Berkes’s work in Ankara villages (1942) tried to map out the characteristics of the villages nearby. Behice Boran’s work (1945) in the Aegean relied on survey and compared two villages: one near the plateau and one in the mountains. Furthermore, the unit of analysis in the anthropological studies in Turkey continued to be the “village” in the 1950s as well, while monographs provided information on marriage, family, and kinship. In fact, most of the information on family came from these sources, as families in urban contexts are fairly new in the study of anthropology in Turkey (e.g., Duben 1982).

Studies at Ankara University’s Department of Ethnology focused more on material culture issues and other culture elements as a “lump sum,” using a descriptive approach, while the tradition by Kıray, Yasa, and Boran used a sociological understanding in the framework of “structuralist-functional” approach. Both traditions maintained a historical depth; however, after the 1950s, though in the work of Kıray, the historical aspect was in the background. Instead, sociological

methods, such as surveys and questionnaires, were used in field research.

The 1940s and 1950s can be described as a period of development in which fieldwork-based anthropological publications appeared as monographs, first focusing on the village, later on the city. As “structural change in society” became a buzzword for anthropology and sociology, the unit of village, which was thought to be more homogenous and static, was studied through the lens of social change. The best example of such a perspective is the work of Yasa in Hasanoğlu (1955), a village near Ankara, where he examined social change. The study relied on participant observation and questionnaires. Another important example is his study of the same village 25 years later (1969) in the framework of precursory ethnography, again maintaining a focus on social change.

Since the end of the 1950s, following villagers into the cities opened up a new category of analysis, as the late 1940s and early 1950s witnessed a rampant change in the ratio of rural–urban population. The impact of this change was observable in many cultural aspects. Thus, many social scientists turned to study the social and structural transformation of rural life. Anthropologists’ interest in the urban sphere grew in the 1950s, when Turkey suffered from a failing agricultural reform, which caused villagers to migrate to various metropolises: Istanbul, Ankara and İzmir. Following villagers into the cities was emblematic of Turkish research, especially studying the effects of modernization. This approach studied the *gecekondu* in a way similar to the British anthropologists’ work in Africa and the American anthropologists’ work in Latin America. The questions of research were limited to the social-evolutionist approach, as many (Kongar 1982; Erman 1998) re-considered the paradigm of rural-urban, often focusing on the ways in which migrants adapt to their new environments. The migrants’ alteration of social structure, interpersonal ties, and collective identities within the city were studied the most. Nonetheless,

most of the researchers studied the city as they would have studied the village, an approach which is close to the small scale community studies. As such, the first *gecekond* studies started in the fashion of monographs. The anthropology of urbanization, which was understood as rural-urban migration, stood at the intersection of the urban and the rural (see Karpat 1976).

There were several reasons for following the villagers in the cities: since the evolutionist approach was the main theoretical framework for social change, many researchers turned to *gecekond* and grounded their understanding of it in the realm of the "traditional versus modern" paradigm. The research was also supported and even patronaged by the state institutions in order to have a more in-depth view of this change. University departments as diverse as architecture, urban planning, sociology, and anthropology took part in field research conducted by not only native researchers from Turkey but also foreign research teams. The data were basically obtained through surveys, without much attention paid to in-depth interviews. For instance, in the later years into the research on *gecekond*, Emre Kongar's "urban integration" (Kongar 1982) became the main question in his study of *gecekond*. Similar to my argument above on the evolutionist character of the studies, Tahire Erman also underlined that the *gecekond* residents since the 1950s have been studied with reference to evolutionary models. They were seen as people who were caught "inbetween" (see Erman 2001, for analysis). It is also true that in the discourse of politics, city planners, and the elite, the term is often used as an evaluative, not as an analytic concept, emphasizing the "illegal" status of homes, reliance on self-help, and the inexpensive materials used in the buildings. Nonetheless, none of these criteria are appropriate to define *gecekond*. In my own work, I have argued for an alternative model to look at the *gecekond*, as a site of critique of modernity,<sup>11</sup> an approach which is only recently presented by the Bozdoğan (2010). Likewise, White's telling (White 2010) of the *gecekond* as a discursive field with

three components (academics, state and the *gecekondu* dwellers) also signals the approach I took in my research.

Different discourses presented towards studying the *gecekondu* has also been underlined by sociologist Sema Erder, who underscored that after the political climate of the 1980s, the rural periphery around the cities have evolved new forms of political demands on the housing and job markets according to the new forms of local politics. The social variations in the cities have to be handled according to this change and focus on the "new urbanites." Her study (Erder 2006) concentrates on three topics: local politics, common city origin and social networks. In her study of Ümraniye (2006: 218), a *gecekondu* in the Anatolian side of Istanbul, she concluded that migrants in the city, because they hang onto the city, should be evaluated as successful and that "they are still within the system of the city and they make the city structure." This study, which had a great impact on the internal migration studies and urban studies in Turkey, aimed to look at the new social stratification among the migrants in the city, emphasizing the role of the individual and the individual strategies to become what Erder termed as "successful migrants."

### **1960s-1970s: The Study of *Gecekondu*, or the Anthropology of the Urban and Urbanization**

In general, studies during 1960-1970 have focused on social problems, as the field for anthropologists moved from the village to the city. However, anthropologists soon discovered that social problems cannot be understood within a single framework, while many other layers might have contributed to them. Therefore, they employed an approach where they can study the topic deeper. This meant to replace the monograph tradition with a more detailed study on a single topic. The most important studies on *gecekondu* by Yasa in Ankara's *gecekondu*s

(1966, 1970, 1973) still relied upon the monographic tradition. In his later work, Yasa focused on 158 *gecekondu* houses and focused on the social structure of the *gecekondu* families (1970, 1973). Kıray's work in the city presented not only theoretical contributions and terminology, but also rich ethnographic data.<sup>12</sup>

By the 1960s, village monographs had already been replaced by work on *gecekondu*, which became identical with "urban anthropology" and "anthropology of migration." This period was marked by "development" studies as well. With this shift in focus, however, "urban anthropology" did not counter the traditional emphasis of anthropology in Turkey on "peasants" in favor of the urban, complex and industrial societies; rather, it complemented it, as its roots were more in continental sociology than in traditional anthropology.

Trained in sociology and philosophy, Yörükân aimed for a holistic approach and conducted research on the housing situation. He focused on sociocultural aspects of the *gecekondus*, calling them "lower income" neighborhoods. Yörükân (2006) referred to the theoretical influences of Robert Redfield on the folk-urban continuum, Max Weber and Howard Becker on typologies, and finally the distinction between *Geimeinschaft* and *Gesselschaft* of Tönnies. Gökçe's work (1976) focused on *gecekondu* youth, presenting a "fragmentation" of the unit she studied. Dubetsky (1976) closely examined kinship in the urban context in a factory setting; Kongar (1972) created a typology based on the families in İzmir; and Keleş, an urban planner himself, worked on the principles of urban research (1976).

In the 1970s a number of studies on small towns emerged, a tradition which is said to have started with the work of Kıray on Ereğli (1964) and continued to the present. Benedict's analyses on Ula (1974a, b); Mansur's study on Bodrum (1972); Magnarella's on Susurluk (1975), Akkayan's on Söğüt (1990); and Szyliowicz on Erdemli (1961) are outstanding ethnographic examples. Furthermore, in the context of the

provincial town, the transformation of class and gender roles was discussed in detail. Magnarella (1970) considered the typology of villager and townspeople, while Aswad (1974) focused on women's network in women's gatherings (see also Benedict 1976; Dobkin 1967; Tapper 1978) and Hatay (Aswad 1978), used indepth analyses to study class and power among women. Taken together, these studies form only a small section of research on people living in small towns, and it might be due to the fact the small town populations at that time formed only 5-6% of the total population of Turkey. A leading anthropologist in Turkey, Bozkurt Güvenç (1994) emphasizes that the work of Mansur (1972), Benedict (1974a, b), and Magnarella (1976) tried to theorize the small town, but since these studies were in English, the results did not inform Turkish anthropologists at that time.

The importance of Kiray's work on Ereğli is, first, that it shows the transformation of a small town into an industrial center. In her work, she compared the pre-industrial characteristics of that town with those of the post-industrial period. Second, methodologically, she initiated an intense schedule of interviews, thus maintaining a qualitative approach. Third, her research is also important from the point of view of the state, as it was supported by the State Planning Organization. Kiray also spearheaded the studies of small towns (*kasaba*), an important yet understudied aspect of modernizing Turkish society. She continued to work on the city with a group of sociologists from the Association of Turkish Social Sciences, which resulted in the publication of *İZMİR: ÖRGÜTLEŞEMEYEN KENT* (1972, republished in 1998). By bringing historical and sociological analysis together, she found out that İzmir did not develop an organized urban infrastructure as a metropolis. At that time, the study was received very positively, although methodologically there were some shortcomings. Yet, since the surveys were undertaken by an amateur group, they were unable to adequately develop a theoretical framework for the study. All

in all, however, despite all the shortcomings in its method, it was a new approach at a moment when the city in Turkey was studied primarily using statistical techniques (understood as “sociological” at the time). These new studies introduced a comparative approach and participant observation to the study of the city, methods which was once employed to study the simple-primitive societies.

Because of the Cold War, and Turkey’s increasing importance to the West, foreign researchers increasingly became involved in the study of Turkey. Turkey became an anthropological destination especially for U.S. scholars. The financial support for this interest, which was interrupted after the collapse of the Soviet Union, became prominent again in the 2000s. This time the topics varied, for example, from studying the Fethullah Gülen movement and Islamism (Tuğal 2009; White 2002), to the study of everyday life in the city as effected by national politics and international processes (Özyürek 2006; Navaro-Yashin 2002). The study of Islam by scholars of Turkish origin also signaled Turkey’s own ideological context, especially Turkey’s fascination with secularism. The new Islamism in the cities prompted researchers to reconsider the great narrative of the state, which supported the idea of progress away from religion and tradition. Research on Islam in the city challenged the great narrative of progress of the Turkish state, as the research presented alternative sociopolitical examples at the local and national levels. Turkish social scientists, especially whose ideology run parallel with Kemalism, were suprised that social practices, identities, and cultural locations co-existed with what is called traditional, religious ideas with the modern and secular ones in the urban settings.

Jenny White (2003: 77) observes that, by the late 1970s, studies focused on the intersection of social class and forms of production within the family and in community life, and that declining interest in the village studies was not due to the massive urbanization that occurred during this period,

but to developments in anthropology itself. Until the 1970s, anthropology was still influenced by the structural functionalist school, inspired by Durkheim, that viewed society as a closed and internally integrated system, the elements of which worked together as a whole.

### **The 1980s: A Political, Economic and Social Turn**

New causes of internal migration to the cities emerged in the 1980s, after the *coup d'état*, due to the ongoing "low-intensity" war in Southeastern Turkey. With the imposition of martial law, especially in rural areas, research was conducted with difficulty. Thus, from the perspective of urban research, several studies emerged in the 1980s. Ruşen Keleş's consideration of urban growth (1988) and Türköz Erder's work on urban (dis)integration (1982) and on the change of family compositions were supported by the Turkish Social Sciences Association and contributed towards an urban theory.

The framework of new modes of production (which was implemented by the Özal government in the 1980s, favoring privatization right after the *coup*) and the consecutive emergence of new social class dynamics can be seen in the small town studies, presenting various approaches to network research, while classical studies on migration also continued. The work on provincial towns with a focus on women emerged especially among the third generation anthropologists in Turkey after Kıray (1982) mapped out the general characteristics of women in small towns. Tapper worked on the wedding rituals, gender and religion, and home visits of women in Turkish towns (1978, 1985, 1990), bringing to light the gender roles in small cities, a topic which was not sufficiently treated in the urban context.

Psychologist Çiğdem Kağıtçıbaşı edited a volume with articles on social change and family (1982). Important in the

volume, from an urban anthropological perspective, are the articles by Duben and Kandiyoti. Duben considered the significance of family and presented challenging data on rural families (contrary to what is widely accepted). He showed that peasant families also lived in nuclear households in villages and that urbanization did not have a great effect on the composition of the families. Kandiyoti (1982) evaluated women from different classes and cultures and questioned earlier explanations of the "nature" of women in the urban sphere. In the anthropology departments in Ankara, research continued on women's work in the *gecekondu*s with an evaluation of the *gecekondu* families. İlbars considered women working outside the house and the impact of work on their statuses, and presented empirical data on two *gecekondu* neighborhoods in Ankara (1981, 1988). Her work is reminiscent of "comparative village studies," without much change in methodology. At Hacettepe University, Akile Gürsoy's dissertation (1980) considered the problems of working-class women in Ankara in terms of urbanization and work. Kıray's edited work (1991) on the structural change in Turkish society brought together articles on social change in the city (S. Ayata 1991; Öncü 1991; Arat 1991), while the theme of "peasants in the cities" continued by others such as Olson (1991).

Until the 1980s, the determining framework was how structural forces shaped urban experience. After that period, the most important transition in the anthropological study of the city occurred in the late 1980s with the introduction of political economy (Kümbetoğlu 1992; White 1991) especially from a gender perspective. Additionally, in this period, "center-periphery relations" and "cultural pollution" became fashionable frameworks in the study of rural-urban migration.

## The 1990s: Culture, Identity Politics, and Network Studies

By the 1990s, the metropolitan area became a space where different cultures came together. Consequently, space, memory, identity, belonging, acceptance and difference in politics all appeared as truths in their own right (see Bartu 1999; Erder 1999; Keyder 1999; Houston 2001a, b; Özyürek 2006). The main elements defining the post-1990s are the debates on identity politics and an empowered political Islam which transformed “new elites” and their lifestyles. Many social scientists realized that Turkey had an ambivalent relationship with modernity and had its own problems. The encounter with the concept of modernity in a context different from Kemalism complicated the scholarly analysis of categorical implications of embedded identities. I should mention that urban life in Turkey was not always analyzed through the lens of cultural or identity politics. Rather, it was located in the creative tension between Western theory and national ideologies, a framework in which the idea of “progress” was understood as Kemalism and vice versa. The theoretical frameworks through which scholars looked at cities (Bozdoğan 2002; Özyürek 2006; Houston 2005) fit right into the Kemalist project, which was seen as the order of the day.

