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**Introduction**

The historical neighborhood Tophane is located on the European side of Istanbul. The neighborhood is about to become the scene of the Galataport project, a large-scale urban transformation initiative. The project will thoroughly change the adjacent port, which will be widened so as to enable larger cruise ships to moor. Furthermore, the surrounding docks will be demolished in order to make way for shopping malls and hotels. The project will affect Tophane profoundly, it will attract investors and store owners, tourists will flock the streets. After the project’s realization, the identity of Tophane will be different, irrevocably different.

In this thesis, the identity of the Tophane neighborhood is analyzed at the very start of the Galataport project. How do people perceive Tophane in 2014 before it will look different – and it will – as a result of the Galataport project?

Chapter 1 offers a brief historical overview of the way in which Istanbul’s urban fabric has changed over time. Especially contemporary geopolitical circumstances have left a footprint on the city. The Byzantine Era, the Ottoman Empire, and the Turkish Republic are all very distinctive timeframes during which the political system, language, and urban planning practices have changed. Most certainly, this has changed the city’s infrastructure, demography, and settlement pattern. By looking into the changing political system and geopolitical configuration one begins to understand the identity of this typical Turkish neighborhood.

Chapter 2 attempts to characterize the identity of Tophane. The neighborhood, being at the heart of Istanbul, is from a historical point of view inextricably related to the city’s history. Tophane’s urban structure and social composition can be explained as a consequence of past political events. Most inner city neighborhoods in Istanbul with narrow, curved streets owe their structure to the Ottoman Empire. This dense atmosphere is still reflected in the street pattern of Tophane. Inhabitants appreciate the so-called mahalle (Ottoman-style neighborhood) culture, which has partly withstood the test of time. Sections 3.2 and 3.3 will describe how the mahalle identity changed as a result of the arrival of newcomers. The old conservative inhabitants living a conservative lifestyle collide with higher educated newcomers. The Art Walk riots, a series of attacks on gallery owners in September 2010, testified to this. Three years later, in 2013, the neighborhood was shaken when Gezi Park protesters took shelter in Tophane and found themselves attacked by conservative inhabitants. Once more, the combination of young and old, progressive and conservative proved to be a flammable mixture in this neighborhood.
In Chapter 3, a definition of urban transformation is presented, since there exists a lot of confusion amongst academics to describe similar phenomena. The phenomenon calls for a more neutral way of describing it. Urban transformation projects, particularly in the context of Istanbul, if not the whole of Turkey, need to be looked at from different perspectives in order to avoid bias. The chapter continues with an overview of specific urban transformation projects from a historical perspective in order to find the red line that characterizes Turkish urban policy making. The current political administration can be better understood by taking account of the coup of 1980 and the beginning of the neoliberal era in Turkish politics. In the 2000’s, the soft neo-liberalist approach as set out by Istanbul’s mayor Bedredden Dalan was replaced by a more hardcore approach, backed up by the AK Parti in Ankara. Taking a look at historical examples of urban transformation might help to predict what could happen to Tophane’s identity once the Galataport project is realized. Becoming a European Union member state means adopting the latest planning standards set out by EU directives. If Turkey’s aim is still to become a member state, initiatives such as UrbAct and Urban might help the country to acquire the same desirable quality of sustainable urban transformation within the European Union. The guidelines as set out by these directives could help project developers and policy makers to improve livelihood conditions in a sustainable manner for Tophane’s inhabitants.

In Chapter 4, the method used to describe Tophane’s identity will be explained. In his 1961 study, geographer Kevin Lynch found a way to capture people’s geographical perception of certain American cities by asking them to draw maps of their respective cities. For the purpose of this thesis, the mental mapping approach was replicated in the form of a survey. The mental mapping procedure helps to characterize the perception respondents have of Tophane. Kevin Lynch’s methodology has been slightly adapted to the Turkish context to enable data merging together with excerpts from nine in-depth interviews; this mixed-method research will be a first attempt to catch a snapshot of Tophane’s identity in 2014.

In Chapter 5, the results of the survey and the in-depth interviews will be presented. In the first section, the respondents’ general mental map of Tophane will be presented, backed up by interview data. In sections 2 to 5, the role of age, gender, residency, and geographical background will be analyzed. Again, the data will be backed up with excerpts from the in-depth interviews. In the third chapter, the relation between respondents’ profession and their mental perception of Tophane will be analyzed with statistical measurements and compared with data from the interviews. Finally, in section 6, interviewees’ perceptions and expectations of the Galataport project will be examined. Throughout the entire chapter both
the survey data and interview results will be merged, leading to a hopefully clarifying characterization of Tophane in 2014.

Taken together, then, the five chapters revolve around and will deal with the following question: What makes up Tophane in the light of the Galataport project? This central question can be split up in the following related sub-questions:

1. How can Tophane’s urban fabric be explained historically?
2. How has urban transformation been carried out in Istanbul historically?
3. What kind of effect did these urban transformation projects have on the lives of the inhabitants and, as a consequence, on the neighborhood identity as a whole?
4. What is mental mapping, and how can it be used to characterize Tophane’s identity?
5. What implication may the Galataport project have for the identity of this neighborhood?
Chapter 1. Istanbul, a short history

Tophane’s current identity is characterized by its proximity to the Bosphorus and especially by its multi-ethnic character. Its identity cannot be understood by solely looking at the area itself. Its street pattern and topology are closely related to Istanbul’s historical development. It goes without saying that a thesis this size will not do justice to the many geo-political configurations it was part of. For purposes of clarity, this section is split up in three major political eras that have shaped the relation between politics and urban development in Istanbul. Identified are first of all the Byzantine Era ending in 1453, when Istanbul (then Constantinople) was part of the Roman Empire. Secondly, the Ottoman Empire, which lasted from 1453 until 1923. Thirdly, the Turkish Republic, founded by Kemal Atatürk from 1923 and lasting until today.

If the history of Europe is a Christian one, the city of Istanbul, then called Byzantium cannot be left out from its narrative. To begin with, during the Byzantine Empire the city was very much a typical European city in terms of its religion. In 324, Constantine the Great declared the city to be the New Rome, the capital of the eastern part of the Roman Empire. After Constantine’s death, the city was renamed after him to Constantinople. To emphasize that the New Rome, in contrast to the Old Rome was a Christian city, two churches were built. The first was devoted to the Holy Wisdom, the second to the Holy Apostles. The Hagia Sophia, together with the hippodrome, the royal palace and the Augustaeum constituted the monumental city.

If the history of Europe is a Christian one, the city of Istanbul, then called Byzantium cannot be left out from its narrative. To begin with, during the Byzantine Empire the city was very much a typical European city in terms of its religion. In 324, Constantine the Great declared the city to be the New Rome, the capital of the eastern part of the Roman Empire. After Constantine’s death, the city was renamed after him to Constantinople. To emphasize that the New Rome, in contrast to the Old Rome was a Christian city, two churches were built. The first was devoted to the Holy Wisdom, the second to the Holy Apostles. The Hagia Sophia, together with the hippodrome, the royal palace and the Augustaeum constituted the monumental city.

Many a times, the Christian Empire was threatened, by the Arabs during the early 8th century and halfway through the 11th century, when the Turks coming from Central Asia took almost half of the Empire. Another Christian impulse was brought about by the fourth Crusade (1202-1204), originally initiated to conquer Jerusalem. The crusaders took over Constantinople and occupied the city until 1261 when the Byzantine Empire recovered itself.

The year 1453 marked the definite end of Istanbul as a solely Christian city and perhaps the start of its Oriental history. For the first time in its history Istanbul became known as ‘Istanbul’, from the Greek eis tin polin, meaning ‘to the city.’ The old Roman style of urban planning changed into an Islamic one with its preference for curves. Sultan Mehmet II

---

conquered the city in 1453, erasing the last remnants of the Ottoman Empire. Straight roads turned into mazes, and the city steadily ‘Islamified’ with as many as 485 mosques and 4492 masjids, houses of worship, by the second half of the 17th century.4

Although Constantinople after its besiege in 1453 became an Islamic city, its conqueror Mehmed II did not intend on ‘completely’ eradicating its European history. In fact, he aimed to combine Perso-Islamic, Turco-Mogan, and Roman-Byzantine traditions to crystallize a great new Empire with Istanbul strategically at the juncture of two continents (Asia and Europe) and two seas (the Black and Mediterranean Sea).5 The sultan carefully mediated between Asia and Europe, potentially subverting binaries of cultural difference reinforced by humanist discourses on the Turks: human versus inhuman, civilized vs. barbarian, Western vs. Eastern and European vs. Asian. By doing so, Mehmed emulges in reverse Alexander the Great, whose adoption of eastern cultural practices is interpreted in Arrian’s Anabasis as a ‘policy’ of mediation, aimed to diminish the Macedonian conqueror’s foreignness in the expanding Asian frontiers of his empire.6

His strategy comprised a wide range of artistic fields, from politics to fine arts and landscape architecture to portrait medals. First of all, he promoted kuls ‘converted Christian born slave’ servants to the highest posts creating a ruling elite that culturally related to European visitors to his court.