The question as to why an identity politics approach came to dominate scholarship in this period can be legitimately raised. Here, I use the term “identity politics” not as a disciplinary fad, but as a concept, through which neoliberal governments produced and applied politics. That scholars turned to using the framework in academic work is illustrative of scholars’ sensibility to the political climate in Turkey. Especially after the 2000s, the AKP government’s policy of “openings” prompted social scientists to study ethnicity and religion in the city context, as these issues presented higher publicity and visibility in the urban setting. Therefore, in the 1990s, scholars started to conceptualize modernity in relation to globalization, which clearly revealed that the lower middle classes and the coun-

tryside played critical roles in the urban context. As such, in the 1990s, anthropology *in cities versus* anthropology *of cities* became the primary framework of research, as urban anthropology in Turkey moved from traditional forms of ethnographic research designs and forms of writing, to embracing different approaches to the study on emergent issues: urban communities, urban music, women's labor, gated communities and so on. Despite overlapping aspects, it could be argued that anthropologists in Turkey after the 1990s started to pay attention to the urban context, emphasizing the development of *international urban systems*, as they considered the interrelated nature of cultural, social, and economic life and especially of the impact of globalization on the urban context. The importance of textbooks and studies during the early 1980s (Gmelch and Zenner 1996 [first edition published in 1980]; Hannerz 1980; Press and Smith 1980) and translations of milestones on urban studies (Harvey 2003; Castells 1997) should be underlined, as they found an audience in the 1990s in Turkey.

In the 1990s, *gecekondu* studies continued to be an important topic, but with a different focus. Gökçe's focus (1993) is the transformation of traditional ties in the establishment of associations, an issue which is also taken up in the 2000s. Erman and Coşkun-Yıldar (2007) demonstrated that Turkish voluntary local organizations (such as neighborhood organizations of higher income groups) differ from those in the West in terms of their commitment to ideological as much as pragmatic issues. Furthermore, the network studies of *gecekondu* also meant a microanalysis, rather than the "holistic" approach in which anthropology took such pride. Erder's writings (see 1997, 1999, 2002) display such an approach. She conducted research on the informal sector among *gecekondu* inhabitants. In this decade, some precursory studies on urban religion started to bloom (see, for example, Gürsoy 1991).

Along the lines of "informality," the most exhausted topics in this decade, is women's labor in the *gecekondu*s (White 1991).

Furthermore, the research (e.g., Stokes 1992, 1999) on *arabesk* music as a “sub-form” of *gecekondu* studies also contributed to studies of the urban scene. More recently, the type of music researched shifted to “hip-hop,” associating it with the issues of the relationship between globalization and locality in the following decade (Solomon 2005). Network analysis in towns also continued. In network research, the focus on women’s networks came to the foreground. For example, Bellér-Hann’s (1996) work is emblematic of research near the Black Sea. Wolbert looked at the reception day among the migrants (1996).

In the 1990s, the observable paradigm change created an environment in which the reproduction of everyday life (family, community relations, and local politics) was put in relation to macro mechanisms of change (post-modern knowledge, state regulation, etc.). An example of that approach is in an edited volume *RETHINKING MODERNITY AND NATIONAL IDENTITY IN TURKEY* (1997) by Bozdoğan and Kasaba. In fact, particularly from an anthropological perspective, Baydar Nalbantoğlu (1997) describes in the spatial history of Ankara, a possible dialogue at the intersections between urban and rural cultures. Ankara is presented as the city that exemplifies the monumental narrative of modern Turkey, a city which shows several encounters between old (traditional, rural) and new (modern, urban) architectural and cultural productions. Similarly, Baydar’s edited work *75 YILDA KÖYLERDEN ŞEHİRLERE* (1999) can be read as a collection of essays which try to come to terms with internal migration, preserving a historical, multidisciplinary approach in the context of the city.

Influential in the increase in the numbers of studies on Istanbul was that some cultural events were recognized worldwide. The United Nations Conference on Human Settlements, also known as the Habitat Conference, was convened in Istanbul in 1996, resulting in a U.N. declaration on cities and other human settlements. It mainly focused on the problems of immense urban population growth, dysfunctional organization,

spreading slums and rising poverty. Presenting Istanbul as a world city resulted in a series of publications. For example, sociologist Çağlar Keyder (1999) brought together essays by anthropologists, sociologists, and ethnomusicologists. Here, the focus was Istanbul, representing both global and local aspects. Studies on the gentrification of older neighborhoods in Istanbul as it was impacted by “globalization” signaled new directions for research in the 2000s. For instance, Navaro-Yashin’s (1999) focus was the local culture in Istanbul, where she examined gender identities in the face of rising Islamicism. The urban sphere as a new axis of cultural differences mostly considered Istanbul. In their study, Aksoy and Robins (1994) showed that globalization has resulted in cultural fragmentation as the well-off classes isolated themselves in the margins of the city; while Ayşe Öncü (1997) confirmed that these new residences can be read as a longing for the “ideal home.” Robins and Aksoy (1995) focused on the debates on urban globalization and the formation of world cities and the attempts of the urban elites to modernize the urban structure and form in Istanbul, concluding that today there are (I would add, at least) “two Istanbuls”: One engineered from above by the urban elites, and the second rising from below as a result of the new cultural dynamics. The modern middle class was also studied with particular interest in globalization, consumerism and identity politics (White 2003: 79).

### **2000s: Global City, Transnational City, Cosmopolitanism and Transnationalism**

Another impetus for focusing on Istanbul in terms of the “urban” is its status as a cultural capital in 2010. *ORIENTING ISTANBUL: CULTURAL CAPITAL OF EUROPE* is a collection of essays by various scholars (Göktürk et al. 2010). Articles in the book give attention to globalization, urban regen-

eration, and arts events and cultural spectacles. Anthropologist Soysal, whose work had already maintained a focus on the city, looks at the debates on Istanbul as cultural capital. Similarly, a publication in German (Esen and Lanz (2007) also confirmed the position of Istanbul as a world city, bringing light to urbanization, *gecekondu*s, new economies, and gentrification.

In the 2000s, new models, which should not be confused with previous evolutionary schemes or the development of earlier urban typologies, have been introduced. The "World City" has been used to describe the changing economies of large central cities from a world systems perspective, and Istanbul suited this description best. The world city approach, however, stood in stark contrast to policy-oriented studies. Houston (2005: 103) suggests that "in brief, world cities research in Turkey, insightful in its analysis of the changing spatial environment of urban sites understood as nodes in global networks, is less attentive to the continuing project of the Republican nation-state to mark both spaces and subjects as Turkish."

Anthropological studies in this period also emerged more along the lines of ethnicity, identity and nationalism, not only among the populations in Turkey, but among the population flows *into* Turkey. As there were "new" forms of migration due to war and displacement and natural disasters in the the Middle East, Turkey became a favorite "waiting room" for the asylum seekers, the de-territorialized, and the "colored." Yüksekler and Brewer (2008) studied African migrants in Istanbul based on surveys; Özdil (2008) focused on the West African migrants in Istanbul. Akalın (2008) focused on the migrant women from the post-socialist countries in Istanbul in domestic work and employed in the gated communities. Similarly, Demirdirek (2007) examined the transnational space of the Moldovan migrant women in Turkey, after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Danış (2007) considered the case of a transit migrants: the Iraqi Christians in Istanbul and the emergence of a specific occupational niche within the domestic service. Yüksekler (2002, 2004, 2007)

published the findings derived from her research conducted in 1996-1997 in Istanbul, which focused on migrant women from the former Soviet Union in the informal "suitcase trade."

Having reviewed the outstanding work in the area of urban studies mainly from the anthropological and sociological perspectives, the question might be asked: was there a different type of city in Turkey other than Istanbul? Istanbul has been the most favorable spot for urban studies in Turkey, as more than 15 million live (according to some informal statistics, even close to 20 million) and go in and out of the city. There are studies on cities other than Istanbul, albeit limited in quantity: on İzmir, Kıray (1972); Keleş (1972); and Sevgi (1988); on Ankara, DüNDAR (2004); Şenyapılı (1985); Seyman (1986); Şenol-Cantek (2006); and Tekeli (1991), all of which have a particular focus on *gecekondu*. On a different process, Çınar (2007) focuses on "making of" Ankara and examines the modernity process and shows the link between the building of a city and the building of a state, a process which indicates similarities to the discourses on village, as I suggested at the beginning of this article.

Southeastern Turkey has become a new focus for urban studies embracing issues of ethnicity, social exclusion, and poverty: on Diyarbakır Gambetti (2005); Öktem (2004); and Şen (2005). Kerem Öktem (2005) discusses the peripheral city of Mardin, where he focused on a post-national building processes. Öktem's contribution is his exposure of different narratives about the city as a central stage for the discourse on Mardin's and Turkey's national identity. Ahmet Dikmen (2002) endeavored to untangle the relationship among urbanization, migration and poverty.

### **Major Topics/Themes/Contributions**

Due to social, historical and political changes, the topics which have not been studied in the anthropology of Turkey

increased in importance in recent years. Certainly internal changes in anthropology itself also contributed to the change in approaches taken to the study of urban anthropology as well. The dialogue between scholars living in Turkey and abroad, writing in Turkish, English, German and French, also expanded both the number and the methodologies of the studies. As a result, starting from the 1990s, studies on Islam, ethnicity, identity, gender and poverty started to emerge, bringing critical approaches to those fields. The most extensively studied issues, however, remain at the border of gentrification, urban transformation and gated communities, which can be labeled as the governing frameworks of recent urban research in Turkey. Contributions from such disciplines as feminist studies (with a particular focus on women's labor and domestic work as well as "gendered poverty"), oral history, memory studies, geography, and architecture also contributed to the liveliness of the urban research in Turkey.

### Islam, Identity, and Ethnicity

Sociologist Tuğal (2009) explored the reasons underlying the growing effectiveness of Islamic movements in a squatter district of Sultanbeyli, one of the poorest neighborhoods in Istanbul, demonstrating how Islamic movements have mobilized the poor and marginal intellectuals. He concluded that the Islamist party is widely supported, not because it has an Islamic essence, but because it produces a dialogic religious field by the interactions among the residents, the state, and Islamism. Tuğal's other work (2006; 2008, 2009a, 2009b) is also a result of the ethnographic research for his doctoral dissertation. He argued that squatter settlements today, "have also provided a vast vote bank Islamism that proclaimed itself totally opposed to the ostentatious consumption and luxurious lifestyles" (Tuğal 2008: 51). (For other works on Islamism in the urban

context see Houston 2001b; White 2002a, b). Similarly, Özler (2000) focused on the 1995 national elections where the Refah (Welfare) Party's victory was significant in the *gecekondu* politics. Houston (2001b) also worked on a tea garden / restaurant complex in Fethi Paşa Forest on the Anatolian side, which was built after the Islamicist Refah Party's victory at the elections in 1994 from the perspective of "Islamic modernity" and "public space." The "production of space" perspective can be seen in Houston's other work (2005) as he gives more weight to "political production." His analysis focus on what he terms "Kemalist cities," urban design, space and political subjectivity, derived from his comparative research in Ankara and Istanbul.

While *gecekondu*s remained an important field site in urban work, studies have more recently been heavily influenced by developments in identity studies, and researchers' discourse on *gecekondu* changed dramatically. Rather than seeing dwellers as passive agents, many researchers (such as Güneş-Ayata 1990, 1997) turned to study networks systems. Other studies focused on the ethnicity of the dwellers (Houston 2001) and their relationship to the political regime (Houston 2005). This shift also included the study of reconfigurations of ethnic and religious identities (especially Kurds and the Alevis, a heterodox group of Muslims of Anatolia) both in urban and trans-urban contexts. Studying migration in transnational contexts also facilitated studies on peoples from Turkey in Germany. This also questioned the classical "home" and "field" dichotomies, putting "native" "foreign," and "halfie"<sup>13</sup> scholars in a disciplinary and interdisciplinary dialogue.

While Çelik (2005) studied the Kurdish migrant associations, her work is more along the lines of ethnic studies than of urban studies. Seufert (1997) demonstrated the transformation of a Kurdish-Alevi tribe in the city, which is an example of studying traditional anthropological topics of the rural in urban contexts. Houston's work (2001a) on the Kurdish diaspora in globalizing Istanbul has a more direct reference to the

study of "urbanity," in terms of reconfiguring Kurdish identity in the metropolis due to the low-intensity war going on since the 1980s in Southeastern Turkey between the PKK and the Turkish state. Houston focused on a single family, and ethnographically reveals their experiences of migration and change in the city context.

### Poverty

Oscar Lewis introduced the term "culture of poverty" in the late 1950s, which he understood as a form of life that exists independent of economic and political deprivation. The ensuing criticisms (Valentine 1968; Goode and Eames 1996) emphasized that poverty in Lewis' work was measured only against deviant behavior. In Turkey, however, studies on poverty (other than "culture of poverty") are relatively new. The delay in working on the topic owes to the official understanding of the discourse on "progress," an understanding according to which there was no room for the unruly. Until recently, the concept of poverty (both rural and urban) has not been studied at length, although sociologist Türkdoğan (1974), influenced by Lewis, associated it with the culture of *gecekondu*, based on his research in Erzurum, the largest city with *gecekondus* in Eastern Turkey, which he studied in 1973. However, Türkdoğan did not bring any critical perspective to his study with respect to what cultural and social degree Lewis's thesis was "applicable" to the Turkish context. On that note, we must remember the work by Kemal Karpat (1976), whose work I have introduced in the earlier parts of my essay: Karpat, besides presenting the general characteristics of the *gecekondus* in the 1970s, brought together ethnographic and historical studies on migration by looking at migration in the Ottoman and Republican contexts. One of the major tenets of the book, unlike Türkdoğan's direct application of "culture of poverty," was that the *gecekondus* were

not slums and that the culture of poverty cannot be associated with these neighborhoods. The *gecekondu*s were expanding housing in answer to the needs of the dwellers, rather than being potential sites of crime.