‘Mehmed II’s intimates included sons of defeated rulers, among whom his Italian couturier Angiolello (attached to the imperial court between 1474 and 1481) counts the princess of Trebizons, the Morea, Bosnia, and Wallachia). His Christian stepmother Mara Brankoviç (a Serbian princess whose sibling was the sister-in-law of the Holy Roman Emperor Frederick III), served as one of his intermediaries in western diplomatic relations.7

Secondly, the sultan’s architectural commission merged Byzantine, Italian Renaissance, and Turkmen elements into the Ottoman tradition. This makes him the only Muslim ruler of his time to render the Ottoman identity by using western art features. Architects and artists arrived from Rimini, Naples, and Florence through diplomatic relations, attracted to the western cultural orientation of the sultan.8 Finally, the sultan used cartography as a contemporary city branding strategy that would turn Istanbul into the city of the future powerful Ottoman Empire. On one map’s representation of the ‘New Palace’ (seraglia nuovo)

---

6 Ibid., 262.
7 Ibid., 262.
8 Ibid., 264.
three pavilions are portrayed. The first pavilion is in the Persian manner (alle persiana), the second in the Turkish manner (alla turchesca) and the third in the Greek manner (alle greca). Sultan Mehmed II, aware of Istanbul’s merciful geo-political location did not refrain from utilizing it. Merging European, Turkish and Asian elements as pointed out by Necipoğlu, was the first step in creating a universal Ottoman Empire.9

The loss of the Byzantine Empire and the strategic location of Constantinople did not go unnoticed by contemporary European politicians and writers. The author of Lamento di Constantinopoli wrote that the fall of Constantinople was ‘another sad stage in the retreat of Christendom, which had begun with the loss of the Holy Land.’10 Yapp describes how the perception of the Orient and the way in which Europe depicted the Orient rather reflected Europe’s own identity. He uses the changing perception of Turkey over time in correlation with the changing European identity. Before the Enlightenment, the Europe vs. Orient contradiction was based on a religious fear for the Ottoman Empire.

Yapp illustrates that between the 15th and 18th century there existed a ‘bad’ and ‘good’ image of the Turk. The bad Turk was reflected in the work of a Hungarian pilgrim, enslaved in the Ottoman Empire. His De Turcorum moribus Epitome, published in 1553, was that of a bloodthirsty infidel, untouched by artistic refinement. The Turks were the evil, taking European Christian children from weeping parents as part of a levy. The perception of the good Turk existed among those who had close relationships with the Ottomans.11 Ogier Ghislain de Busbecq wrote that Turkey was very different from Europe but possessed qualities Europe lacked. The justice system was simpler, quicker and less corrupt than that of Europe. The Turks themselves tended to be more polite, hospitable and clean than most Europeans.12

After the Enlightenment, the image of Europe as a Christian geographical unit had waned off. The European-Orient, i.e. Turkish juxtaposition now had to be enforced by reflecting other characteristics, based on more political or cultural identities. Concepts emphasized in the depiction of Europe were: the pursuit of science, the temperate climate conducive for economic activities, and, in later times, the relative amount of freedom for women, and the social system. The notion of progress came into common use, masked but nevertheless clear for the later observer. Population growth according to Smith in The Wealth

---

9 Ibid., 271.
11 Ibid., 148.
12 Ibid., 149.
of Nations, is the main indicator for a nation’s wealth. Turkey with its lack of industry and its apparently declining population perceived to be declining was thought to have little wealth. Due to the gradual wane of the Ottoman Empire throughout its existence, Istanbul lost its power to European cities mastering shipping. When the Ottoman Empire during World War I acquired the luckless image of the sick man of Europe, the city had lost its former grandeur.

In 1923, the Ottoman Empire was to enter a new phase when it was declared to be the Republic of Turkey by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, a secular state of ethnic Turkish Muslims. This lead to discussions on the definition of the Turkish identity that last to this day. The population characteristics of Istanbul changed profoundly during the compulsory exchange of Greek-Turkish minorities in the same year. People of Greek and Turkish origin were exchanged in great numbers, according to later calculations; the number of Turkish Muslims from Greece amounted to more than 1 million Christian Greeks and 400,000 Turkish Muslims. The city of Istanbul remained an exception and a multicultural city, the 100,000 Greeks living in Istanbul were granted permission to continue doing so. However, the Greek population in Istanbul had been three times higher a century earlier.

Istanbul’s demographics changed towards a more homogeneous, Turkish pattern. Firstly, the exchange of population in 1923 resulted in various ethnic-religious minorities leaving the city. Secondly, the government imposed a tax on wealth officially applying to everyone, though in actual practice striking the Greek and Jewish minorities more severely. The Turkish state engaged in a so-called ‘Turkification process.’ In 1964, the Turkish government revoked a 1930 treaty granting Greek citizens permanent residency in Istanbul. A decree, which in fact, came down to their emigration to Greece and the abandonment of their houses. They were permitted to take 20 kilos of possessions and were forbidden to sell their property. The decree affected 9,000 inhabitants directly, a number not including their spouses who were also forced to move. The Turkish state confiscated most of the property, which, according to Mills, ‘was the most significant of all the ‘Turkification’ policies in Istanbul.’

The city Turkified even more from the 1950’s onwards, because of rapid improvements of the transportation network in Anatolia. Saunders in his study on

---

13 Ibid., 153.
urbanization, describes how the Harem bus station located at the Asian part of Istanbul, became an omen for future urbanization and the flight to the city. The bus station was, for a long time, the scene of unprecedented immigration decades before the phenomenon occurred in other world cities. When the road network in Turkey was laid out, it became possible for Turkish citizens to travel through the country swiftly. Especially during the 1980’s, the arrivals added half a million people to the city on a yearly basis.¹⁹

Anno 2014, it is argued that Turkey and Istanbul in particular, has become an immigration hub for the Central Asian and Middle Eastern region. The growing Turkish economy attracts people with all kinds of qualifications and skills. While Europe has turned into a fortress, resulting in declined immigration, its neighbor Turkey is applying a less strict immigration policy. It has become a center of immigration for people coming from the Black Sea Area and the Middle East.²⁰

The migrants seem to prefer Istanbul as their location of settlement. The city has been growing at an unprecedented rate in the last decades. In 1950 there were approximately one million citizens living in the city, in 2012 it was 13 million, a population growth of 1300 percent. The United Nations predicted that Istanbul could see its population increase to 18 million by 2025, a number that could be even higher if immigration from Asian parts of Turkey continues as it does now.²¹ As Saunders puts it: ‘If you begin at Harem, you will find the future of world’s cities.’²²

---

²⁰ Seçil Paçaci Elitok and Thomas Straubhaar, “Turkey as a Migration Hub in the Middle East,” Insight Turkey 13, no. 2 (2011): 112.
Chapter 2. Tophane

2.1 Tophane as a mahalle

In 2011, Istanbul’s mayor Kadir Topbaş claimed that ‘Istanbul is a country, not a city.’ Following his line of thought, this would imply that Tophane, being a neighborhood of Istanbul, is a city. All the clashes that Turkey faces, secularism vs. Islam, modernity vs. traditionalism, poor vs. rich, can be found on a smaller scale in Tophane as well. Now, to understand the identity of Tophane first a better understanding of neighborhoods in Turkey is needed. The concept of a neighborhood or more precisely, the identity of a neighborhood in Turkey differs from, say, a Western European city.

The Ottoman Empire laid out the foundation of a new type of neighborhood, the mahalle, which still is clearly defined as such in Turkey and other parts of Eastern Europe. The Ottomans used the mahalle as a main territorial unit in their settlement policy during the expansion of the Empire. They carefully planned the neighborhoods’ make-up, by segmenting the city into various religious groups, such as Muslims, Jews, Christians and even smaller entities, such as Gregorians, Orthodox Greeks, Catholic Latins, etc. The Ottomans did not divide the mahalle on the basis of a class system; citizens of various economic backgrounds were placed crisscross throughout the city. In this respect, the mahalle system fundamentally differed from the system in Western Europe, where lower classes were segregated in their own quarters.

The mahalle also functioned as an administrative unit. It was the smallest administrative unit to be represented by a religious leader. From the classical period to the post 1827 reforms, the imam and the muhtar26 were the responsible persons for the collection of taxes. The state did not interfere in the everyday life of the citizens, with the elites and other affluent families providing local public services, religious buildings, schools and fountains for the community. These families also functioned as a mediator between the state and the community, thus reflecting that hierarchy was omnipresent in the contemporary society. 28

---

27 Mischek, “Mahalle Identity Roman (Gypsy) Identity under urban conditions,” 158.
Although the spatial structure of the public sector was ordered according to religious principles of the state, the ordering of residential areas in the mahalle were not bound to any regulations according to the Ottoman government. The state did not interfere with the private sector, and, the mahalle was considered to be the private sector. The government applied a laissez-faire policy, thus safeguarding the privacy of the Muslim community. Other religious communities were peacefully living their private lives in their districts, separated from the Muslim community. Only potential threats such as fires or other incidents had to be dealt with by the mahalle. As for the public sphere, the mahalle was centered on a small mescit (mosque), a church or a synagogue, in other words a place of communal worship. This was, as mentioned briefly, to set up a new Islamic Istanbul, including the construction of mosques, medreses (religious schools) and markets.

The mahalle has been subjected to different political tides throughout its history, as has Turkey. Although the physical appearance of Istanbul changed during the Balkan Wars, World War I and the modernization at the beginning of the 21st century, according to Mischek, the core identity or social composition of the mahalle was not radically altered. Indigenes with a great variety of ethnic backgrounds lived together side by side, amongst them Greeks, Armenians, Jews and Roma. All of them were part of the ‘cosmopolitan understanding of being an indigene or Istanbullu.’

Scholars disagree about the point in time during the 20th century at which the mahalle’s social structure was altered by domestic political changes. Ögdül argues that the mahalle changed as a result of the creation of the Turkish Republic in 1923. The main policy for the Republic was total modernization of the system through direct intervention. Though traditional communities dissolved as a result of the secularization policy, the nation state did not succeed in unifying its citizens with a bonding national framework in which government institutions could work. The rural-urban migration perhaps offered that kind of framework for the newcomers to the mahalle in Istanbul.