Recently, however, the impact of globalization and neoliberal politics both in Turkey and abroad, lead the researchers to focus on the topic of "poverty" with a renewed interest in poverty studies as a social problem. They looked at forms of poverty in relation to state and local politics, the impact of macrosystems and the new urban classes in Istanbul. The sites and subjects of research extended to gated communities, ethnic populations and gender. Necmi Erdoğan's collected volume (Erdoğan 2009) brought together articles by anthropologists, sociologists and political scientists at the "intersections" of urban poverty and ethnicity, religiousness, and gender, also presenting firsthand accounts of the poor. In a different research, Işık and Pınarcıoğlu (2001) working in Sultanbeyli, one of the poorest neighborhoods in Asian Istanbul, showed the types of poverty and the role of the state and local governments in the heightening of poverty with reference to the informal sector and the newly rich in an Istanbul *gecekondu*. As such, "class" became an important part of urban research, as the concept was related to globalization and was a basis for "unskilled" squatter dwellers' structural position in Turkish society.

As a micro-perspective was utilized in post-1980 urban research, scholars studied the reasons and the ways of coping with poverty among different communities, rather than seeing it as a superorganic concept. On that note, Keyder's view on social exclusion (2005) has references to gated communities, as he believes that the emergent young professionals since 1980s worked along the lines of their transnational counterparts. Their lifestyle in gated communities widened the gap between the poor and the rich created a new periphery. In conclusion, Keyder called for a new social policy that should be implemented by the state. Similarly, Ayşe Öncü (1999) ex-

amined the cultural dynamics of exclusion and poverty; Ersoy (2002) associated the term with migration in Diyarbakır; while Kümbetoğlu (2002) evaluated poverty in a post-disaster context; Kalaycıoğlu (2006) examined urban poverty with reference to social networks.

As Istanbul stands at the center of research, Yılmaz's work (2003) is on the disadvantaged groups in Istanbul-Tarlabaşı can also be enumerated among the studies on poverty. There are also other ethnographic studies focusing on different cities. In Diyarbakır, Leyla Şen (2005) focused on women's views; and Özbek Sönmez (2007) presented a more general view on poverty in the case of İzmir. Bediz Yılmaz (2008) also focused on the poverty of displaced Kurds in the inner-city neighborhoods in Istanbul. Dayıoğlu (2006) looked at child labor and household income.

### Gentrification, Urban Transformation and Gated Communities

Because Istanbul has undergone a neoliberal restructuring over the past two decades, the phenomenon of gated communities emerged by the 1990s. As a result, many researchers began to study the phenomenon from various aspects, but mainly from the perspective of urban segregation. With multiple projects of historic preservation, gentrification, and urban renewal, Istanbul has been transformed over the last two decades into a paramount metropolis. The state-sponsored large urban transformation projects are the main mechanisms through which a neoliberal system is instituted in commodified cities. In this context, the *gecekondu* studies continued, as they had direct references to the gated communities and poverty. For example Bozkulak (2005) focused on residents' self-perceptions in Gülsuyu, a neighborhood in Asian Istanbul. Erman and Eken (2004) focus on urban violence in "peripheral" neighborhoods

and looked at the potential sources of conflict. Two sociologists, Kuyucu and Ünsal (2001), focused on two projects: one in an informal housing zone and another in the inner-city slum in Istanbul and discussed the motivations behind the new urban regime.

On this note, Pötüoğlu-Cook's work (2006) on dance and gentrification in Istanbul considered the city context not only from an anthropological perspective, but it also from an interdisciplinary approach. She examined the complex interplay among shifting practices of belly dance, new Islamic veiling, and urban space in contemporary Istanbul. In a similar vein, Uzun (2003) examined three urban residential transformation processes in Turkey, two in Istanbul and one in Ankara, with different structures. They evaluated the differences with respect to their impact on the social and spatial structure in these neighborhoods. Besime Şen (2005) reflected on gentrification as a new form of segregation in her fieldwork in the "old" neighborhoods of Istanbul. In that respect, the "historical heritage" was underlined by anthropologist Ayfer Bartu (1999, 2001a), who concluded that re-imaginings of the past and current globalization attempts are in tension. Ayşe Öncü's focus (2007) was theme parks as sites of "cultural heritage," which she showed were used as marketable commodities. Based on ethnographic data, sociologist Dikmen Bezmez (2007) and Senem Zeybekoğlu (2008) examined the urban regeneration along the Golden Horn, while an urban planner, Tolga Islam (2005), focused on gentrification, highlighting the role of development, rural forms and commercial aspects (2005). Arıkanlı-Özdemir (2008) chose to work in Karanfilköy, a *gecekondu* site, which is also the focus of Sevil Alkan's fieldwork (2008), a site where she examined globalization.

While the previous literature on families and kinship referred mostly to the rural, the "modern," middle class, they were analyzed in the framework of neoliberalism in the 1990s (Öncü 1999), consumption (Kandiyoti and Saktanber 2002) and

globalization (Keyder 1999). Within this framework, “public” in the urban sphere also became a topic of interest. Ünlü-Yücesoy (2008) considered the impact of gentrification on urban public space. Because Istanbul has been marketed as a world city in recent campaigns, including the 2010 cultural capital status and the previously held meetings, Ozan Karaman (2008) provided an analysis on the urban transformation campaign launched by the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality (IMM) as part of such efforts. He showed that the poor residents’ livelihoods are put at stake in spite of the Greater Istanbul Municipality’s claim that “urban transformation” is ultimately beneficial for all citizens. In a similar vein, Kevin Robins and Asu Aksoy (1995) take the debates on urban globalization and the formation of world cities as their starting point. They discuss the attempts at transforming Istanbul into a global metropolis. They consider the attempts of the urban elites to modernize the urban structure and form, in line with economic strategies taking place in other world cities.

Studies on gated communities can be approached from two different perspectives: those which focus on the urban phenomenon from merely textual perspectives, treating “gated community” as an object of desire, an idea that is promoted by designers and marketers (see Güvenç and Işık 1996; Bartu 2001a; Öncü 2007); and those with an ethnographic focus (see Akalın 2008; Kurtuluş 2005b; Bartu 2001b). Political scientists, sociologists, urban planners, and architects helped form a growing body of literature on the gated communities, as some of them worked on the discursive level and some worked on the ethnographic level (Öncü 1997; Ayata 2002; Bali 1999, 2002; Bartu 2001b). For instance, Ayata’s work (2002) on the “suburban middle classes” to gated communities, which became the norm in suburban Ankara in the 1990s, is based on survey research and interviews conducted with the residents.

Kurtuluş’s edited volume (2005b) (all the studies of which were based on ethnographic data) presents a common theoreti-

cal background for the articles in the book and the authors in each paper analyze the social and spatial transformation of Istanbul from a critical historical perspective. Danış and Pérouse (2005) focused on different gated communities in Istanbul, one on the Asian side and one on the European side. They treated spatial and social transformations in urban environments primarily based on data they extracted from construction firms's advertisement brochures. Other information came from Danış's work (2005; see also Danış 2001) who conducted in-depth interviews with residents. Bartu-Candan and Kolluoğlu (2008) investigated two urban spaces, a gated town and a public housing project, with a particular emphasis on the new forms of urban wealth and poverty in Istanbul. In the gated community, they found segregated compounds, where urban governance is increasingly privatized. In a similar fashion, Sibel Bozdoğan's work (2010) explored the transformation in the housing design, from the republican modern aspirations of apartments to the isolated gated communities and villas with a garden.

### **Feminist Contributions**

Feminist contributions to the field of urban research in general and urban anthropology in particular offer a valuable terrain for studying urban life in Turkey. Certain issues regarding women in urban contexts have been favored in scholarship, among which veiling, women's labor and domestic work, marriage, Islam, and ethnicity have particular importance, and thus should be underscored. Because the Second Wave of feminism in Turkey had a tremendous effect on the shift in the study from "women" to "gender," it also resulted in an increase in the number of studies on sex and sexuality in the urban context. Previously, the study of the women's issues had been mostly limited to family and fertility issues. Kandiyoti's work (2002) focused on transsexuals in the city, while Öncü (2002) examined

sexuality as public spectacle. Erman (1997) explored the meaning of city life for Turkish women in *gecekondu*. She examined their role in the migration process and in establishing their lives in the city, letting women speak about their own experiences, challenging the stereotypical images of Islamic migrant women who are depicted as passive followers of their husbands to the city and as subordinate or passive in the city.

### Women's Labor and Domestic Work

The change in the representations of *gecekondu* and *gecekondu* women also impacted other topics of study in the urban areas. Especially in the 1990s, many books and articles were published. One of the pioneers in women's work is Yıldız Ecevit (see, for example Ecevit 1991, 1993), the founder of the Gender Studies program at METU, who had a Ph.D in sociology and anthropology. Similarly, Kümbetoğlu, who completed a pioneering dissertation (1992) on the contribution of women from the informal sector to their households in Istanbul, worked on the *gecekondu* women's home-based money earning activities (1994). Psychologist Hale Bolak (1997a), based on a series of indepth interviews with blue-collar women and their husbands in Istanbul, examined the negotiation of family work in households in which the wives are major providers. She showed (1997b) that cultural ideology and structural factors played important roles, which also effect marital negotiations, where women engage male authority.

In the 2000s women's work and domestic work were widely studied: Erman et al. (2002) focused on Turkish domestic labor which is transferred from the rural to the urban, accentuating "subjectivities" of the domestic female workers. Özyeğin (2001) focused on domestic work in Turkey, mostly performed by the migrant women in the city, producing a series of articles on their control of the money they earn and how this money

creates status in the family. Based on the same ethnographic data, her group comprised the wives of doorkeepers, a concept that developed in the process of rapid urbanization (2005), and utilizing surveys to study the “doorkeeper” families, who lived and worked in “middle-class” neighborhoods in Ankara, and their interactions with employing residents (2002). Similarly, Aksu Bora’s work (2005) on women who provide domestic services can be read along these lines.

The 2000s also mark an intersection between ethnicity and women’s labor. Kümbetoğlu (2005) examined young migrant women from the former Soviet Union and their networks in the process of informalization. Üstündağ (2005) worked on the subjectivities of Kurdish women in Istanbul, while Akalın (2007) examined women from post-socialist countries who started migrating to Turkey in the second half of the 1990s. In a similar vein, Dedeoğlu (2008) focused on the experiences of women working in Istanbul’s low-paid garment industry. She showed that in such industries workers in general, and female workers in particular, were made invisible. Based on the same data collected in 1999 during her fieldwork, Secor (2003b) treated the spatial practice of work as a critical element to the constitution of what it means to “be a woman” in the Turkish context.

In the post 1980 period, the most important study on Islam and women is the work of Arat (1994). Additionally, an ethnographic-oral historical example is that of İlyasoğlu (1994), who focused on Islamic women. Later work on women and Islam also considered veiling as an issue of representation (White 1999) and as urban fashion and commodity (Gökarıksel and Secor 2009, 2010a). These scholars focus on “veiling-fashion,” a concept which continues to be a controversial issue in Turkey today and analyze it as a factor that influences economic, political and cultural fields. They conclude that it has a new role in understanding Islam in the global arena. Likewise, since her dissertation fieldwork in 1999, Secor (2003b, 2004) sees veiling

as a spatial practice that gains significance through women's urban mobility and their construction of Islamic understandings in the city. Navaro-Yashin's work (1999) on the tension between the Islamic and secularist identities in Istanbul should be mentioned.

The issues of ethnicity and identity also started to carry a "gender" component as, for example, Heidi Wedel sampled the political participation of Kurdish women in squatter settlements in Istanbul and discussed their subjectivity along these lines. She showed that Alevi-Kurdish women's participation in civil society is limited to the *hemşehri* (common city origin) associations (Wedel 2001a, b; Gedik 2008). Kümbetoğlu (2001) evaluated the participation of women in local civil initiatives. Onaran-İncirlioğlu's (2006) work in Ankara's oldest squatter settlement, Çınçın Bağları, looked into the lives of gypsies, as the neighborhood is demarcated as such and is not officially recognized in the registry. (See also, Foggo 2007.) This issue is also related to gentrification and urban regeneration as many elite wanted to purge the old neighborhoods of their neighborhood dwellers. The case is not peculiar to Ankara, but also to other cities with the implementation of urban regeneration, as seen in the ethnography of Binnur Öktem (2005) in Istanbul. The work on *gecekondu* continued to occupy a central place in anthropology, sociology, geography, architecture and many other disciplines. Tahire Erman, trained in architecture and environmental psychology, contributed to different aspects of *gecekondu*. First (1998) concerned with the question of the rural-urban continuum, Erman later (1997) focused on the role of women in migration, violence in *gecekondus* (Erman and Eken 2004), and women and neighborhood associations (Erman and Türkyılmaz 2008), however, mistranslating the word *gecekondu* as "slum."

## Other "Urban" Disciplines: Oral History, Geography, and Architecture

Since the 1990s, a burgeoning literature on the urban, not only from an anthropological perspectives, but also from the perspectives of oral history, memory studies, geography, and architecture, emerged, as the scope of "urban research" widened. Just to name a few important recent examples from a historical perspective, Behar (2003) examined fruit vendors and civil servants in the Kasap İlyas neighborhood in Ottoman Istanbul. Other examples of historical work had a comparative aspect of the "Ottoman city" (Eldem et al. 1999); and urban families and their socio-historical and demographic contexts (Duben 1982; Duben and Behar 1991). Recently, Gül (2009) charted the urban transformation of Istanbul during the late Ottoman, early Republican and Democrat Party periods. These historical studies provide important information on the transformation of the neighborhoods by providing an understanding of the "historical city," "Ottoman city," or "Islamic city." Taken together, the conceptualization of the city as such can fruitfully work with the current ethnographic interests, as we see in the oral historical approaches to the study of the city. For example, the U.S.-trained anthropologist Leyla Neyzi's (1999) consideration of individual's memory and a sense of belonging brought together 37 indepth interviews she collected between 1995 and 1999, shedding light on how individuals experienced the city. Likewise, *STREETS OF MEMORY* (2010), a book based on Amy Mills' dissertation, contributed to community studies by bringing ethnography and history together. Mills' field site was Kuzguncuk, a "multicultural," old-fashioned neighborhood with an intimate social character in Asian Istanbul, where she worked on issues such as nationalism, ethnicity, identity, and locality. Her work appeared in diverse journals: (on cultural identity, 2005), (landscape and social memory, 2006), and (cosmopolitanism and minorities 2008). Memory

studies approach can be seen in the work of Aslan (2004), who focused on *1 Mayıs Mahallesi* (May 1/1 *Mayıs*: Labor Day in Turkey) a neighborhood in the Asian side of Istanbul where leftists, working class and village migrants live. He focused on the ways of remembering how the mafia and the local governments worked in the neighborhood, which is representative of pre-1980 politics.

Cultural geographer Anna Secor (2004) developed an analysis of citizenship and everyday spatial practice in Istanbul through the narratives she collected in focus groups with Kurdish migrant women. She confirmed how participants narrate their own spatial stories of resistance to and appropriation of dominant codings of “the citizen” and “the stranger” in the Turkish context. She also examined citizenship, gender, and urbanism in Istanbul. Analyzing four focus group discussions conducted in Istanbul in 1999, Secor (2003a) looked at multiple ways in which migrant women of different ages and backgrounds position themselves in relation to Istanbul’s urban community, their own “right to the city,” and the informal and formal channels through which claims to urban space and resources are pursued. In the framework of citizenship and social and political trust, she made a comparison between Istanbul and Moscow (Secor and O’Loughlin 2005) mainly based on questionnaires in both cities, tying urban research into more global aspects of cultural systems.

## Conclusion

Having reviewed a large body of scholarship, what can be concluded from the above discussions in order to gain insight into the context of scholarship? What kind of patterns and trends can be generalized from these studies? It is clear that not all the works critically reviewed here have impacted the field of urban anthropology in Turkey; however, some patterns can

be generalized in terms of disciplinary terrain as well as the relationship of these studies to sociopolitical contexts.

**1- WHY study the city/Issues related to society, state, and the discipline of anthropology:** Urban anthropology in Turkey has been heavily influenced by social, cultural and economic visions of the state. In this framework, village and villagers that carried utmost importance both in the eyes of the Turkish state and anthropologists' approach to the "objects" of inquiry, was replaced by the studies in urban settings roughly around in the 1960s. Certainly, this shift is not unprecedented. The early Republic's ideal of a "progressed village" meant to collect firsthand information in the villages in the fashion of monographs. Delaney reminds (1998: 191) that village studies in Turkey were marked by studies on the mode of production, social organization, social change, and state and village relationships, were done under the supervision of the state which aimed to create a sociocultural profile of villages in concert with state ideology. Similar to Delaney's observation Nükhet Sirman (2001: 251) points out that village studies initially focused on kinship systems and economic investments, and in recent years on religious differences and (to a very limited degree) on ethnic studies (e.g., Kurds, the Lazi and Circassians) and internal migration. However, after the 1950s, internal migration, failed agricultural reforms and other sociopolitical elements caused villagers to migrate to the city, and anthropologists followed the villagers in urban settings.

Carol Delaney calls this spatial shift of focus from the "rural" to the "urban" as "decline" in village life (Delaney 1998) and a subsequent "decline" in village studies. Sirman explains (1996: 116-117), the reasons for this decline: the shift from larger agricultural activities to agricultural work done by families, and the migration to cities. Furthermore, the 1980s created a political vacuum which also influenced the research towards villages, resulting in a radical change from a "nation-

alistic progress” paradigm to a “capitalist system” paradigm. Consequently, urban anthropological studies developed in this context, although the precursory work was done mainly on the massive rural-urban migrations since the 1960s.

In the realm of urban studies, there is also a similar trend in the involvement of the state in the process and results of research. Urbanism was the subject of both state and scholarly interest because the “statist” understanding of modernity based on urban life was associated with the idea of progress. Urbanization meant modernization for the Turkish Republic and for certain of its scholars (see, Şenyapılı 1985, for example). Considered from the perspective of the discursive interplay between academics, the state, and the subjects of urban anthropology (particularly exemplified in the studies of *gecekondu*), it might be useful to recall what Jenny White (2010) reminds us: We can talk about three linked sets of voices shaping the discourse of cities in Turkey: the state, scholars and migrants. Early studies were sponsored, even commissioned, by the state. Certainly these studies reflected state interests. The later anthropological studies that are not directly linked to state interests were carried out only after the 1950s and 1960s. Finally, village migrants in the cities reshaped the nature of their relationship to the city and the state over time in a way that required new approaches (White 2010).

**2- The SCOPE of urban anthropology/HOW it interacts with other disciplines:** Urban anthropology in Turkey today has largely incorporated ideas and practices from geography, ecology, and economics, music, and other disciplines, producing what I call an “anthropological sphere of urban studies.” Along with a theoretical interest in and conceptualization of urban space and urbanism, overall, the issues of contemporary urban anthropology include rural-urban migration, adaptation and adjustment of migrants, the effects of urban settings on cultural pluralism and social stratification, social networks, the

function of kinship, employment, the growth of cities, architecture, crime (and other urban dilemmas), youth, and practical urban problems such as housing, transport, use of space, urban regeneration, and gentrification. The contribution of feminist studies to the study of the urban should not be underestimated, as feminist approaches also cut across disciplines and present a variety of methods and methodologies. Feminist approaches also contributed to the discussions on the variations of categories such as "native," "halfie" and "foreign," where the delineation today is more difficult due to the "theory transfer," either through anthropologists' education and their current teaching or what they wrote. In the feminist realm, urban religion, rural migration, women's informal work, functions of neighborhood associations received considerable attention.

**3- HOW does urban anthropology study its topics?/Urban anthropological methods:** The general patterns of urban work in the anthropological sphere can be characterized as follows: During the 1960s and 1970s, the major work mainly looked at "classical" topics such as kinship, the role of the individual, and the "rural-urban continuum," which resulted in descriptive monographic ethnographies, with the exception that these issues have been transplanted to urban settings. There was an emphasis on the demographic features of migration, especially the "documentation" of rural-urban migration. Mainly, survey methods were used and there was a group fieldwork tradition, especially among the scholars and students of Istanbul University. This type of work emphasized the importance of anthropology in solving "social problems" in the context of the city. The ethnographies were mainly single-site ethnographies and they were framed as "realistic." A single topic for research was chosen, for example changing family patterns among city migrants or the functions of voluntary associations. (The examination of the nature of family relations and the role of voluntary associations beyond the *gecekondu* neighborhoods, or

their effects in national level began in the 1990s.) Studies in the city have have mostly been oriented towards developmental anthropology, with an idealized notion of modernization. Most of the studies were in the positivistic tradition.

Different research studies in urban anthropology, like those in mainstream sociology, focused on smaller units in cities after the 1980s. By the mid-1980s, but mostly in the 1990s, anthropologists expanded their interests to additional aspects of urban life. The prominent studies focused on small-scale issues: communities in the city. After the 1990s, the perspective in Turkish ethnography shifted to multisited and comparative studies, as exemplified by Bartu Candan and Kolluoğlu (2008). Last but not least, instead of lengthy monographs, shorter articles which are based on shorter fieldwork experience appeared in diverse sources. Studies look at the micro experience, but scholars related them to macro issues, such as globalization.

Especially after the 1990s, the main method, i.e. "participant observation," the *sine qua non* of Turkish anthropology in rural settings, to a large degree, renewed itself in the urban context. Anthropologists (and to a degree sociologists) of the urban adapted to the new environment by extending their methodology to develop new skills through a series of dialogues with other disciplines to include surveys, historical studies, discourse analyses, and oral histories. However, the challenge is then to grasp the realities of larger groups without giving up ethnography and without reducing the city to a mere text. In the ethnographic approach of the 1990s and into the 21st century, ethnographies of social relations and network analyses in the city considered political alliances (common city origin, ethnicity, religion), and market relationships. In this period, studies of community and family displayed characteristics of more sophisticated versions of the "classical" anthropological topics. Ethnographically, political alliances and the role of Islamic power in low-income neighborhoods (see Tuğal, esp. 2008, 2009a) became important gateways to understand the

complexities of city life exemplified at the national level. After the 1990s, ethnicity and women in the context of the city emerged; however, not all studies on women in the city can be classified as feminist. Until now, most of the anthropological studies focused on women's work and workplaces in the informal sphere: the market, homework, and domestic service. But an emphasis on "the gendered city" is still lacking.

In addition to ethnographic fieldwork, textual and discursive methods have been employed. The textual/discursive approach can be understood in the framework of "changing representations of" or "changing discourses on" the city: cities of immigrants, world city, or divided city; hidden barriers of race and class in housing options, and housing policies. All of which were related to the idea of "the new urban poverty" in which the local and national governments, the informal sector, and civil society were intertwined in creating and remedying poverty in the cities.

In the 2000s, Istanbul has been discussed in the framework of "representational cities" (see Göktürk et al. 2010). Critiques of power/knowledge of planning and architecture emerged with subjects studied including urban regeneration, urban segregation, and gated communities. The general patterns of the 2000s can be given as "ethnic city," "segregated city," and "global city" borrowing the term from Low (2005), mostly culling examples from Istanbul.

**4- PROCESSES of writing anthropology/Language and audience issues:** One of the important aspects of anthropological writings focusing on urban life in Turkey relates to the writing and reception of anthropological texts. There seems to be a communication issue due to the use of different languages, which creates different audiences. Most of the studies by Turkish scholars were written in Turkish and circulated among the foreign researchers who understood Turkish. On the other hand, the works of English-speaking researchers were well re-

ceived by Turkish scholars. Turkish anthropologists frequently publish in English, as a reflection of a trend by Turkish graduate students for training in the U.S. There is, however, another line of publication which appears in Turkish mostly maintained by urban scholars (primarily architects, urban planners, and geographers who unwittingly or otherwise chose to or can only write in Turkish) at the universities where the medium of education is Turkish. One should remember that Turkish is the medium of education in many universities while there are some universities that use English. Most of the examples are written in Turkish either as articles or unpublished dissertations, making the accessibility to these works by English speakers more difficult. On the other hand, publications in English are much more available to Turkish scholars. Writing for a foreign audience creates networks outside Turkey, while in Turkey an anthropological voice is rarely heard in urban studies or urban policy discourse.

In conclusion, it is clear that urban anthropological research and writings in Turkey are growing. There remains, however, some important issues which have not been studied either properly or not at all, for example education and health care systems which are the two urgent issues in urban Turkey. Also, research projects that "study up" (to borrow the term from Laura Nader), are imperative for the Turkish scholars of the "urban." Anthropology in Turkey, which has a "home-made" character, can, through the work *in* and *of* the urban, relate the work to the broader arena of the world system, rid its introverted character, and have a holistic dialogue within the discipline and beyond. Other topics which were exhaustively researched in rural settings but not in urban contexts are "honor, reputation, and hospitality," as Jenny White (White 2003: 79) astutely observes, but have not been studied in urban settings, "even though the majority of Turks now live in cities."

There are also some methodological problems in the urban research, which also relates to the theoretical issues. While

interdisciplinary studies enrich the study of the urban, anthropology has to maintain its own disciplinary methods and boundaries, yet continue to establish dialogues with neighboring disciplines. However, an anthropological challenge remains to maintain the holistic character of anthropology and maintain small-scale research in cities. The answer seems to follow what Ulf Hannerz (1980) describes as "detailed local ethnography."

On the theoretical level, one can observe that while the Turkish village was over-generalized, there is no standing anthropological theoretical perspective on the Turkish city. There are compartmentalized discussions and emergent topics, and networking among scholars is weak. There is not a single tradition of "urban anthropology," while instead there exists a fragmented character of research: diverse ideas, a constellation of concepts, and a bundle of frameworks used to analyze and to write about the city. On this note, one has to recall Sirman's critique (2001: 252) on conceptualizing village and city. Is a village a "miniture" form of the urban? Or, is the city a "dynamic" version of the village? How should one understand the two? Instead of seeing village and city as interpolated units, one should think about urban studies together with the studies of the rural (Sirman 1996). Similarly, White observes that with urban studies, the anthropology of Turkey came to full circle, displaying a continuum with village studies. But it should not be understood in the framework of "traditional" versus "modern" nor "rural" versus "urban." "These studies, taken as a whole, provide a more holistic picture of Turkish society that, in some ways, transcends geography and historical period (White 2003: 85). It can be rightly argued that there are not any particular studies on urban anthropological theorizing per se by Turkish academics except for what İlhan Tekeli noted for Ziya Gökalp (Tekeli 1986: 251) and Hilmi Ziya Ülken (1986: 261), the two important figures of sociology and sociological theory in the early years of the discipline. I would add to that

that one also has to look at works by Mübeccel Kıray, whose ideas must be renewed in the face of new developments both in Turkey and in the world.