According to Mischek, the fifties were a turning point for the mahalle’s social structure, when rural-urban migration provided a new framework of reference. Domestic migrants

---

30 Ibid., 158.
31 Containing Condition (Containing, Belonging to, Place of): The suffix -lü/-lü/-lü/-lü gives the sense of belonging to somewhere or being contained in something. E.g. İstanbul + lu = Inhabitant of Istanbul. Turkish Language, “Turkish Language – Basic suffixed,” accessed, March 26, 2014. http://www.turkishlanguage.co.uk/suffix.htm
32 Mischek, “Mahalle Identity,” 158.
34 Mischek, “Mahalle Identity,” 158.
engaged in a livelihood strategy to survive in Istanbul mahalles. Their memleket became the basis of new urban communities with an old physical structure. With this kinship or townmenship livelihood strategy, migrants from rural parts of predominantly Eastern Turkey and the Black Sea region bonded and settled in the same mahalle. The mahalle gradually became a quarter around a nucleus of immigrants, a self-fortifying process, in which one group of migrants settles and newcomers with an identical rural background benefit from the knowledge of the initial migrants. This mechanism turned out to be useful for job finding, housing provision and security of immigrants in the city. Although the identities linking together newcomers could vary from religion, ethnicity to tribal origins, the point of reference was always having a similar rural background. Eder and Öz illustrate how townmenship in actual practice helps newcomers in the process of new business formation:

‘Regarding the process of new business formation, fellow townmenship apparently plays a prominent role. On the Nevizade Street, which is well-known for its traditional taverns as mentioned above, for example, there are about 30 establishments around 20 of which having owners/workers coming from the Black Sea town of Ordu. In a similar vein, a considerable number of owners of türkü bars come from another Anatolian city, Tunceli. This, amongst other things, reveals the importance of social networks in the process of new business formation in the district of Beyoğlu.’

Tophane exhibits multiple features of the Ottoman style neighborhood with small streets built as if it were a maze. The neighborhood, located right next to the Bosphorus, owes its name to the cannonball factory built in the 15th century. The combination of top (ball, canon) and hane (house) makes up cannonball factory. Tophane used to be the centre of artillery production during the times of the Ottoman Empire and it is believed to be the most important canon foundry in the Ottoman Empire. The building, Tophane-i Amire (imperial armoury), was the center of the Turkish defense industry during the Ottoman times and began to serve as the Mimar Sinan Universities’ Culture and Arts Centre in 1998. Scholars describe old Tophane as a multicultural non-Muslim neighborhood, hosting the main trade port to Istanbul. During the Ottoman times in particular, non-Muslim members of the Empire, and foreigners working in the trade sector inhabited the neighborhood. As a result of both its close proximity to the Bosphorus and the influx of foreign influences, the neighborhood developed a very

35 Memleket.
36 Udo Mischek, “Mahalle Identity,” 158.
multicultural demography. Minorities with a Greek, Armenian and Jewish background resided in the neighborhood for centuries, making it a distinct multicultural neighborhood until the 20th century.  

After the ‘Turkification’ process in the 1930’s, the neighborhood became a homogeneous Turkish neighborhood. The pogrom of September 6-7 1955, became one of the clearest examples of the Turkification history and a dark episode in modern Turkish history. On the 6th of September 1955, a TRT radio broadcasted that a bomb had exploded near Atatürk's former house in Thessaloniki. Members from both the Turkish Student Union and the Cyprus Turkish Society led demonstrations against the Greeks scanting: ‘Cyprus is Turkish. It will remain Turkish!’ Anyone who dared to touch Atatürk’s sacred house was to pay a heavy price. In Istanbul a crowd wreaked havoc on the properties of Greek and other minorities. Their shops were smashed, their houses were burned down and many people were subjected to severe physical violence. The death toll was estimated to be between three and fifteen citizens. It would later be revealed that the bomb near Atatürk’s birth house in Thessaloniki was planted by the Turkish secret service, commissioned by the contemporary Turkish government. This ‘trick’ was supposed to chase the minorities away from Istanbul, leaving behind a pure ‘Turkish city.’ In a military trial in 1960, Adnan Menderes, president during the 1955 attacks, and Foreign Office Minister Fatin Rüştü Zorlu were convicted for plotting against the Greek minority and sentenced to death.

As a result of both this pogrom and the 1960 discriminatory anti-minority law, Tophane, though historically having been a rather cosmopolitan area is left with a predominantly homogeneous population. The neighborhood became populated by a large group of migrants with an Arabic origin migrating from eastern parts of Turkey. They replaced the Armenians, Greeks and Jews, who were forced to leave the city as a result of the discriminatory legislation. Schuitema noted that Tophane’s current citizens are aware of that black chapter in Tophane’s history:

‘I don’t know the details of the history of Tophane itself, but probably the September 6-7 pogroms might have done this [by “this” he meant that the neighborhood became dilapidated and religious – N.Z.] to Tophane. Tophane was one of the main targets. As a Turk, I am ashamed of that piece of history. It is worse than the Armenian

---

pogrom. You should read about it if you didn’t read it before. You will see how Adnan Menderes and his party are behind these pogroms.43

Tophane was characterized as an impoverished and run-down area for the second half of the 20th century. To begin with, the change in the international shipping industry hit the local harbor industry. Due to advancements in transportation technology (trucks, trains), the need arose for shipping containers to handle the shipping of such vehicles. The warehouses and cranes at the Tophane docks, however, were unsuitable for this type of shipping, thus leaving the docks out of use. Furthermore, the neighborhood had become more homogeneous during the Turkification policy. Once a thriving, cosmopolitan and multicultural neighborhood, Tophane now saw its minorities leaving for elsewhere. The Greeks and a small number of Armenians left Istanbul altogether, whereas the Spanish Jews who had been there since the Spanish Inquisition had Inquisition, had resettled in richer and more spacious parts of Istanbul.44

At present, Tophane features the same striking contrast as any neighborhood in Istanbul. Tuominen pinpoints how these differences come across to him, being a foreign PhD researcher. On the one hand, there is the very modern looking Boğazkesen Caddesi with hostels and galleries, on the other hand, there are the old-fashioned side streets and alleys where men in Islamic attire enjoy a cup of tea in one of the çay hane (tea houses). 45 This contrast, however charming and amusing it may seem from a foreign perspective, has a darker side to it: the vast gap between the ‘oldcomers’ from Eastern Anatolia and the ‘newcomers,’ the avant-garde upper middle class gallery owners fuelling the gentrification in the neighborhood. It is this inflammable sociological make-up of the site that in the near future is likely to be affected profoundly by the Galataport project.

2.2 The Art Walk riots and Tophane

Over the last couple of years Tophane's identity has increasingly been portrayed as ‘urban turmoil’ in media and academics. The neighborhood owes this image to a series of violent clashes between polarized social groups. In 2010, for instance, there were conflicts between gallery owners and inhabitants of the neighborhood. It all started on the evening of the 21st of September 2010 when a coordinated series of exhibitions, the so-called ‘Tophane Art Walks’

44 Ibid., 24-25.
was organized in the Boğazkesen Caddesi. A mob of twenty to forty people attacked visitors of the exhibition, violated them for over half an hour before the police arrived, and damaged the shops of gallery owners.\textsuperscript{46} \textsuperscript{47} Presumably, the use of alcohol had met with dismay on the part of Tophane's conservative residents.\textsuperscript{48} In the LA Times, however, an interviewee puts it down to gentrification and blames some of the inhabitants for the upheaval:

‘The attackers were the underdogs. This area will be gentrified. The slums will be cleared. These guys will have to leave, and they know it and are upset about it.’\textsuperscript{49}

Conflicting values or identities between different social groups in Tophane may be the dominant cause of the Art Walk riots. Leven Ozate distinguishes two categories of residents: new-and oldcomers. What defines an oldcomer in the historical timeline of Tophane’s existence? And what defines a newcomer? The current oldcomers are the migrants from Eastern Turkey who arrived in Tophane during the 1950's when they replaced the previous oldcomers: the Greeks and Armenians, who were forced to leave due to the pogrom. The current newcomers, the higher educated gallery owners may be oldcomers in the future.\textsuperscript{50} In short: it is problematic to define newcomers and oldcomers based on their time spent in Tophane. During his fieldwork in the neighborhood, Levent Ozata found out that inhabitants have used this concept of old-and newcomers to construct the identity of a typical Tophaneli (inhabitant of Tophane). Nowadays, a typical Tophaneli has Arabic or Kurdish origins in Eastern Turkey, is a conservative Muslim and arrived in the neighborhood in the 1950's. One respondent in Ozata’s study expressed his dismay of the newcomer’s ‘occupier mentality’ when one newcomer opened a gay hostel, a business unsuitable to the values of the neighborhood, according to the respondent.\textsuperscript{51}

Banu Karaca, who wrote a paper on the Tophane Art Walk case, criticizes ministry officials, responsible for cultural affairs for not stepping up for the arts after the attacks, hiding behind Turkish cultural sentiments. Nor in the case of the riots, nor in the case of exhibitions of works of art that may go against the neighborhood values. The official response

\textsuperscript{48} Edith Ammeraal, “Does Art Divide People?” 49.
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in the aftermath of the Artwalk riots, issued by Ertuğrul Günay, Minister of Culture and Tourism, illustrates his tendency to agree with the conservative demonstrators:

‘No one has the right to impose their way of living on Istanbul, but no one has the right to dismiss the customs and traditions of the people here either.’ 52

In a similar vein, when director Okan Urun was about to put on a play in gallery Kumbaracı50 in Tophane, the troupe was forced to opt out. The troupe had received several e-mail threats after the piece’s synopsis (an angel returning to earth in the body of a porn actress) was made public. Once again, minister Günay’s statement expresses his incapability to address the difficulties that the arts face in Turkey when it comes to freedom of expression:

‘I am someone who is against censorship, but I also think that artists have to be respectful towards some of the values of society.’ 53

In a response, the director argued that a statement of this kind by a minister of Culture, regardless of his having seen the play or not, is equally wrong as citizens of Tophane who feel justified in going to a gallery with bats. The Turkish government in his opinion needs to take a more proactive stance towards protecting its citizens, even though these citizens may have a different opinion on cultural values.

2.3 The Gezi Park protests and Tophane

Another episode of urban turmoil shook the neighborhood during the early summer days of 2013. The much larger Gezi Park protests took place on Taksim Square, barely a mile away from Tophane, and as a matter of fact all across Istanbul in May and June 2013. It all began in last week of May 2013, when a group of peaceful demonstrators was violently attacked by the police using teargas canisters. The brutal attack sparked the advent of a nationwide movement with citizens showing their dissatisfaction of the current Ak Parti’s neo-liberalist agenda.

Its leader, Tayyip Erdoğan came to the political forefront when he became the Mayor of Istanbul in 1994. At that time, Istanbul was coping both with public waste not being taken away from the streets and with heavy air pollution. During his administration the waste was removed from the streets and the city became cleaner and greener. After Turkey suffered a deep economic crisis in 2001, serious measurements had to be taken in order to restore the damage. With Erdoğan becoming Prime Minister of Turkey in 2003, the banking structure was reformed, and large investments in infrastructure, education, health and technology

---
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increased were made.\textsuperscript{54} Especially Anatolia, the mainland, took benefit from the economic reforms. Thanks to the Erdoğan’s AK Parti, small towns and villages had their infrastructure renewed; the local inhabitants also gained access to credit cards and privatized health care, a major improvement.\textsuperscript{55} Many villages in Turkey, until recently, did not have a sewage system. Most importantly, Erdoğan’s Ak Parti was democratically elected, which, as he now emphasizes again, is the proof that the majority of the people support him.\textsuperscript{56}

The Gezi Park demonstrators are dissatisfied with some of the measurements taken by Erdoğan. The first strand of criticism is directed against the ecological implications of megalomaniac urban renewal projects and the neo-liberal capitalism invoked by Erdoğan after his appointment as Prime Minister. The criticism comes from left wing environmentalists who are dissatisfied with the plan to build a shopping mall in the Gezi Park. The park is one of the last green areas left in Istanbul’s central district, where others have already made way for shopping malls or office spaces. The demonstrators fear that the Ak Parti’s future development plans might bring severe harm to Istanbul’s ecosystem, and, as a consequence, to public health. Envisaged are a third airport in Istanbul, a new bridge across the Bosphorus, and a canal connecting the Black Sea to the Sea of Marmara. Plans of this scale will most likely lead to deforestation and resettlement of poor people being forced to leave their house to make way for the plans of Erdoğan.\textsuperscript{57}

The second strand of the criticism is directed at the ongoing Islamization Erdoğan has brought about. This criticism often comes from secular higher educated citizens who prefer Turkey to remain a secular state in which both religious and secular people can live together and function as equal citizens. The demonstrators disapprove of the authoritarian and paternalistic policies that the Ak Parti uses to reform Turkey into a more conservative Islamic state.\textsuperscript{58} Indeed, Erdoğan was part of the Islamist movement in the eighties, and the recent measurements, such as a ban on selling alcohol during the night, are testimony to his previous political preferences.

The third strand of criticism comes from demonstrators who joined the protests at a later stage, outraged as they are about the violence used by the riot police in order to evict the
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initial campers who were trying to protect the Gezi Park from being demolished. It appears that even though Erdoğan is democratically chosen, he does not shy away from pushing political measurements through without any consideration for the opinion of minority groups in the society. Especially in the last couple of months, campaigns concerning chastity were followed by alcohol restrictions and, the destruction of old elite cultural centers such as the Emek-cinema in Istanbul.\(^{59}\) The main frustration for the mostly young and educated demonstrators in Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir, is that the current administration is deaf to their voices. President Gül commented: ‘Democracy is more than elections’, almost a warning signal to Erdoğan.\(^{60}\)

Academic research has been done on the deeper causes that bring about political demonstrations on a scale such as in Turkey. The recent Turkish protests have been compared with mass-demonstrations in Chile and Brazil. In Chile, the local populations rallied against higher tuition fees and in Brazil against a 9% increase in public transportation fares. In 1968, Harvard scholar Samual Huntington observed in 1968 that sudden economic growth in a particular country might lead to a political turmoil in the respective country.\(^{61}\) When economic growth takes off, the government needs time to catch up with a higher demand for public services. Political institutions face a kind of time lag, as if they are incapable of responding promptly and adequately to socio-economical changes in the society in which they are situated. Turkey, with its improved socio-economical circumstances for lower middle classes, might face this issue in the near future. The higher educated, richer demonstrators in the big cities in Turkey turn against the system and demand to be included in the democratic processes.\(^{62}\)

Vermeulen, a former Dutch correspondent in Turkey sees Tophane as a microcosm of everything that happens in Istanbul. There, during the Gezi Park protests, a part of the inhabitants turned against the demonstrators. Youngsters formed attack groups, attacking demonstrators who came back from Taksim Square. This seems to be a repetition of what happened during the Art Walk riots three years earlier,\(^{63}\) that is the clash of values between
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the old conservative inhabitants of Tophane, originating from cities in eastern Turkey, and the newcomers, such as the gallery owners. Identity can lead to unification of people in a spatial entity, it can however as shown in the Tophane case lead to segregation when ideas about identity diverge.
Chapter 3. Urban transformation

3.1 Urban transformation: regeneration or degeneration?

The radical transformation of Tophane’s adjacent neighborhoods has been severely criticized by planning scholars. The main criticism seems to be directed towards the lack of public participation, i.e. the possibility for citizens to participate in urban transformation projects that affect their lives. Project developers in Istanbul do not take into account the specificities of neighborhoods. Next to that, the outcome often results in eviction of the lower class citizens. Socio-economical differences and environmental issues are not properly addressed.64 In order to explain the relation between urban transformation and neighborhood identity, it is necessary to define urban transformation.

In this thesis the term urban transformation will be used, rather than urban regeneration. Urban regeneration, according to Keleş is defined as ‘A conscious, systemized and planned action concerning a certain section or totality of a town,’ which implicates a process with a clear target. Urban regeneration has the ability of ‘giving new strength or life to something’.65 Urban transformation on the other hand is different from urban regeneration in terms of direction and nature. Ma belies that urban transformation is not a change towards a preconceived and fixed target but a more natural process, it lacks direction.66 Following Keleş' definition, urban regeneration is, like urban transition, a systemized and planned action, concerning a certain section or totality of a town, presumably giving new strength or life to that part of city or the city in its entirety. Urban transformation however, may be a passive or active process and can imply a process having either a positive or, in some cases, a negative nature. Therefore, in contrast to urban regeneration, urban transformation, being a more neutral term, is preferred in the context of the Tophane case.

In the next sections, a number of urban transformation projects in Istanbul and their impact on the respective neighborhoods’ identity will be compared. This will shed light on the current plans for Tophane and expose the flaws of previous urban transformation projects. How successful have these various projects been in transforming impoverished areas and simultaneously improving living conditions? The lessons drawn from these urban

transformation projects may help planners to implement projects that will regenerate the neighborhood, instead of degenerating it.

3.2 Urban transformation from Ottoman times to 1980

Istanbul has been an excellent environment for urban planners to apply their experiments to. Especially after 1950, the exponentially growing city has seen numerous of these experiments. It is, however, undeniably difficult to practice urban planning in a city expanding at the rate of Istanbul. A plan written today might be outdated tomorrow. The potential implications of the impending Galataport project on the identity of Tophane may be substantial for the current inhabitants. In order to understand what kind of effect the Galataport project may have on the identity of Tophane, the centralized nature of the Turkish planning system and its indifferent approach to the receiving end of these projects will be analyzed in the next sections. Addressing the flaws of previous urban transformation projects may help to improve future urban transformation in Tophane.

Recent urban planning in Istanbul has embraced neo-liberalism as its core justification strategy to implement urban transformation projects. The year 2000 has been marked as the definitive start of the current neo-liberalist planning practices set out by the Ak Parti.67 68 69 The Ak Parti in combination with the Central Planning Authority (TOKİ) and the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality (IMM) have set the agenda throughout the first decade of the 21st century. The neo-liberalist wave sweeping through Turkey may appear to be new in its current shape. It is not, however, and in fact it shows similarities with planning practices during the Ottoman times.

The current urban issues Istanbul deals with, such as over population, disrupted traffic and unsustainable development have their genesis in 1945. During the post-World War II European economic recovery, Turkish urban industrial centers had exploded. Moreover improvements in Turkey’s infrastructure facilitated widespread rural-urban migration, causing thousands of migrants to migrate to Istanbul. The housing stock came under pressure because of the steady influx of immigrants, which created the need for a new type of housing, the gecekondu.70 The urban development of built overnight housing, inhabited by peasants,
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70 Translates to ‘built overnight’. A similar pattern characterized the industrial revolution in Britain, as migrants pitched temporary accommodation to get a foothold near the new coal and slate industries, and later turned these into permanent dwellings and enduring settlements.
occurred sporadically in the 1950’s but had its hey days during the 1980’s. Hundreds of thousands took part in the rural-urban migration process. Planning authorities were faced with the daunting task to regulate the gecekondu.  