The lack of theory in urban anthropological writings on Turkey cannot be separated from the general disciplinary character of anthropology in Turkey. Turkish data are rarely used in theorizing. This is true of native, "halfie," and foreign scholars of anthropology in Turkey. Anthropologists use mixed methods such as the integration of textual analyses with other anthropological methods. On the other hand, many other social scientists turn to small-scale ethnographic fieldwork projects. Urban analysis in Turkey has been left to a group of scholars who draw from architecture, history, geography, planning, sociology, and economics matching their own disciplinary methods with that of ethnography, especially in the last few decades.

Thirdly, when I discuss the lack of theorizing, I should also mention the lack of visibility of anthropologists. Anthropological data are essential to understanding urban problems; however, anthropologists have been hesitant to participate in urban public policy debates. This fact is true not only for urban anthropology, but also for anthropology in general in Turkey. In sum, it seems that the problem is not the absence of the city in the anthropological landscape in Turkey, but rather this line of inquiry has not been theorized adequately and has not had a major theoretical impact in the study of Turkey. The fact that more than half the population in Turkey now lives in cities gives the urban anthropological studies a unique position.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank Jr. Prof. Dr. Erdoğan Gedik who helped me with developing ideas for this article and read the versions several times, and to my stu-

dent Işıl Demirel (M.A), who provided me with some important materials on urban anthropological studies in Turkey.

### NOTES

- 1 The Susurluk event, a car crash that took place on November 3, 1996 near Susurluk-Balıkesir, revealed the close relationship between the Turkish government, the armed forces, and organized crime.
- 2 Anthropologists' writing in their "native" languages should not be always interpreted as a "shortcoming." There are many "anthropologies" other than those writing in English that have contributed to what is called "world anthropology."
- 3 Here "western" can be read as "modern," "modernized," or what Atatürk has described as "*contemporaneous* civilization."
- 4 It might be interesting to look at the American Anthropological Association's 2008 discussion on how anthropology should work in the context of the state. Many anthropologists in Turkey favor this idea, while a minority puts forth that anthropology should work as a critique of the state. For some exceptionally critical ethnographies of the state, see Navaro-Yashin (2002); Houston 2005; White 2002; Alexander 2002; Özyürek 2006).
- 5 Along these lines, first, "*köylü milletin efendisidir*" (folk is the master of the nation), and later on, "*halka doğru*" (towards people) emphasized the importance of village and villagers as the nation's "exalted" objects. This was a reflection of a "villagism" movement, which had its heyday in the 1930s. Creating a common consciousness and memory within the paradigm of nationalism and aiming for progress for the village within modernization was the order of the day. Sociology, anthropology and folklore created a disciplinary tripod and contributed to this ideal. The structuring of the Faculty of Language and History-Geography at Ankara University was established within this framework. The "salvage ethnographies" widespread in folklore are exemplary of this approach. Between the 1930s and 1940s state institutions, such as People's Houses and the Village Institutes gained support. This helped to promote village culture as they became the ideological apparatuses of the new republic and promoted research in Anatolia.
- 6 The interplay between sociology and anthropology is an interesting yet a complicated case to note. To present the more obvious reasons: from the earlier days of anthropology the "field" intersected with sociology, producing ethnographies in the rural and creating

common methodologies at times. As many anthropologists were educated in the U.S. and came back home, they found jobs in the sociology departments and labeled their work as sociology. This was partly due to the disciplinary hierarchies, and partly to the definition of the field of anthropology in Turkey mainly as a discipline of physical anthropology. Especially after the Second World War the two disciplines came even closer with respect to their sites and methods.

7 Having graduated from the Institute of Philosophy at the Faculty of Language, History and Geography of Ankara University, Kıray went to the U.S. in 1946 and received her Ph.D. in Social Anthropology from Northwestern University in 1950. She came back to Turkey and started teaching sociology. With state support, she conducted research in Ereğli, a coastal town on the Black Sea, where an iron factory was established.

8 *Dolmuş* and *minibüs* refer to the main transportation vehicles. *Dolmuş* is a shared cab, going on a certain route. Approximately 5-8 people can be transported in different models of cars. *Minibüses* are larger vehicles and can take passengers standing.

9 Such an attitude is also true of other researchers (for criticism see Birkalan 1999a, 2004), as it shows the dilemma between the “researcher and researched” (also see Saran 1985, 1986).

10 As I have stated elsewhere in the article, state support for the social sciences in Turkey was a notable trend, especially until the 1980s. Certainly funding implies the possibility of ideological influence, and the studies with state funding were no exception. With the attempts of privatization with the Özal government in the 1980s, other funding agencies have been active in Turkey; nonetheless, their ideological agendas were also apparent in research they supported.

11 My fieldwork in Istanbul was between 1997 and 1999. I am especially grateful to the Uyguntürk family, who welcomed me warmly and hosted me with great hospitality and friendship.

12 Kıray’s work in urban anthropology/sociology is an issue that should be studied just by itself, as her numerous studies have contributed not only to the theory, but also towards ethnographic data. Her collection of essays from different periods was published in first in 1993, with a second edition in 2003.

13 I do not want to “essentialize” categories of “foreign,” “native,” and “halfie,” as the content and meaning of Turkish-ness is created, contested, and consumed. The so-called “Turkish” culture undergoes constant displacements. I had written earlier about the

shifting limits of "selfness" as opposed to the "otherness" of the anthropological subject/object relations. Even with the coinage of the term "halfie," we do not have the opportunity to solve the problem of the "self." Rather it is a term that complicates the field and writing situations.

### REFERENCES CITED

- Ağdur Gevrek, Meltem (1998). Yurt ve Dünya/1941-1944: 1940'ların 'Solu-nun' Ankara Çevresi. *Toplum ve Bilim* 78: 255-272.
- Akalın, Ayşe (2007). Hired as a Caregiver, Demanded as a Housewife: Be-coming a Migrant Domestic Worker in Turkey. *European Journal of Women's Studies* 14(3): 209-225.
- Akalın, Ayşe (2008). Die dort oben-die da unten: Die Beschäftigung von Migrantinnen als Haushaltsbedienstete in Istanbul gated commu-nity's. IN *Facetten internationaler Migration in die Türkei: Gesell-schaftliche Rahmenbedingungen und persönliche Lebenswelten*, Barbara Pusch and Toman Wilkoszewski (eds.) Würzburg: Ergon, pp. 87-107.
- Akkayan, Taylan (1971). Türkiye'de İller Arası Göçler. *Sosyal Antropoloji ve Etnoloji Bölümü Dergisi* I: 59-85.
- Akkayan, Taylan (1979). Göç ve Değişme. İstanbul: İ.Ü. Edebiyat Fakül-tesi.
- Akkayan, Taylan (1983). Ertuğrulgazi'den Bugüne Söğüt. İstanbul: Yeni-lik.
- Akkayan, Taylan (1986). Eğitim, Göç ve Güvenlik. *Sosyal Antropoloji ve Etnoloji Dergisi* 4: 169-202.
- Akkayan, Taylan (1990). Osmaneli: Değişen Bir Anadolu Kasabası. İstanbul: İÜ Yayınevi.
- Akkayan, Taylan (2003). Türkiye'de İç Göçler ve Sorunlar. *Antropoloji* 15: 29-61.
- Akkayan, Taylan and Saran Nephan (1981). Notes on the Methodology Used in Field Work: Dolmuş-Minibus System in İstanbul: A Case Study In Low Cost Transportation. İstanbul: İTÜ.
- Akşit, Bahattin (1985). Köy, Kasaba ve Kentlerde Toplumsal Değişme. Ankara: Turhan.
- Akşit, Bahattin, Nuray Karancı, Ayşe Gündüz-Hoşgör (2001) Turkey, Working Street Children in Three Metropolitan Cities: A Rapid Assessment. Geneva: ILO.
- Aksoy, Asu and Kevin Robins (1994). İstanbul Between Civilization and Discontent. *New Perspectives on Turkey* 10: 57-74.

- Alexander, Catherine (2002). *Personal States: Making Connections between People and Bureaucracy in Turkey*. New York: OUP.
- Alkan, Sevil (2008). *Globalization, Locality and Struggle over a Living Space: The Case of Karanfilköy*. IN *Public Istanbul: Spaces and Spheres of the Urban*, Frank Eckardt and Kathrin Wildner. (eds.). Bielefeld: Transcript, pp. 49-81.
- Arat, Yeşim (1991). *Social Change and the 1983 Governing Elite in Turkey*. IN *Structural Change in Turkish Society*, Mübeccel B. Kıray (ed.). Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies, pp.163-178.
- Arat, Yeşim (1995). *Feminizm ve İslam: Kadın ve Aile Dergisinin Düşündürdükleri*. IN *1980'ler Türkiye'sinde Kadın Bakış Açısından Kadınlar*, Şirin Tekeli (ed.). İstanbul: İletişim, pp. 79-100.
- Arıkanlı-Özdemir, Maya (2005). *Kentsel Dönüşüm Sürecinde Eski Bir Gecekondu Mahallesi: Karanfil Köyü, Kentlere Vurulan "Neşter"ler*. IN *İstanbul'da Kentsel Ayrışma: Mekansal Dönüşümde Farklı Boyutlar*, Hatice Kurtuluş (ed.). İstanbul: Bağlam, pp. 187-238.
- Aslan, Şükrü (2004). *1 Mayıs Mahallesi: 1980 Öncesi Toplumsal Mücadeleler ve Kent*. İstanbul: İletişim.
- Aswad, Barbara (1974). *Visiting Patterns among Women of the Small Elite in a Small Turkish City*. *Anthropological Quarterly* 47(1): 9-27.
- Aswad, Barbara (1978). *Women, Class and Power: Examples from the Hataş, Turkey*. IN *Women in the Muslim World*, Louise Beck and Nikki Keddie (eds.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press, pp. 473-481.
- Atauz, Sevil (ed.) (1986). *Türkiye'de Sosyal Bilim Araştırmalarının Gelişimi*. Ankara: Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği.
- Ayata, Sencer (1981). *Varoşlar, Çatışma ve Şiddet*. *Görüş* 18: 18-23.
- Ayata, Sencer (1991). *Industrial Change and Social Stratification in the Urban Context*. IN *Structural Change in Turkish Society*, Mübeccel B. Kıray (ed.). Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies, pp. 125-139.
- Ayata, Sencer (2002). *The New Middle Class and the Joys of Suburbia*. IN *Fragments of Culture: The Everyday of Modern Turkey*, Deniz Kandiyoti and Ayşe Saktanber (eds.). London: I.B. Tauris, pp. 25-42.
- Bali, Rıfat (1999). *Çılgın Kalabalıktan Uzak... Birikim* 123: 35-46.
- Bali, Rıfat (2002). *Tarz-ı Hayattan Life Style'a: Yeni Seçkinler, Yeni Mekânlar, Yeni Yaşamlar*. İstanbul: İletişim.
- Bartu, Ayfer (1999). *Who Owns the Old Quarters? Rewriting Histories in a Global Era*. IN *İstanbul: Between the Local and the Global*, Çağlar Keyder (ed.). Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, pp. 31-45.
- Bartu, Ayfer (2001a). *Rethinking Heritage Politics in a Global Context: A View from İstanbul*. IN *Hybrid Urbanism: On Identity Discourse*

- and the Built Environment, N. Al Sayyad (ed.). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, pp. 131-155.
- Bartu, Ayfer (2001b). Kentsel Ayrışım: İstanbul'daki Yeni Yerleşimler ve Kemer County Örneği. IN 21. Yüzyıl Karşısında Kent ve İnsan, Firdevs Gümüşoğlu (ed.). İstanbul: Bağlam, pp. 145-150.
- Bartu-Candan, Ayfer, and Biray Kolluoğlu (2008). Emerging Spaces of Neoliberalism: A Gated Town and a Public Housing Project in İstanbul. *New Perspectives on Turkey* 39: 5-46.
- Baydar Nalbantoğlu, Gülsüm (1997). Silent Interruptions: Urban Encounters with Rural Turkey. IN *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*, Sibel Bozdoğan and Reşat Kasaba (eds.). Seattle: University of Washington, pp. 192-210.
- Baydar, Oya (ed.) (1999). 75 Yılda Köylerden Şehirlere. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı.
- Behar, Cem (2003). A Neighbourhood in Ottoman İstanbul: Fruit Vendors and Civil Servants in the Kasap İlyas Mahallesi. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Bellér-Hann, Ildikó (1996). Informal Associations Among Women in North-East Turkey. IN *Turkish Families in Transition*, Gabriele Rasuly-Palazcek (ed.). Frankfurt: Peter Lang, pp. 114-138.
- Benedict, Peter (1974a). Ula: An Anatolian Town. Leiden: Brill.
- Benedict, Peter (1974b). Changing Role of Provincial Towns: A Case Study from Southwestern Turkey. IN *Turkey: Geographic and Social Perspectives*. Leiden: Brill, pp. 241-280.
- Benedict, Peter (1976). The Kabul Günü: Structured Visiting in an Anatolian Provincial Town. *Anthropological Quarterly* 47(1): 28-47.
- Berkes, Niyazi (1942). Bazı Ankara Köyleri Üzerinde Bir Araştırma. Ankara: DTCF Felsefe Enstitüsü, Sosyoloji Serisi.
- Bezmez, Dikmen (2007). The Politics of Urban Regeneration: The Case of Fener and Balat Initiative. *New Perspectives on Turkey* 37: 59-86.
- Birkalan-Gedik, Hande (2005). Özgün ve Özgür Bir Antropolojiye Doğru. IN *Gelenekten Geleceğe Antropoloji*, Belkıs Kümbetoğlu and Hande Birkalan Gedik (ed.) İstanbul: Epsilon, pp. 73-89.
- Birkalan, Hande (1999a). Homemaking and Story Telling in a Gecekondu in İstanbul. (Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis. Indiana University).
- Birkalan, Hande (1999b). Transformations: Gecekondu as Vernacular Architecture. *Traditional Dwellings and Settlements Working Paper Series 109: Culture, Craft, and Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Birkalan, Hande (2004). Gecekondu Entdecken: Menschen, Geschichte, Orte. IN *Call me İSTANBUL ist mein Name. Kunst und urbane Visionen*