3.3 The 1980’s to 2000: Neo-liberalism: a soft approach

At the end of the 1970’s, tensions between ultra-nationalist and radical leftists groups reached a boiling point, erupting in violent clashes that left many dead. In September 1980, through a military intervention the protests were brought to a halt. Activists were either killed or send to prison and rebellious academics were replaced by academics, who were supportive of the regime. After the military regime had been in power for three years, it dissolved itself, making way for an elected government. Turgut Özal, a former World Bank employee responsible for economic reforms during the military coup, became Prime Minister.

Özal's installation meant the definitive start of the neo-liberalist era in Turkish politics. Since sharing the ideology of the military regime had been beneficial for him during the elections, Özal continued along the same path. Turkey was opened up to the western world and by applying neo-liberalist policies in economics he pushed neo-liberalism through in politics. Turkey became an exemplar of ‘authoritarian neo-liberalism’.

The neo-liberalist government affected the way urban planning was to solve overpopulation, the Gecekondu and congestion. Bedreddin Dalan, mayor of Istanbul from 1984 to 1989, believed that in order to become an important world-city, taking part in globalization, Istanbul had to improve its infrastructure. All at the cost of the city’s heritage.

‘Istanbul was a city of 2500 years and it possesses more than 3 thousand historical buildings. If nearly one hundred of them constitute an obstacle to the construction of a major transport artery to serve the national and international trade, they must be demolished. We do not share the protectionist views, which prevent development.’

The mayor’s attitude is exemplary for the general view of urban policy making in the 1980’s, which is based on the fear of being left out of globalism. A couple of issues the neo liberalist government tried to address were the gecekondu lands and the perceptions of Istanbul as a degenerated city. In order to do away with the gecekondu of Istanbul and other prominent
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Turkish cities, the government commercialized the gecekondu lands. Those who owned gecekondu lands became apartment owners, while the gecekondus were demolished, thus making the owners rich while the gecekondu inhabitions experienced increasing deprivation.\(^{75}\)

The ambitious mayor rallied for globalization, pleading that Istanbul had to be transformed from a tired city ‘whose glory resided in past history, into a metropolis full of promise for the twenty-first century.\(^{76}\) In terms of its urban fabric, Istanbul gained nothing but zoned amenities, being implemented on a widespread scale\(^ {77}\), clearing the way for project developers to keep on building. Luxurious hotels and residential complexes have been built on top of green areas; the Golden Horn was cleared from industrial infrastructure. However, to green spaces or to the preservation of natural areas in the city little attention was paid.\(^{78}\)

While, in the 1990’s, neo liberalist top-down policy-making continued to dominate the agenda, a new urban phenomenon appeared, the *gated communities*. It is a form of privatized housing for more affluent citizens who want a higher standard of living. A standard of living in which inner city issues – uncanny neighborhoods, congestion problems and, in the case of Istanbul, the risk of an impending earthquake - do not fit. Pelin Tan, an authority on urban planning in Istanbul, juxtaposes the nature of these gated communities with the nature of the Tophane neighborhood. The neighborhood itself is experienced as a very safe place, according to Tan. Yet, the inhabitants of the gated communities keep on believing in the urban myth that Tophane represents the Other, something uncanny and insecure.\(^ {79}\)

The gated communities have been critized by sociologists for increasing the gap between richer and poorer urban citizens. In a city like Istanbul, where distances between citizens are substantial, creating gated communities may exacerbate social differences. Inhabitants can surround themselves by the comforts of their gated communities, where they do not need to interact with people who may have different opinions. They gather with people who have exactly the same wishes, and thus put a wall between themselves and the outside world. This might leave them to fantasize about the dangers outside even more and, paradoxically, it might generate the crime they want to keep out since it becomes clear that the rich are living in this neighborhood.\(^{80}\)

In her fieldwork on gated communities, Şerife Geniş observes that the neighborhood is
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inhabited by an ‘elite nostalgia’. They reminisce old times in Istanbul and the connectedness there supposedly once was. They ‘construct a false image of Istanbul’s old neighborhoods as homogeneous places. Later on, I will demonstrate that Tophane, albeit very old, has never been a very homogeneous neighborhood.82

3.4 The 2000’s: Neoliberalism hardcore

During the 2000’s, neoliberalism in its current shape started with the Ak Parti at the time that Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan came into power. The crucial difference between neoliberalism in Turkey between 1980 and 2000, and after 2000 is the role of the central government in Ankara. After 2000, the government in Ankara starts to back up the global aspirations of Istanbul's mayor. Had neo-liberalist urban planning between 1980 and 2000 only partially succeeded in transforming the urban landscape, after 2000 neo-liberalist policies became more widespread and profound.83 It is the Ak Parti’s explicit strategy to globalize Istanbul, thereby bringing ‘laissez faire globalization’ to a close. Globalization is serious business, and Istanbul, according to Tayip Erdoğan has to be updated to the 21st century:

‘Like every other nation, Turkey now has two options. We can choose to resist change. In this case, we will also have to accept that our current lot is the highest step we can achieve on the ladder of historical evolution. We will have to accept and be content with the state we are currently in, if, that is, we survive. Or, we will choose to change our worn-out discourse dating back to the years of the Cold War.’84

The Ak Parti has been able to push through neo-liberalism in urban transformation rather successfully, without any doubt the result of a ‘total accord between local and central governments.’ Istanbul has become a showcase for the Ak Parti, the city where projects are faster and better than before, carefully directed by the government in Ankara.85 Three actors steer the massive urban transformation in Istanbul. TOKİ86, the Istanbul Metropolitan
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Municipality and Ali Ağaoğlu. All have been criticized by urban planners because of their inelegant approach towards urban transformation in Istanbul. Dilek Unalan notes that the IMM’s urban transformation projects will leave 85,000 housing units demolished and around a million inhabitants displaced. She criticizes the lack of sustainability in urban transformation projects initiated by the IMM. Forests are cut down and green zones turned into building units, which is affecting Istanbul’s climate. Precipitation in autumn and winter has decreased and the city has difficulties to supply the inhabitants with drinking water. Problems of this kind are most likely to increase if the mismanagement of urbanization, in combination with unsustainable urban transformation, continues.

TOKİ is perhaps the most active urban transformation actor in Istanbul and simultaneously the most criticized. TOKİ is the single responsible housing body in Turkey and over the last decade steadily it has steadily turned into a less accountable organization with help of Prime Minister Erdoğan. Especially after 2004, a couple of laws have granted metropolitan municipalities juridical status to cooperate with TOKİ, thus increasing its legitimacy. Scholar and economist Güven Sak has pointed out how TOKİ starts to look like a Big Brotheresque organization, and released the following ominous warning: ‘The judge, the prosecutor, and the policy were one and the same.’

TOKİ’s website reads that the company covers 5 to 10 percent of the total housing need in Turkey. ‘Around 40 percent of housing in Turkey is shanty housing and 67 percent of the housing stock lacks settlement permit.’ According to TOKİ, most of these houses have to be demolished and rebuilt to safeguard its inhabitants against the risk of earthquakes. Ironically, Erdoğan Bayraktar, TOKİ’s head and former minister of Environment and Urban planning of Turkey, resigned as of December 2013. His son as well as two sons of other Minister’s sons was implicated in a graft probe concerning 4.5 million dollar. Bayraktar also invited Prime Minister Erdoğan to step down, since the zoning plans that were under
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investigation, were made under his order.\textsuperscript{94} During his time as head of TOKİ he issued the following statement:

‘Today, the gecekondu is one of the most important two or three problems that Turkey faces. It is well known that such things as terror, drugs, psychological negativity, health problems and oppositional views all come out of gecekondu zones and irregular areas. For this reason, a Turkey that wants to integrate with the world, that wants to join the European Union, must rid itself of illegal dwellings…Turkey cannot speak of development without solving the gecekondu problem.’\textsuperscript{95}

The displacement of the poor has been described as ‘Istanbul’s current class cleaning’.\textsuperscript{96} The current administration sees gecekondu inhabitants as the scapegoats for Istanbul’s urban issues. But the gecekondu inhabitants do not have the financial means to defend themselves against forced eviction. In fact, TOKİ has the legal freedom to realize its objective, which is to demolish shanty housing and replace them with apartment blocks. The inhabitants face burdensome requirements to be admitted to TOKİ apartments. All residents are obligated to pay service costs for the cleaning of public space such as elevators or waste disposal. Most of the former gecekondu inhabitants cannot afford these costs and have to turn to a robotic life, working from dawn to dusk, to meet the financial requirements. Residents find their TOKİ apartments to resemble coffins and prefer their old housing, where green space was available and children had enough space to play.\textsuperscript{97}

In the documentary Ekümenopolis about neo liberalist urbanism in Istanbul, urban planners criticize TOKİ for building monotone apartments blocks that lack social cohesion. Research in Australia revealed that there is a relation between the type of housing in a neighborhood and the social relations within that neighborhood. Respondents living in townhouses or villas reported stronger levels of social ties than amongst respondents living in apartment blocks. The bigger the distance between apartment blocks, the weaker social ties between residents. Interestingly, Jane Jacobs a writer on urban planning asserts in her ‘Life and Death of American Cities’ that gradual or evolutionary redevelopment leads to stronger neighborly ties within a neighborhood.

‘A district must mingle buildings that vary in age and condition, including a good proportion of old ones.’\textsuperscript{98}
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Social ties are constructed very differently in gated communities. Pekelsma criticizes gated community projects in Istanbul such as My World from Ağaoğlu for being too exclusive towards other socio-economic groups. The inhabitants of My World may enjoy a very comfortable lifestyle, which helps to fulfill their goals and desires, while in close proximity people are evicted from their houses and forced to move far away from the city center, to the outskirts of Istanbul.99

3.5 Urban transformation after 2000, the case of Tarlababaşı

In this section, in order to understand how the Galataport project may affect Tophane's identity, the case of urban transformation in the adjacent Tarlababaşı will be examined. There are similarities and differences in both the urban transformation that occurred in this cases and the neighborhoods' identity itself. Especially after the arrival of the AK Parti and top down neo-liberalist policies multiple neighborhoods in Beyoğlu have been the site of large scale urban transformation projects, varying in size and nature.100 In this section, the case of Tarlababaşı will be analyzed.

Tarlababaşı is one of the neighborhoods that has been and still is the site of a major urban transformation project. The neighborhood is located in the city center of Istanbul, in close proximity both to Taksim Square, the most prominent square of Istanbul and to İstiklal Caddesi, the busiest shopping street in town. Whereas the neighborhoods surrounding Taksim are quite commercialized and touristic, Tarlababaşı was known as the opposite. It was considered to be a run down area, inhabited by working class citizens and plagued by criminality, prostitution and drug consumption.101 Tarlababaşı was constructed during the late 19th and early 20th century and known as a predominantly non-Muslim neighborhood, inhabited by minorities such as Greeks and Armenians. Similar to what happened in Tophane, these original inhabitants saw themselves forced to move when they fell prey of discrimination and violence in the 1950’s. The last non-Muslim residents were deported in 1964.102 The empty houses they left behind were confiscated by a new wave of immigrants, arriving by train from the Southeast of Turkey. Tarlababaşı's current demographics reflect how this black page in Turkish history changed Tarlababaşı’s population characteristics. In the renewal area, as found by Sakızoğlu, around 52 percent of the citizens have a Kurdish

102 See chapter 2.1 ‘Tophane as a mahalle’ on the events of 1955. Greeks and Armenes in Tophane were suspected to have planned the attack on the former birth home of Kemal Atatürk.
background. Most of the inhabitants cannot call themselves the original habitants of Tarlabası as they arrived after the Greeks and Armenians were evicted. Almost 95 percent have origins outside of Tarlabası, mostly in the east of Turkey, but also in Nigeria, Somalia, Romania, Iraq and Bangladesh. A small minority, a fraction of the 11 percent of citizens coming from the Marmara region is found to have a Roma background.\textsuperscript{103}

Circumstances have not been fortunate for these inhabitants, who are living below average levels of income, education and literacy. Having social insurance is an exception, rather than a rule, as is to be expected considering the sectors that the inhabitants work in. An undefined percentage is employed in marginal jobs such as refuse collection and prostitution. And 4 percent of the household heads are transvestites, who occupy the most marginal position in Tarlabası.\textsuperscript{104} One could argue that it is perhaps unfortunate or unfair that citizens who have to struggle to get by, got struck by the installment of Law No. 5366 that left them in an even weaker and more inferior position.

This particular law, Law No. 5366 has been criticized by urban planning scholar for enabling authorities to implement urban transformation projects without public agreement, using random criteria to designate urban transformation areas. Law No. 5366 regulates how future urban transformation areas should be designated and what kind of requirements the parties involved have to fulfill. Dinçer notes that residents affected by urban transformation hardly receive legal protection. In Article 3 of the Law on Expropriation, which is not the same as Law No. 5366, it is stated that if agreement between the relevant authorities and tenants, or other types of inhabitants, cannot be reached to ‘realize settlement planning projects’ the Article applies. This means that inhabitants would always loose when it comes to a legal case between tenants and authorities. Furthermore, in Article 7 it is stated that when it comes to consultation, the authority in charge could call for consultation meetings ‘if and whenever’ is necessary.\textsuperscript{105} Kuyucu and Ünsal also criticize the seemingly random criteria the law prescribes in designating areas of urban transformation. For example, according to the law areas at risk of earthquakes, or blighted areas, can already be designated. However, it is not specified with what degree of blight or earthquake risk the threshold for urban transformation is passed.\textsuperscript{106}

Generally, urban transformation in Istanbul has affected tenants negatively and in
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many cases it has led to large-scale displacement. Local governments that did not succeed in getting consent of property owners and used Article 3 to expropriate property from owners who disagreed with proposed transformation projects. Currently, the law states that in case of expropriation, the property value has to be paid back in installments within a pay off term of at most five years. For property owners who lost their property, there is no alternative solution for replacement housing prescribed by law. A binding relocation policy would offer tenants more security when their area is the site of a transformation policy.\textsuperscript{107}

The relentless nature of Law No. 5366 with respect to the receiving end of urban transformation projects, became painfully clear to the inhabitants of Tarlabası in 2005. When they first learned of the municipality’s plans to transform a part of the area, the inhabitants were hopeful and believed they had hit the jackpot. A deputy mayor told the inhabitants that the World Bank would provide funds to renew the neighborhood and that everybody got the chance to renovate his own place. The reality, however, differed from the deputy mayor's story.\textsuperscript{108} The Beyoğlu Municipality had put the designated area, 278 buildings in 9 blocks, out to tender. As of April 2007, the GAP\textsuperscript{109} attracted seven major architectural companies and nine Turkish ‘star architects’ to prepare revitalizing projects.\textsuperscript{110} In a speech delivered at TOKİ, Turkish Prime Minister Erdoğan made no mistake about it: urban transformation projects are a necessity, used to ‘remove the tumors that have surrounded our cities.’\textsuperscript{111}

The municipality’s approach towards the affected tenants in urban transformation project Tarlabası reflects this attitude. Tenants did not receive bank loans originally promised to them, and now found themselves confronted by the municipality with different options, depending on their status as a user group. The first group, the property owners had three options. The first option was either to accept an amount of 42 percent of the original floor space of their property after the project’s completion or full compensation and an underground parking lot. Their second option was a complete refunding of the original value of their property before the onset of the project. The third option was the claim right to buy a housing unit, provided by TOKİ, situated 35 kilometers away from their current property, in the outskirts of Istanbul, provided by TOKİ. For the second and third group, tenants with or without a formal contract, the offers were less benevolent. They were initially not taken into account during the negotiation process. Eventually, however, the situation was ‘solved’ as
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follows. The second group, tenants with a formal contract, was offered the possibility to buy a house belonging to Mass Housing of TOKİ. The third group, tenants without an official contract, the so-called squatters, was not taken into consideration whatsoever. 112

The event of displacement may have negative effects on inhabitants’ ‘insider advantages.’ Insider advantages are location-specific skills and knowledge an individual accumulates over time. If residents move to a different location, these skills or knowledge would (partly) loose their function since they are not relevant to the new location.113 In her work on the Urban Transformation Project Tarlabası114, Bahar Sakızlioğlu argues that residents benefit from the help of friends and family, these are their ‘insider advantages.’ The weakest in society, such as prostitutes or transvestites, find comfort and protection by clustering together. As people rely on the social bonds that the community offers, displacement may have detrimental effects on their livelihood strategies.115 The displacement process as experienced by the inhabitants of, in this case Tarlabası, was often arduous and experienced by the residents as psychologically wrecking. Some inhabitants had been waiting from 2005 until 2011 until they learned that their displacement was inevitable. Sakızlioğlu interviewed a single woman with four children on her experience. This is one of the telling answers she received:

‘I have not thought of moving out. We cannot move out before they evict us. We cannot move out before they put us on the streets. I went to the municipality to ask how I will stay in the streets with these kids. If not your mother, no one would help in these hard times. People help maybe for once or twice but not for the third time. They (the municipality) should at least show us a house.’116

The outcome of the final urban transformation as outlined by the municipality will change the neighborhoods’ identity profoundly. The inhabitants who will be able to live in Tarlabası after the realization of the project are most likely to be the affluent ones, those who belong to a different class in society. 117 The project may succeed in ‘revitalizing’ the area, but it shows the negative implications of urban transformation on poorer inhabitants. And by removing those inhabitants, the government has undoubtedly removed a piece of the identity of Tarlabası as well.

112 Sakızlioğlu, “Inserting Temporality,” 211.
114 Sakızlioğlu, "Inserting," 211.
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3.6 The Galataport project

‘When this project is realized, the number of cruise liners will increase as the project facilitates the passage and modernizes the environment of the new port; the quality and number of tourist who arrive on such liners will significantly improve. As an eventual consequence, the new functions of the zone will not only bring great financial profits but also visitors will feel the contemporary development of Istanbul soon after their arrival.’118

This quote can be found on the website of Tabanlıoğlu Architects, the architectural office that is involved in designing the dockings next to Tophane. The transformation of these dockings is part of a larger transformation process of the Golden Horn area. Since the 1980’s, neo-liberal governments backed up by Istanbul’s mayor Bedreddin Dalan have been transforming the waterfront of the Golden Horn (Haliç), the body of water separating the historical Sultanahmet district from the Beyoğlu district. Back in the 1980's urban transformation aimed at clearing the waterfront from heavy industry, which was the primary cause of the severe pollution troubling the Golden Horn. Bozdoğan and Akcan point out that the initial transformation of the 1980’s left the Golden Horn with ‘rather uninspiring parks and playgrounds serving primarily the poorer neighborhoods on the overlooking hills’119

Starting in the 1990’s and continuing in the 2000’s the IMM, under direction of the Ak Parti, transformed the Golden Horn area into a ‘cultural zone.’ The country’s wealthy few invested in the transformation of historical buildings into museums or university buildings. Among them, the Feshane factory became a temporary host to the internationally renouned Art Biennalle in 1987.120 When Turkey was accepted as a candidate country for the European Union in 2004, the old history of the harbor was used to set up the flagship museum called the Istanbul Modern. One of the old warehouses, a post-industrial complex close to the Bosphorus, was transformed into a museum on Modern Art. Among the investors are the Sabancı family,121 Eczacıbaşı, and foreign partners.122 As in the case of Tarlabası described in the previous section, an established architect office, Tabanlıoğlu, was involved in the

120 Ibid., 286.
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transformation process. The museum offers the visitor galleries and cafés in a modern, industrial environment. It is with this panoramic location, right at the Bosphorus embankment, with the proximity to Beyoğlu and with the narrative of art, that Istanbul Modern has become the stepping-stone to the more extensive Galataport project.123

The Galataport project, also known as the Salıpazarı-Karaköy Cruise Port Project, is supposed to transform the area of old warehouses adjacent to the Bosphorus into a big harbor. The Turkish Maritime Organization that originally owned the Istanbul Salıpazarı Port area, proposed the project initially in 1998.124 The port is one of the largest in Europe and accounts for a number of 600.000 passengers yearly.125 As the harbor is currently insufficient in accommodating large cruise ships, the Turkish Maritime Organization wants the area to be widened to allow larger cruise ships to moor. Transformation into a larger cruise port is supposed to generate huge economical profits for the companies involved. The port is the only cruise port in Istanbul and could see its number of arriving passengers increase by a fivefold. The harbor will also contain a museum, various shopping malls, multiple star hotels and offices.126 The plan once again fit into the neo liberalist strategy to transform the waterfront into a zone of culture, education and tourism.