- einer Metropolis, Roger Conover, Eda Çufer, Peter Weibel (eds.). Tübingen: Ernst Wasmuth Verlag, pp. 57-65.
- Bolak, Hale C. (1997a). When the Wives are Major Providers: Culture, Gender, and Family Work. *Gender and Society* 11: 409-43.
- Bolak, Hale C. (1997b). Marital Power Dynamics: Women Providers and Working-class Households in Istanbul. IN *Cities in the Developing World: Issues, Theory, Policy*, Joseph Gugler (ed.). Oxford: OUP, pp. 218-232.
- Bora, Aksu (2005). Kadınların Sınıfı. İstanbul: İletişim.
- Boran, Behice (1945). Toplumsal Yapı Araştırmaları: İki Köy Çeşidinin Mukayeseli Tetkiki. Ankara: DTCF Felsefe Enstitüsü.
- Bozdoğan, Sibel (2010). From 'Cubic Houses' to Suburban Villas: Residential Architecture and the Elites in Turkey. IN *Turkey's Engagement with Modernity: Conflict and Change in the Twentieth Century*, Celia Kerslake, Kerem Öktem, and Philip Robins (eds.). New York: Palgrave, pp. 405-424.
- Bozdoğan, Sibel, and Reşat Kasaba (eds.). (1997) Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey. Seattle: University of Washington.
- Bozkulak, Serpil (2005). Gecekondu'dan "Varoş"a: Gülsuyu Mahallesi. IN *İstanbul'da Kentsel Ayrışma: Mekansal Dönüşümde Farklı Boyutlar*, Hatice Kurtuluş (ed.). İstanbul: Bağlam, pp. 239-66.
- Castells, Manuel (1997). Kent, Sınıf, İktidar. Asuman Erendil (tr.). Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat.
- Çelik, Ayşe Betül (2005). "I Miss My Village!": Forced Kurdish Migrants in Istanbul and their Representation in Associations. *New Perspectives on Turkey* 32: 137-163.
- Çınar, Alev (2007). The Imagined Community as Urban Reality: The Making of Ankara. IN *Urban Imaginaries: Locating the Modern City*, Alev Çınar and Thomas Bender (eds.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 151-182.
- Çınar, Alev and Thomas Bender (ed.). (2007). *Urban Imaginaries: Locating the Modern City*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Danış, Aslı Didem (2001). İstanbul'da Uydu Yerleşmelerin Yaygınlaşması: Bahçeşehir Örneği. IN *21. Yüzyıl Karşısında Kent ve İnsan*, Firdevs Gümüşoğlu (ed.). İstanbul: Bağlam, pp. 151-60.
- Danış, Didem (2007). A Faith that Binds: Iraqi Christian Women on the Domestic Service Ladder of Istanbul. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 33(4): 601-615.
- Danış, Aslı Didem, and Jean-François Pérouse (2005). Zenginliğin Mekânda Yeni Yansımaları: İstanbul'da Güvenlikli Siteler. *Toplum ve Bilim* 104: 92-123.

- Dayıoğlu, Meltem (2006). The Impact of Household Income on Child Labor in Urban Turkey. *Journal of Development Studies* 42(6): 939-956.
- Dedeoğlu, Saniye (2008). *Women Workers in Turkey: Global Industrial Production in Istanbul*. London: I.B Tauris.
- Delaney, Carol (1998). The Rise and Demise of Village Life in Turkey. IN *Bilanço 1923-1998: Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin 75 Yılına Toplu Bakış 2*. (Collective ed.). Ankara OTDÜ, pp. 191-197.
- Demirdirek, Hülya (2007). New Modes of Capitalist Domination: Transnational Space between Turkey and Moldova. *Anthropology of East Europe Review* 25(1): 15-20.
- Dikmen, Ahmet A. (ed.) (2002). *Kentleşme, Göç ve Yoksulluk*. Ankara: Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği.
- Dobkin, Marlene (1967). Social Ranking in the Women's World of Purdah: A Turkish Example. *Anthropological Quarterly* 40(2): 65-72.
- Duben, Alan (1982). The Significance of Family and Kinship in Urban Turkey. IN *Sex Roles, Family and Community in Turkey*. Bloomington: IU Turkish Studies, pp. 73-99.
- Duben, Alan (1985). Turkish Families and Households in Historical Perspective. *Journal of Family History* 10(1): 75-97.
- Duben, Alan and Cem Behar (1991). *Istanbul Households: Marriage, Family, and Fertility 1880-1940*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Dubetsky, Alan (1976). Kinship, Primordial Ties, and Factory Organization in Turkey: An Anthropological View. *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 7(3): 433-451.
- Dündar, Özlem (2004). Models of Urban Transformation Informal Housing in Ankara. *Cities* 18(6): 391-401.
- Ecevit, Yıldız (1991). The Ideological Construction of Turkish Women Factory Workers. IN *Working Women: International Perspectives on Labor and Gender Ideology*, Nanneke Redcliff and M.Thea Sinclair (eds.). London: Routledge, pp. 56-78.
- Ecevit, Yıldız (1993). Kentsel Üretim Sürecinde Kadın Emeğinin Konumu ve Değişen Bicimleri. IN *Kadın Bakış Açısından Kadınlar, Şirin Tekeli* (ed.). İstanbul: İletişim, pp.117-128.
- Eckardt, Frank, Kathrin Wildner. (eds.). 2008. *Public Istanbul: Spaces and Spheres of the Urban*. Bielefeld: Transcript.
- Eldem, Edhem, Daniel Goffman and Bruce Alan Masters (eds.) (1999). *The Ottoman City between East and West: Aleppo, İzmir, and Istanbul*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Erdentuğ, Nermin (1956). *Hal Köyünün Etnolojik Tetkiki*. Ankara: AÜDTCF.
- Erdentuğ, Nermin (1959). *Sün Köyünün Etnolojik Tetkiki* Ankara: AÜDTCF.

- Erdentuğ, Nermin (1973). *Battal Köyü'nde Fıstık Tarımının Toplum Kültüründe Meydana Getirdiği Değişmeler*. Ankara University Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.
- Erder, Sema (1997). *Kentsel Gerilim: Enformel İlişki Ağları Alan Araştırması*. Ankara: Umag.
- Erder, Sema (1999). Where Do You Hail From? Localism and Networks in Istanbul. IN *Istanbul Between the Global and the Local*, Çağlar Keyder (ed.). Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield, pp. 161-171.
- Erder, Sema (2002). Urban Migration and Reconstruction of the Kinship Networks. The case of Istanbul. IN *Autonomy and Dependence in the Family*, Rita Liljeström and Elizabeth Özdalga (eds.). Swedish Research Institute-Istanbul, pp. 117-136.
- Erder, Sema (2006). *İstanbul'a Bir Kent Kondu: Ümraniye*. İstanbul: İletişim.
- Erder, Türköz (ed.) (1982). *Kentsel Bütünleşme*. Ankara: Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği.
- Erder, Türköz (ed.) (1984). *Türkiye'de Ailenin Değişimi: Toplumbilimsel İncelemeler*. Ankara: Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği.
- Erdoğan, Necmi (2009). *Yoksulluk Halleri: Türkiye'de Kent Yoksulluğunun Toplumsal Görünümleri*. İstanbul: İletişim.
- Erman, Tahire (1997). The Meaning of City Living for Rural Migrant Women and Their Role in Migration: The Case of Turkey. *Women's Studies International Forum* 20: 263-73.
- Erman, Tahire (1998). Becoming "Urban" or Staying "Rural": The Views of Turkish Rural-to-Urban Migrants on the "Integration" Question. *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 30(4): 541-561.
- Erman, Tahire (2001). The Politics of Squatter (*Gecekondu*) Studies in Turkey: The Changing Representations of Rural Migrants in the Academic Discourse. *Urban Studies* 38(7): 983-1002.
- Erman, Tahire, and A. Eken (2004). The Other of the 'Other' and Unregulated Territories in the Urban Periphery: Gecekondu Violence in the 2000s with a Focus on the Eserler Case, İstanbul. *Cities* 21: 57-68.
- Erman, Tahire, and Meliha Coşkun-Yıldar (2007). Emergent Local Initiative and the City: The Case of Neighbourhood Associations of the Better-off Classes in Post-1990 Urban Turkey. *Urban Studies* 44(13): 2547- 2566.
- Erman, Tahire, Sibel Kalaycıoğlu, and Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç (2002). Money Earning Activities and Empowerment of Rural Migrant Women in the City: The Case of Turkey. *Women's Studies International Forum* 25: 395-410.

- Erman, Tahire and Süheyla Türkyılmaz (2008). Neighborhood Effects and Women's Agency Regarding Poverty and Patriarchy in a Turkish Slum. *Environment and Planning A* 40 (7): 1760-1776.
- Ersoy, Melih (2002). *Kente Göç ve Yoksulluk: Diyarbakır Örneği*. Ankara: ODTÜ.
- Esen, Orhan and Stephan Lanz (ed.) (2007). *Self Service City: Istanbul*. Berlin: B Books.
- Foggo, Hacer (2007). The Sulukule Affair: Roma Against Expropriation. *Roma Rights Quarterly* 4: 41-47.
- Gambetti, Zeynep (2005). The Conflictual (trans)formation of the Public Sphere in Urban Space: The Case of Diyarbakır. *New Perspectives on Turkey* 32: 43-71.
- Gedik, Erdoğan (2008). Sozialer, kultureller, ökonomischer und sprachlicher Wandel im Rahmen der Binnenmigration und der transnationalen Migration: soziale Netzwerke am Beispiel der Provinz Varto in Ostanatolien, Türkei. Frankfurt Goethe University. Abteilung Gesellschaftswissenschaften. Fach Soziologie.
- Geniş, Şerife. (2007). Producing Elite Localities: The Rise of Gated Communities in Istanbul. *Urban Studies* 44(4): 771-798.
- Gmelch, George, and Walter P. Zenner (ed.) (1996). *Urban Life: Readings in Urban Anthropology*. Prospect Heights: Waveland.
- Goode, James, and Edwin Eames (1996). An Anthropological Critique of Culture of Poverty. IN *Urban Life: Readings in Urban Anthropology*, George Gmelch and Walter P. Zenner (eds.). Prospect Heights: Waveland, pp. 405-417.
- Gökarıksel, Banu, and Anna Secor (2009). New Transnational Geographies of Islamism, Capitalism and Subjectivity: The Veiling-fashion Industry in Turkey. *Area* 41(1): 6-18.
- Gökarıksel, Banu, and Anna Secor (2010a). Between Fashion and *Tesettür*: Marketing and Consuming Women's Islamic Dress. *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies* 6 (3): 118-148.
- Gökarıksel, Banu, and Anna Secor (2010b). Islamicness in the Life of a Commodity: Veiling Fashion in Turkey. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 35: 313-333.
- Gökçe, Birsen (1976). *Gecekondu Gençliği: Ankara 1971*. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi.
- Gökçe, Birsen (1993). *Gecekondularda Ailelerarası Geleneksel Dayanışmanın Çağdaş Organizasyonlara Dönüşümü*. Ankara: T.C. Başbakanlık Başbakanlık Aile Araştırma Kurumu.
- Göktürk, Deniz, Levent Soysal, and İpek Türeli (2010). *Orienting Istanbul: Cultural Capital of Europe?* London: Routledge.

- Gül, Murat (2009). *The Emergence of Modern Istanbul: Transformation and Modernisation of a City*. London: I.B.Tauris.
- Gümüšođlu, Firdevs (ed.) (2001). 21. Yüzyıl Karşısında Kent ve İnsan. İstanbul: Bağlam.
- Güneş-Ayata, Ayşe (1990). Gecekondularda Kimlik Sorunu, Dayanışma Örüntüleri ve Hemşehrilik. *Toplum ve Bilim* 51-52: 89-101.
- Güneş-Ayata, Ayşe (1997). The Emergence of Identity Politics in Turkey. *New Perspectives on Turkey* 17: 59-73.
- Gürsoy, Akile (1980). Ankara Kentinde Bir Grup İşçi Kadının Kentleşme ve Çalışma Sorunları. Ankara: Hacettepe University, Unpublished Dissertation.
- Gürsoy, Akile (1991). Mosque or Health Center: A Dispute in a *Gecekondu*. IN *Islam in Modern Turkey, Religion, Politics and Literature in a Secular State*, Richard Tapper (ed.). London, I.B. Tauris, pp. 84-101.
- Güvenç, Bozkurt (1994). Türkiye’de Sosyal Bilimler, Gelişmeler ve Süreklilikler. Ankara: TÜBİTAK Report.
- Güvenç, Murat, and Oğuz Işık (1996). İstanbul’u Okumak: Statü-Konut Mülkiyeti Farklılaşmasına İlişkin Bir Çözümleme Denemesi. *Toplum ve Bilim* 71: 6-60.
- Hannerz, Ulf (1980). *Exploring the City*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hart, Charles W. M., and Nephana Saran (1969). Nephana Saran (tr.) *Zeytinburnu Gecekondu Bölgesi*. İstanbul: İTO.
- Harvey, David (2003). *Sosyal Adalet ve Şehir*. Mehmet Moralı (tr.). İstanbul: Metis.
- Houston, Chris (2001a). Profane Intuitions: Kurdish Diaspora in the Turkish City. *The Australian Journal of Anthropology* 12(1): 15-31.
- Houston, Chris (2001b). The Brewing of Islamist Modernity: Tea Gardens and Public Space in İstanbul. *Theory, Culture and Society* 18(6): 77-97.
- Houston, Chris (2005). Provocations of the Built Environment: Animating Cities in Turkey as Kemalist. *Political Geography* 24(1): 101-119.
- Işık, Oğuz, and M. Melih Pınarcıođlu (2001). Nöbetleşe Yoksulluk: Sultanbeyli Örneđi. İstanbul: İletişim.
- İlbars, Zafer (1975). Aile Akrabalık İlişkileri ve Değişmeler Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *A.Ü.D.T.C.F. Antropoloji Dergisi* 7: 201 - 206.
- İlbars, Zafer (1981). Ankara Gecekondu Kadınının Hane Dışı Çalışmasının Geleneksel Kadın Statüsü ve Rollerini Üzerine Etkisi. Ankara: A.Ü.D.T.C.F. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis.
- İlbars, Zafer (1988). Ankara Gecekondu Ailelerine Genel Bir Bakış. *A.Ü.D.T.C.F. Dergisi* 32(1-1): 20-31.