The project has, recently, been put out to tender by the Turkish Privatization Authority in order to start the privatization process and further implementation of the Galataport project. The highest and winning bid came from Doğuş Holding in May 2013 with an offer of 702 million dollar for operating the project area during the next 30 years. The company, a Turkish conglomerate, primarily active in the banking and media sector, has expressed its great interest in the Galataport Area. During a press conference in 2013, when Istanbul was still running for the Olympic Games of 2020, CEO Hüsnü Akhan recognized the importance of the harbor’s central location. The project, according to Akhan ‘will add to Istanbul’s brand value amid its Olympic bid.’127

123 Bozdoğan and Akcan, “Turkey,” 286.
126 Erbaş, “Port Regeneration,” 7.
Urban planners, architects and contractors’ chambers, do not share Akhan's vision. In fact, they recently started a lawsuit against the Galataport project’s implementing. The project’s execution goes against the constitution and what urban planners perceive as the basic principles of urban planning, such as citizen participation. Scholars fear that the project’s budget calculations and the available financial resources do not meet the implementation costs. Furthermore, the project as a whole is not sustainable in its current shape and will have detrimental effects on the environment, infrastructure and local economy. The area's infrastructure, being right next to Kemeraltı Caddesi, the main road along the western shore of the Bosphorus, already suffers from heavy traffic. The current amount of traffic exceeds the maximum capacity in Karaköy and Tophane. If this project is executed as it is proposed, the growing amount of visitors will only aggravate the current traffic issues. Finally, the Galataport project does not include enough green space for nearby residents in the current plans: there are no parks or trees to be found.

The fear exists among planners that the Galataport project in its current shape will not sufficiently address Tophane residents in the plans and exacerbate the congestion issue. In order to join the European Union, Turkey needs to change its current urban planning policies into a more inclusive approach, finds Marc Pierini, visiting scholar at Carnegie Europe. Turkey, in contrast to the European Union member states, lacks a uniform policy to engage citizens in urban planning policies and stimulate public participation to ensure a democratic outcome. In her fieldwork on Tophane, Edith Ammeraal points out that policy-makers in Turkey criticize the ruthless approach in which urban transformation is executed, and more specifically, how the objective of economic gain usually wins from sustainability. One Dutch senior advisor, working at the Istanbul Policy Centre of Sabancı University, notices that in comparison with the Netherlands there is no citizen participation: ‘They just plan something and when the inhabitants get informed, at the end they have to leave immediately.’

An architect in Istanbul draws a similar conclusion:

---
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As an architectural office we don’t have to do anything with this (citizen participation). Of course it hurts me too. But there is a plan, and when it is economically profitable, everything has to give way for that. The same goes for cultural history and heritage.\(^{133}\)

As the Galataport project is yet to be realized, it is not too late for the parties involved to take notice of current EU guidelines. The EU has a host of programs with guidelines for urban transformation policies, especially in poorly developed regions. URBAN, for instance, is an initiative that was set up in 1994 by the European Commission to encourage cities or neighborhoods in crisis to come up with innovative and integrate measurements in the field of urban transformation. The member states and the Commission both funded URBAN II and between 2000 and 2006, a substantial 1.6 billion euro’s for a population of 2.2 million inhabitants has been made. Areas potentially qualifying for Urban II are those cities or neighborhoods that constitute a homogeneous geographical and social-economic unit. A qualifying area must be in a state of crisis and in need of socio-economical rehabilitation. In Urban II, one of the criteria established for the execution of urban transformation programs was the following: ‘The integration of other social actors into the project and to provide a reasonable accessibility to the public services.’\(^ {134}\)

Apart from Urban, there is another initiative called URBACT, a European exchange and learning program aimed at enhancing sustainable development in European Union member states. It is financed both by the member states and the European Union (European Regional Development Fund). Currently, 500 cities and 29 countries are involved in Urbact, which includes the member states plus Norway and Switzerland.\(^ {135}\) The guidelines laid down in Urbact III for the timeframe 2014-2020, explicitly address public participation and transparency as conditions for investments. The most important thematic objectives that Urbact III strives for during the next six years are the protection of the environment, the promotion of social inclusion and the combatting of poverty.

The latest developments in Tophane indicate that the reality for local residents will differ from what the EU initiatives are striving for. Although URBACT appears to be involved in the Galataport project\(^ {136}\), discussions on the preservation of historical assets and
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the project’s integration have been of concern among architects and urban planners who along with the contractors' chamber filed a lawsuit against the project during the bidding process in 2013. Moreover among residents fear that their panoramic view over the stray of Bosphorus might be blocked by the shopping malls when the project is finished. And finally, the project is developed for a limited area defined by property borders, which may or may not align with the neighborhood’s borders of identity.\(^{137}\)

Recently, both inhabitants and entrepreneurs in Tophane have begun to feel the effect of the impending Galataport project. Hotels have moved into the area as the project has ignited high expectations amongst hotel owners. Rent prices have gone up quickly and the owners of teahouses and water pipe cafés are put out by competition as a result of the arrival of new hip bars and cafés were a young crowd enjoys a cappuccino.\(^{138}\) A local café owner is flabbergasted by the expertise the new generation brings along. His quote in the Turkish newspaper Today’s Zaman beautifully illustrates the change of times:

‘These new places are serving world-class cuisine. They serve cappuccinos, which I have no idea about. Tea is what I know.’

The same article reports that nargile (water pipe) café owners in a stroke along the seaside have been told by Doğus Holding to shut down their cafés by the end of April. Some owners decided to close earlier, confronted with the inevitability of the impending project. Also in the Galip Dede Street, closer to İstiklal Caddesi and the westernized Taksim area, the effect of the Galataport project is felt. In the last five years fifteen of these shops, and one located in a backstreet, have been forced to close due to the rising rent prices.\(^{139}\) Another interviewee illustrates the imminent change:

‘Bülent, in his 60s, runs a small bakery and fruit juice stand in Tophane. He says he was born and raised in the area and recalls fond memories of his Greek and Armenian neighbors. “There was a beautiful atmosphere back in those days. But the area is always changing. Our homes will probably be sold in the next few years,” he said, noting that rents in the area are on the rise.’\(^{140}\)

Of course, neighborhoods all around the world are changing continuously, in various ways and gradations. Change can be positive too, it can clear the way for newcomers and fresh influences, thus adding a new historical layer to a neighborhood. If urban transformation is
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done well, it may help to improve the quality and identity of a neighborhood but, as shown in the Tarlabası case it appear as if urban transformation was not used for local residents. Instead, economical gain prevailed over sustainability: money was spent on demolishing local residents' apartments instead of renovating them which would be more sustainable. A policy of sending the poorest out and letting the richest in was applied. If the Galataport = aims to contribute to both Istanbul’s market value and to Turkey’s potential membership of the European Union, its developers should perhaps start to communicate with the residents of Tophane. Odd as it may seem in the eyes of Turkish developers in key positions, they should perhaps draw a lesson from what over the last decades in some European countries has become this simple truth, if not this human right:

‘Public participation is based on the belief that those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process.’