- İlbars, Zafer (2000). The Structure of Family in Turkey. *Ethnologia Balkanica* 4: 59-65.
- İlyasoğlu, Aynur (1994). *Örtülü Kimlik*. İstanbul: Metis.
- İslam, Tolga (2005). Outside the Core: Gentrification in İstanbul. IN *Gentrification in a Global Context: The New Urban Colonialism*, Rowland Atkinson and Gary Bridge (eds). New York: Routledge, pp. 121-36.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Çiğdem (ed.) (1982). *Sex Roles, Family and Community in Turkey*. Bloomington: IU Turkish Studies.
- Kalaycıoğlu, Sibel (2006). Dynamics of Poverty in Turkey: From a Specific Focus on Welfare System and Social Inclusion in Turkey, to Combat Rural/Urban Poverty, and the Significance of Social Networks and Reciprocal Survival Strategies. No: 16. Permanent Link: [http://www.inst.at/trans/16Nr/01\\_3/kalaycioglu16.htm](http://www.inst.at/trans/16Nr/01_3/kalaycioglu16.htm)
- Kandiyoti, Deniz (1982). Urban Change and Women's Roles in Turkey: An Overview and Evaluation. IN *Sex Roles, Family and Community in Turkey*. Bloomington: IU Turkish Studies, pp. 101-121.
- Kandiyoti, Deniz (2002). Pink Card Blues: Trouble and Strife at the Crossroads of Gender. IN *Fragments of Culture: The Everyday of Modern Turkey*, Deniz Kandiyoti and Ayşe Saktanber (eds.). London: I. B. Tauris, pp. 277-292.
- Kandiyoti, Deniz and Ayşe Saktanber (eds.) (2002). *Fragments of Culture: The Everyday of Modern Turkey*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Kansu, Şevket Aziz (1940). *Türk Antropoloji Enstitüsü Tarihçesi*. İstanbul: Maarif Matbaası.
- Karaman, Ozan (2008). Urban pulse—(re)making space for globalization in İstanbul. *Urban Geography* 29(6): 518-525.
- Karpat, Kemal (1976). *The Gecekodu: Rural Migration and Urbanization*. New York: CUP.
- Kartal, Kemal (1983). *Ekonomik ve Sosyal Yönleriyle Türkiye'de Kentleşme*. Ankara: Yurt.
- Keleş, Ruşen (1972). *İzmir Mahalleleri*. Ankara: Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği.
- Keleş, Ruşen (1976). *Kentbilim İlkeleri*. Ankara: Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği.
- Keleş, Ruşen (1988). *Management of Urban Growth in Turkey*. Ankara: Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği.
- Kerslake, Celia, Kerem Öktem, and Philip Robins (2010). *Turkey's Engagement with Modernity: Conflict and Change in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Palgrave.
- Keyder, Çağlar (ed.) (1999). *İstanbul Between the Global and the Local*. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield.

- Keyder, Çağlar (2005). Globalization and Social Exclusion in Istanbul. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 29(1):124-34.
- Kıray, Mübeccel (1964). Ereğli: Ağır Sanayiden Önce Bir Sahil Kasabası. Ankara: DTP.
- Kıray, Mübeccel (1982). Küçük Kasaba Kadınları. IN *Türk Toplumunda Kadın, Nermin Abadan-Unat, Deniz Kandiyoti and Mübeccel Kıray* (eds.). Ankara: Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği. pp. 341-356.
- Kıray, Mübeccel (1998). Örgütlemeyen Kent: İzmir. İstanbul: Bağlam.
- Kıray, Mübeccel (2003a). Az Gelişmiş Memleketlerde Şehirleşme Eğilimleri: Tarihsel Perspektif İçinde İzmir. IN *Kentleşme Yazıları*. İstanbul: Bağlam, pp. 28-64.
- Kıray, Mübeccel (2003b). Gecekondu: Az Gelişmiş Ülkelerde Hızla Topraktan Kopma ve Kentle Bütünleşememe. IN *Kentleşme Yazıları*. İstanbul: Bağlam, pp. 90-104.
- Kıray, Mübeccel B. (ed.). (1991). *Structural Change in Turkish Society*. Indiana University Turkish Studies.
- Kıray, Mübeccel (ed.) (2003c). *Kentleşme Yazıları*. İstanbul: Bağlam.
- Kongar, Emre (1972). İzmir'de Kentsel Aile. Ankara: Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği.
- Kongar, Emre (1982). Kentleşen Gecekonducular ya da Gecekondulaşan Kentler Sorunu. IN *Kentle Bütünleşme*. Ankara: Türkiye Gelişme Araştırmaları Vakfı 4, pp. 23-46.
- Kurtuluş, Hatice (2005a). İstanbul'da Kapalı Yerleşmeler: Beykoz Konakları Örneği. IN *İstanbul'da Kentsel Ayrışma: Mekansal Dönüşümde Farklı Boyutlar*, Hatice Kurtuluş (ed.). İstanbul: Bağlam, pp. 25-76.
- Kurtuluş, Hatice (2005b). Bir Ütopya Olarak Bahçeşehir. IN *İstanbul'da Kentsel Ayrışma: Mekansal Dönüşümde Farklı Boyutlar*, Hatice Kurtuluş (ed.). İstanbul: Bağlam, pp. 77-126.
- Kuyucu, Tuna, and Özlem Uysal (2010). 'Urban Transformation' as State-led Property Transfer: An Analysis of Two Cases of Urban Renewal in İstanbul. *Urban Studies* 47(7): 1479-1499.
- Kümbetoğlu, Belkıs (1992). *Women's Informal Sector Contribution to their Households in Urban Turkey*. İstanbul: Marmara University, Unpublished Dissertation.
- Kümbetoğlu, Belkıs (1994). Kadın-Çalışma ve Evde Üretim: Türkiye'de Dünyada Güncel Sosyolojik Değişmeler. Birinci Ulusal Sosyoloji Kongresi Bildiri Kitabı. İstanbul: Sosyoloji Derneği, pp. 563-571.
- Kümbetoğlu, Belkıs (2001). Kentsel Alan ve Yerel Yönetimlerde Toplumsal Cinsiyet. IN *Yerli Bir Feminizme Doğru*, Aynur İlyasoğlu and Necla Akgökçe (eds.). İstanbul: Sel, pp. 259-82.

- Kümbetoğlu, Belkıs (2002). Afetler Sonrası Kadınlar ve Yoksulluk. *IN* Yoksulluk, Şiddet ve İnsan Hakları, Yasemin Özdek (ed.). Ankara: TODAİE, pp. 129- 142.
- Kümbetoğlu, Belkıs (2005). Enformelleşme Süreçlerinde Genç Göçmen Kadınlar ve Dayanışma Ağları. *Folklor ve Edebiyat* 41: 5-26.
- Kümbetoğlu, Belkıs, and Hande Birkalan Gedik (2005). *Gelenekten Geleceğe Antropoloji*. İstanbul: Epsilon.
- Lewis, Oscar (1959). *Five Families: Mexican Studies in the Culture of Poverty*. New York: Basic Books.
- Low, Setha (2005). Introduction: Theorizing the City. *IN* *Theorizing the City: The New Urban Anthropology Reader*, Setha Low (ed.). New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, pp. 1-33.
- Magnarella, Paul (1970). From Villager to Townsman in Turkey. *Middle East Journal* 24(2): 229-240.
- Magnerella, Paul (1974). *Tradition and Change in a Turkish Town*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Mansur, Fatma (1972). *Bodrum: A Town in the Aegean*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Mills, Amy (2005). Narratives in City Landscapes: Cultural Identity in İstanbul. *Geographical Review* 95(3): 441-462.
- Mills, Amy (2006). Boundaries of the Nation in the Space of the Urban: Landscape and Social Memory in İstanbul. *Cultural Geographies* 13: 367-394.
- Mills, Amy (2008). The Place of Locality for Identity in the Nation: Minority Narratives of Cosmopolitan İstanbul. *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 40: 383-401.
- Mills, Amy (2010). *Streets of Memory: Landscape, Tolerance and National Identity in İstanbul*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Navaro-Yashin, Yael (1999). The Historical Construction of Local Culture: Gender and Identity in the Politics of Secularism Versus Islam. *IN* *İstanbul: Between the Global and the Local, Çağlar Keyder* (ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, pp. 59-75.
- Navaro-Yashin, Yael (2002). *Faces of the State: Secularism and Public Life in Turkey*. Berkeley: Princeton University Press.
- Neyzi, Leyla (1999). *İstanbul'da Hatırlamak ve Unutmak: Birey, Bellek ve Aidiyet*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı.
- Olson, Emelie (1991). Of Türbe and Evliya: Saints and Shrines as Environments that Facilitate Communication and Innovation. *IN* *Structural Change in Turkish Society*, Mübeccel B. Kıray (ed.). Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies, pp. 75-94.
- Onaran İncirlioğlu, Emine (2006). Where Exactly is Çınçın Bağları: The Boundaries of a Gypsy Neighborhood in Ankara. *IN* *Gypsies and the Problem of Identities: Contextual, Constructed and Contested*,

- Elin Strand and Adrian Marsh (eds.), Istanbul: Swedish Research Institute, pp. 191-204.
- Öktem, Binnur (2005). Küresel Kent Söyleminin Kentsel Mekânın Dönüştürmedeki Rolü: Büyükdere-Maslak Hattı. IN *Istanbul'da Kentsel Ayrışma: Mekansal Dönüşümde Farklı Boyutlar*, Hatice Kurtuluş (ed.). Istanbul: Bağlam, pp. 25-76.
- Öktem, Kerem (2004). Incorporating the Time and Space of the Ethnic 'Other': Nationalism and Space in Southeast Turkey in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. *Nations and Nationalism* 10(4): 559-578.
- Öktem, Kerem (2005). Faces of the City: Poetic, Mediagenic and Traumatic Images of a Multi Cultural City in Southeast Turkey. *Cities* 22(3): 241-253.
- Öncü, Ayşe (1991). The Transformation of the Bases of Social Standing in Contemporary Turkish Society. IN *Structural Change in Turkish Society*, Mübeccel B. Kıray (ed.). Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies, pp. 140-162.
- Öncü Ayşe (1997). The Myth of the "Ideal Home": Travels Across Cultural Borders to Istanbul. IN *Space, Culture and Power: New Identities in Globalizing Cities*, Ayşe Öncü and Petra Weyland (eds.), London: Zed, pp. 56-72.
- Öncü, Ayşe (1999). Istanbulites and Others: The Cultural Cosmology of 'Middleness' in the Era of Neo-Liberalism. IN *Istanbul Between the Global and The Local*, Çağlar Keyder (ed.), New York: St. Martins, pp. 95-120.
- Öncü, Ayşe (2002a). Consumption, Gender and the Mapping of Istanbul in the 1990s. IN *Fragments of Culture: The Everyday of Modern Turkey*, Deniz Kandiyoti and Ayşe Saktanber (eds.) London: I.B. Tauris, pp. 171-190.
- Öncü, Ayşe (2002b). Global Consumerism, Sexuality as Public Spectacle, and the Cultural Remapping of Istanbul in the 1990s. IN *Fragments of Culture: The Everyday of Modern Turkey*, Deniz Kandiyoti and Ayşe Saktanber (eds.), London: I.B. Tauris, pp. 171-190.
- Öncü, Ayşe (2007). The Politics of Istanbul's Ottoman Heritage in the Era of Globalism. IN *Cities of the South: Poverty, Citizenship and Exclusion in the 21st Century*, H. Wimmen, F. Mermier and B. Driessens (eds.), London: Saqi, pp. 233-264.
- Öncü, Ayşe, and Petra Weyland (1997). *Space, Culture and Power: New Identities in Globalizing Cities*. London: Zed.
- Özbek Sönmez, İpek (2007). Concentrated Urban Poverty: The Case of Izmir Inner Area. *Turkey European Planning Studies* 15(3): 319-338.

- Özdil, Koray (2008). Creating New Spaces, Claiming Rights: West African Immigrants in Istanbul. IN *Public Istanbul. Spaces and Spheres of the Urban*, Frank Eckardt and Kathrin Wildner. (eds.). Bielefeld: Transcript, pp. 279-298.
- Özler, Şerife İlgü (2000). Politics of the *Gecekondu* in Turkey: The Political Choices of the Urban Squatters in National Elections. *Turkish Studies* 1(2): 39-58.
- Özyeğin, Gül (2001). *Untidy Gender: Domestic Work in Turkey*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Özyeğin, Gül (2002). The Doorkeeper, The Maid and the Tenant: Troubling Encounters in the Turkish Urban Landscape. IN *Fragments of Culture: The Everyday of Modern Turkey*, Deniz Kandiyoti and Ayşe Saktanber (eds.). London: I.B. Tauris, pp. 43-72.
- Özyeğin, Gül (2005). Calling the Tune: Impact of Domestic Worker's Earnings on Intra-Household Gender Relations. IN *Domestic Service and the Formation of European Identity: Understanding the Globalization of Domestic Work, Sixteenth-Twenty-First Centuries*, Antoinette Fauve-Chamoux (ed.). Frankfurt: Peter Lang, pp. 317- 350.
- Özyürek, Esra (2006). Nostalgia for the Modern: State Secularism and Everyday Politics in Turkey. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Pötüoğlu-Cook, Öykü (2006). Beyond the Glitter: Belly Dance and Neoliberal Gentrification in Istanbul. *Cultural Anthropology* 21(4): 633-660.
- Press, Erwin, and Estelle Smith (ed.) (1980). *Urban Place and Process: Readings in the Anthropology of Cities*. New York: McMillan.
- Robins, Kevin, and Asu Aksoy (1994). Istanbul Between Civilization and Discontent. *New Perspectives on Turkey* 10: 57-74.
- Robins, Kevin, and Asu Aksoy (1995). Istanbul Rising: Returning the Repressed to Urban Culture. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 2(3): 233-235.
- Saran, Nephana (1968). İstanbul Şehrinde Polis ile İlgisi Olan 18 Yaşından Küçük Çocukların Sosyo-Kültürel Özellikleri Hakkında Bir Araştırma. İstanbul: İ.Ü. Edebiyat Fakültesi.
- Saran, Nephana (1974). Squatter Settlement (*Gecekondu*) Problems in Istanbul. IN *Turkey: Geographic and Social Perspectives*, Peter Benedict, Erol Tümertekin and Fatma Mansur (eds.). Leiden: Brill, pp. 327-361.
- Saran, Nephana (1975). Üniversite Gençliği. İstanbul: İÜ Edebiyat Fakültesi.
- Saran, Nephana (1984). Köylerimiz. İstanbul: İÜ Edebiyat Fakültesi.
- Saran, Nephana (1985). Çağlayan: İstanbul'un Bir Gecekondu Bölgesinin Tarihi ve Gelişimi. *Antropoloji* (12): 17-33.

- Saran, Nephana (1986). Göç ve Kentleşme. *Sosyal Antropoloji ve Etnoloji Dergisi* 4: 155-168.
- Saran, Nephana (2009). İ.Ü. Sosyal Antropoloji ve Etnoloji Bölümünün Kuruluşu ve Bölümün Temel Politikası (Part 1 and 2) Added on 12 January 2009. [http://www.antropoloji.net/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=290&Itemid=9](http://www.antropoloji.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=290&Itemid=9)
- Saran, Nephana, and Akkayan Taylan (1981). Notes on the Methodology Used in Fieldwork: Dolmuş-Minibus System in Istanbul: A Case Study in Low Cost Transportation. Istanbul: İTÜ.
- Saran, Nephana, and Akkayan Taylan (1988). Çalışan Gençliğin İşbaşında Eğitimi: Çıraklık, Kalfalık, Mesleğe Yönelme Sorunları. Ankara: MEGS Bakanlığı.
- Secor, Anna (2003a). Citizenship in the City: Identity, Community, and Rights Among Women Migrants to Istanbul. *Urban Geography* 24(2): 147-168.
- Secor, Anna (2003b). Belaboring Gender: The Spatial Practice of Work and the Politics of 'Making Do' in Istanbul. *Environment and Planning* 35: 2209-2227.
- Secor, Anna (2004). There Is an Istanbul That Belongs to Me: Citizenship, Space, and Identity in the City. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 94(2): 352-36.
- Secor, Anna J., and John O'Loughlin (2005). Social and Political Trust in Istanbul and Moscow: A Comparative Analysis of Individual and Neighbourhood Effects. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 30(1): 66-82.
- Seufert, Günter (2005 [2000]). Mezhep ile Etnisite Arasında: Küreselleşen İstanbul'da Bir Kürt-Alevi Aşiret. IN Mekan, Kültür, İktidar: Küreselleşen Kentlerde Yeni Kimlikler, Ayşe Öncü and Petra Weyland (eds.). Istanbul: İletişim, pp: 215-238.
- Sevgi, Cezmi (1988). Kentleşme sürecinde İzmir ve Gecekonducular. İzmir (Merkez İlçe) Konak Belediyesi.
- Seyman, Yaşar (1986). Hüzünün Coşkusu: Altındağ. Istanbul: Gür.
- Sirman, Nükhet (1996). From Economic Integration to Cultural Strategies of Power: The Study of Rural Change in Turkey. *New Perspectives on Turkey* 14: 115-125.
- Sirman, Nükhet (2001). Sosyal Bilimlerde Gelişmecilik ve Köy Çalışmaları. *Toplum ve Bilim* 88: 251-254.
- Solomon, Thomas (2005). Living Underground is Tough: Authenticity and Locality in the Hip-hop Community in Istanbul, Turkey. *Popular Music* 24(1): 1-20
- Soysal, Levent (2010). Future(s) of the City: Istanbul for the New Century. IN *Orienteering Istanbul: Cultural Capital of Europe? Deniz Göktürk,*

- Levent Soysal and İpek Türeli (eds.). London: Routledge, pp. 296-312.
- Stokes, Martin (1992). *The Arabesk Debate: Music and Musicians in Modern Turkey*. New York: OUP.
- Stokes, Martin (1999). *Sounding Out: The Culture Industries and the Globalization of Istanbul*. IN *Istanbul: Between the Global and the Local*, Çağlar Keyder (ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, pp. 121-139.
- Szyliowicz, Joseph S. (1961). *Erdemli: A Case Study in the Political Integration of the Turkish Villager*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Şen, Besime (2005). *Soylulaştırma: Kentsel Mekanda Yeni Ayırıştırma Biçimi*. IN *Istanbul'da Kentsel Ayırışma: Mekansal Dönüşümde Farklı Boyutlar*, Hatice Kurtuluş (ed.). Istanbul: Bağlam, pp.127-160.
- Şen, Leyla (2005). *Poverty Alleviation, Conflict and Power in Poor Displaced Households: A Study of the Views of Women in Diyarbakır*. *New Perspectives on Turkey* 32: 113-135.
- Şenol-Cantek, Funda (2006). *Sanki Viran Ankara*. Istanbul: İletişim.
- Şenyapılı, Tansı (1985). *Ankara Kentinde Gecekondu Gelişimi (1923-1960)*. Ankara: Batkent Konut Üretim Yapı Kooperatifleri Birliği.
- Tapper, Nancy (1978). *Gender and Religion in A Turkish Town: A Comparison of Two Types of Formal Women's Gatherings*. IN *Women's Religious Experiences*, P. Holden (ed.). London: Croon Helm, pp. 71-88.
- Tapper, Nancy (1985). *Changing Wedding Rituals in a Turkish Town*. *Journal of Turkish Studies* 9: 305-313.
- Tapper, Nancy (1990). *Ziyaret: Gender, Movement, and Exchange in a Turkish Community*. Daniel Eickelman and James Piscatori (ed.). IN *Muslim Travelers: Pilgrimage, Migration, and the Religious Imagination*. London: Routledge, pp. 236-255.
- Tekeli, İlhan (1986). *Türkiye'de 19. Yüzyıl Ortalarından 1950'ye Kadar Kentsel Araştırmaların Gelişimi*. IN *Türkiye'de Sosyal Bilim Araştırmalarının Gelişimi*. (ed.). Ankara: Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği. Sevil Atauz, pp. 239-268.
- Tekeli, İlhan (1991). *Kent Planlama Konuşmaları*. Ankara: TMMOB Mimarlar Odası.
- Tekeli, Şirin (ed.). (1995a). *1980'ler Türkiye'sinde Kadın Bakış Açısından Kadınlar*. Istanbul: İletişim.
- Tuğal, Cihan (2006). *The Appeal of Islamic Politics: Ritual and Dialogue in a Poor District of Turkey*. *Sociological Quarterly* 47(2): 245-273.
- Tuğal, Cihan (2008). *The Greening of Istanbul*. *New Left Review* 51: 64-80.

- Tuğal, Cihan (2009a). *Passive Revolution: Absorbing the Islamic Challenge to Capitalism*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Tuğal, Cihan (2009b). The Urban Dynamism of Islamic Hegemony: Absorbing Squatter Creativity in Istanbul. *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 29(3): 423-437.
- Tümertekin, Erol, Peter Benedict, and Fatma Mansur (1974). *Turkey: Geographic and Social Perspectives*. Leiden: Brill.
- Türkdoğan, Orhan (1977 [1974]). *Yoksulluk Kültürü: Gecekonduların Toplumsal Yapısı*. Istanbul: Dede Korkut Yayınları.
- Uzun, C. Nil (2003). The Impact of Urban Renewal and Gentrification on Urban Fabric: Three Cases in Turkey. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 94(3): 363-375
- Ünlü-Yücesoy, Eda (2008). Contested Public Spaces vs. Conquered Public Spaces. Gentrification and its Reflections on Urban Public space in Istanbul. IN *Public Istanbul: Spaces and Spheres of the Urban*, Frank Eckardt and Kathrin Wildner (eds.). Bielefeld: Transkript, pp. 29-48.
- Üstündağ, Nazan (2005). *Belonging to the Modern: Women's suffering and Subjectivities in Urban Turkey*. Bloomington: Indiana University, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. .
- Valentine, Charles A. (1968). *Culture and Poverty: Critique and Counter-Proposals*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wedel, H. 2001a. Kurdish Migrant Women in Istanbul: Community and Resources for Local Political Participation of a Marginalized Social Group. IN *Women of a Non-State Nation: The Kurds, Shrazad Mojab* (ed.). Costa Mesa, CA: Mazda, pp. 95-112.
- Wedel, Heidi (2001b). *Siyaset ve Cinsiyet: İstanbul Gecekondularında Kadınların Siyasal Katılımı*. Istanbul: Metis.
- White, Jenny (1999). *Islamic Chic*. IN *Istanbul: Between the Global and the Local*, Çağlar Keyder (ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, pp. 77-91.
- White, Jenny B. (2002). *Islamist Mobilization in Turkey: A Study in Vernacular Politics*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- White, Jenny B. (2003). The Anthropology of Turkey: A Retrospective. IN *Turkish Studies in the United States*, Donal Quataert and Sabri Sayarı (eds.). Bloomington: Indiana University Ottoman and Modern Turkish Studies Publications, pp. 75-98.
- White, Jenny B. (2004). *Money Makes Us Relatives: Women's Labor in Urban Turkey*. Second edition. London: Routledge.
- White, Jenny (2010). *Tin Town Fanatics: Turkey's Rural to Urban Migration from 1923 to the Present*. IN *Turkey's Engagement with Modernity: Conflict and Change in the Twentieth Century*, Celia Kerslake,

- Kerem Öktem, and Philip Robins (eds.). New York: Palgrave, pp. 425-442.
- Wirth, Louis (1938). Urbanism as a Way of Life. *American Journal of Sociology* 44(1): 1-24.
- Wolbert, Barbara (1996). The Reception Day—A Key to Migrants' Reintegration. *IN Turkish Families in Transition*, Gabriele Rasuly-Palazcek (ed.). Frankfurt: Peter Lang, pp. 186-215.
- Yasa, İbrahim (1955). *Hasanoğlan Köyünün İctimai-İktisadi Yapısı*. Ankara: TODAİE.
- Yasa, İbrahim (1966). *Ankara'da Gecekondu Aileleri*. Ankara: Akın.
- Yasa, İbrahim (1969). *25 Yıl Sonra Hasanoğlan Köyü*. Ankara: A.Ü. Yayınları.
- Yasa, İbrahim (1970). Gecekondu Ailesi: Geçiş Halinde bir Aile Tipolojisi. *AÜSBF Dergisi* 25: 9-18.
- Yasa, İbrahim (1973). Gecekondu Ailesi Mozayığı. *Amme İdaresi* 6: 41-46.
- Yavuz, Fehmi (1962). *Şehircilik*. Ankara: Sevinç Matbaası.
- Yılmaz, Bediz (2003). Göç ve Kentsel Yoksulluğun İstanbul Tarlabası Mahallesi Örneğinde İncelenmesinde İlk Adımlar, İlk Sorular. *Toplumbilim* 17: 95-105.
- Yılmaz, Bediz (2008). Entrapped in Multidimensional Exclusion: The Perpetuation of Poverty Among Conflict-Induced Migrants in an Istanbul Neighborhood. *New Perspectives on Turkey* 38: 205-234.
- Yörükân, Turhan. (2006). *Gecekonducular and Gecekondu Bölgelerinin Sosyo-Kültürel Özellikleri*. İstanbul: Nobel.
- Yükseker, Deniz (2002). Business Relations into/from Gendered Social Relations: Exchange in the Transnational Suitcase Trade Market of Laleli. *New Perspectives on Turkey* 27: 77-106.
- Yükseker, Deniz (2004). Trust and Gender in a Transnational Market: The Public Culture of Laleli, İstanbul. *Public Culture* 16(1): 47-65.
- Yükseker, Deniz (2007). Economy and Gender in the Urban Borderland: The Public Culture of Laleli, İstanbul. *IN Urban Imaginaries: Locating the Modern City*, Alev Çınar and Thomas Bender (eds.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 17-36.
- Yükseker, Deniz, and Kelly T. Brewer (2008). İstanbul'daki Afrikalı Göçmen ve Sığınmacıların Yaşam Koşulları. *IN Facetten internationaler Migration in die Türkei: Gesellschaftliche Rahmenbedingungen und persönliche Lebenswelten*, Barbara Pusch and Tomas Wilkoszewski (eds.) Würzburg: Ergon, pp. 249-269.
- Zeybekoğlu, Senem (2008). Regenerating "Public İstanbul:" Two Projects on the Golden Horn. *IN Public İstanbul: Spaces and Spheres of the Urban*, Frank Eckardt, and Kathrin Wildner. (eds.). Bielefeld: Transcript, pp. 163-185.