---

Chapter 4. Methodology

4.1 Definitions of mental mapping

Academics use various and sometimes overlapping terms to define mental maps. Roger Downs defines mental maps as cognitive maps, drawing on the psychological side of them: ‘Cognitive maps are complex, highly selective, abstract, generalized representations in various forms.’\(^{142}\) In 1975, geographer Yi Fu Tuan noticed geographers do not see the mind as their principal object of study.\(^{143}\) Instead, their interest in mental maps focuses on the relation between mental maps and actual behavior in space. Tuan defines mental maps as ‘cartographic representations of how people differ in their evaluation of places, and freehand maps that people can draw – outlines of city streets and continents.’\(^{144}\) Mental mapping can be a great research method for studies on perceptions of spatial identity. Powell believes that mental mapping ‘evokes and captures the mutually constitutive nature of place and social relationships.’\(^{145}\) The Oxford Dictionary of Geography highlights the acquisition process of a mental map:

‘A map of the environment within an individual’s mind that reflects the knowledge and prejudices of that individual. A mental map indicates the way an individual acquires, classifies, stores, retrieves, and decodes information about locations.’\(^{146}\)

Within science, multiple explanations exist on the construction of a mental map in human beings. To begin with, from a geographical perspective, a human being, in his or her everyday survival, needs to have locational information about an object, e.g. a school, an office, a theater. Locational information can be broken down into two distinctive concepts: distance and direction. Calculations of time and money to bridge a certain distance between you and an object are intrinsic to spatial behavior.\(^{147}\) Direction is essential information in order to determine the most efficient route from you to a given object. Secondly, the construction of mental maps requires attributive information about an object to be stored in the mind. Attributive information entails what is to be found at that particular object’s location, and why
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someone needs to go there. There are two types of attributive object information, denotative and evaluative.\textsuperscript{148} Denotative contains all the factual or neutral information related to that object. Someone may consider a cinema to be ‘big’ but may not have further thoughts on that. Attributive information of an object may be of an evaluative nature. One may, for instance, consider a cinema to be cheap or expensive, thereby charging the given object with either a positive or a negative judgment.\textsuperscript{149}

Secondly, Tuan explains how, from a psychological perspective, mental maps are constructed within the human being. He compares a mental map with a photograph. The crucial difference between the two is that a mental map is not a photograph of a reality, but rather a mental redefinition of it. The eye registers an environmental stimulus, transmits a signal to the mind, which, in its turn, constructs an image or a percept based on the needs of that moment. As Tuan puts it: ‘To see is to create.’\textsuperscript{150} Likewise, a mental map is a reconstruction of a reconstruction. It is ‘a reconstruction of a real cartographic map, which in itself is already an abstraction of a certain geographic space.’ A mental map can be more accurate if the beholder has actually seen a cartographic map of the area the beholder finds him or herself in.\textsuperscript{151}

Mental maps can be very powerful sources of information but they do have a couple of limitations. Scholars need to be careful in assuming that mental maps may be accurate depictions of a reality. There are a couple of interesting flaws people make when drawing up maps. To begin with, mental maps may be incomplete. In Kevin Lynch’s study of Boston, incompleteness occurred when some respondents omitted an important landmark, the John Hancock building. They did so because they did not use landmark in their daily geographical routine.\textsuperscript{152} Secondly, mental maps can be distorted and schematized. An urban resident living at the same distance to an object in the city center as to an object in the suburbs, often considers the object in the center to be closer. Schematization occurs when we use concepts such as ‘the Orient’, ‘the East Coast’, or ‘behind the Iron Curtain’ to describe large areas. Other schematization occurs when people lack categories to describe spatial phenomena: ‘Once you've seen a slum, you’ve seen them all.’\textsuperscript{153} Thirdly, map drawers tend to ‘fill in the blanks’ when drawing up mental maps. This is called augmentation, and it already occurred centuries ago when ancient cartographers, afraid of drawing up an incomplete map,
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filled voids with fictitious rivers, seas or even sea monsters.\textsuperscript{154} These examples show that it is very difficult for the human mind to store all information about location data and attributes of a given area. Mental maps tend to depict the most vital objects or paths people use in their daily lives. On the other hand, they do offer scholars insight into people’s daily activity pattern and spatial perception. The next section will show the methodology applied by scholars in gathering mental map data.

4.2 Kevin Lynch’s mental mapping

The interest in mental mapping is not very recent, although mental mapping gained more attention after American geographer Kevin Lynches’ influential mental mapping study in 1961. With his study among thirty urban dwellers in Boston and fifteen both in Los Angeles and Jersey City, Lynch attempted to understand how his respondents perceived the visual quality of American cities.\textsuperscript{155} The ease with which people find their way in a city teaches us how urban design can enhance the visual quality and livability for different user groups. Lynch believed that the ‘performance of the city’ is related to vitality, sense, fit, accessibility and control. A city needs to have an abundance of water, air and energy to sustain life.\textsuperscript{156} In his study on the image of the city, Lynch brought forth a term still in common practice within urban design: \textit{legibility}. The geographer understood legibility to be the apparent clarity of the citiescape to the user. It is the ease ‘with which parts of the city can be recognized and organized into a coherent pattern.’ The more a city exhibits legibility, the more likely possesses a unique identity, structure and environmental quality.\textsuperscript{157}

Another product of his case study is the so-called Lynchian elements: paths, edges, districts, nodes, and landmarks. \textit{Paths}, channels of movement such as streets, train tracks, and canals can have strong path properties if they have continuity. If a path along the way remains continuous and uninterrupted by side streets or by a change in building patterns, this, according to Lynch, may strengthen the path’s identity, which then helps to connect city parts.\textsuperscript{158} By \textit{edges} Lynch understood ‘the linear elements not used or considered as paths by the observer’. An edge may function as a division between two districts. A remarkable edge may also be used as a reference point. Lynch notes that it would be interesting to see how many Chicago residents would not start drawing their mental maps without picturing Lake
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Michigan. This clear urban natural area demarcation line gives Chicago its unforgettable sight and legibility.\(^{159}\) A \emph{district} is defined as a ‘city area, which the observer can mentally go inside of, which has a common character.’ A continuous building type, facade material, user group or activity pattern can strengthen the district’s identity. A name may help to give a district a certain identity when it is not clearly demarcated by edges.\(^{160}\) A \emph{node} is defined as a ‘junction of pathways into which the observer can enter’. Not only do they entail the crossing of pathways, a node can also be a thematic concentration, such as a concentration of shopping malls. A strong, recognizable node is ideally supported by a strong physical structure in the form of buildings or apartment blocks.\(^{161}\) And finally, there are the \emph{landmarks}, which are objects used by an individual as a reference point in the way finding process. They are mostly static and unique objects and should not be placed in a city too frequently, as they can complicate the way finding process. Ideally, a landmark should be dominant and unique in terms of its shape, color, size, and contrast with the background.\(^{162}\)

Lynch employed two methods to come to his findings. First of all, he carried out a ‘systematic field reconnaissance’ by exploring the site and its surroundings. A trained observer mapped the area by defining its elements thereby using the typical Lynchian elements. Secondly, he used interviews and questionnaires to come to a synthesized mental map of all respondents included in the research. The interviewees were asked to draw a sketch map of the area, indicating on it the most important features of the area, their imaginary daily trip and a list of distinctive elements (streets, buildings, the district, etc.). Also, the inhabitants were asked what part of the area they liked or disliked. The interviews were recorded on tape and the maps were compared with a base map.\(^{163}\)

Although Lynch’s study was regarded as groundbreaking, it did meet with some serious criticism, directed at his method. The amount of respondents, ranging from fifteen in Los Angeles and Jersey City to thirty in Boston, was considered to be too low to make general assumptions of their general mental map. Moreover, the group’s composition was too homogeneous, i.e. middle-class families or young urban professionals. Since factors such as class, gender and culture or familiarity with a given area, may influence spatial perception, Lynch might have been too quick to proceed with the aggregation of individual mental maps into a general map. Furthermore, it has been argued that map drawing is too difficult for most
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of the respondents. Map reading or drawing is a skill that has to be taught in a geography class and some respondents may not understand how to read or draw a map.\textsuperscript{164}

4.3 Mental mapping, quantitative and qualitative research

As observed in the previous sections, cognitive mapping has been used as a tool to capture the relationship between place and identity. Kevin Lynch used mental mapping as a tool to improve the quality of a (part of a) city. Within the field of urban planning studies, mental mapping is now commonly used as a way to improve impoverished parts of a neighborhood. In our case study, however, mental mapping is not used to measure neighborhood satisfaction or to improve Tophane. Instead, mental mapping was used to effectively capture the identity of the Tophane neighborhood and the different ways in which residents or other users perceive the neighborhood. In this paper, mental mapping serves as a means to demarcate Tophane’s borders, size, and identity.

In the years to come the Galataport project could alter the neighborhood’s physical structure and demographics profoundly, and accordingly modify the perception of Tophane. If in ten years time the same group of respondents would be asked to draw a map of Tophane, they would obviously come up with a different one because of the changes that took place. Moreover, the neighborhood’s social composition is bound to change, too, as a result of the Galataport project. There will be a new wave of residents, and these will have a different view of Tophane than the residents whom they replaced. Indeed, they might not even have the faintest idea of what the neighborhood looked like before these changes. The maps that have been obtained in this case study, then, may help to understand how Tophane is perceived in the minds of its current residents and other users, and may in the future serve as a historical record of how the neighborhood was experienced in the year 2014.

In order to capture the synthesized mental map of residents and users, both quantitative and qualitative methods have been used. Quantitative research aims at finding the characteristics in which groups differ from one another, as well as finding statistical relations between characteristics (e.g. age, gender) and social phenomenal (e.g. educational attainment, income level). In quantitative studies, the type of data being used is numerical data, data that require statistical analysis during the calculation process.\textsuperscript{165} In the case study on Tophane, only descriptive statistics will be used. Descriptive statistics aims at the capitulatory description of a research unit’s characteristics, thereby making use of statistical data and
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values such as percentages, means and medians. Inductive statistics focuses on whether or not a statistical measure, calculated in a sample of units (electors, for example), could be generalized to the population of all units of which the sample was derived. To use inductive statistics would exceed the limits of this thesis and it is therefore omitted for clarity purposes.\textsuperscript{166}

In a qualitative study, on the other hand, the style of questioning tends to be more flexible. Researchers want to understand the behavior of people by describing and explaining them,\textsuperscript{167} and respondents are allowed to bring their own (related) topics of interest to the front as well. Scholars can analyze the perspective of a person on his or her social environment by acting as an instrument to acquire data. By ‘going native’ scholars try to grasp the \textit{emic perspective}, the perspective on reality that exists within a group. A common method to acquire information on the perspective of a specific group is the qualitative interview.\textsuperscript{168} Understanding the phenomenon of neighborhood perception, it being a complex social phenomenon as it is, requires a qualitative approach in order to obtain information. A common method used is the \textit{snowball method},\textsuperscript{169} in which additional interviewees are found via the first interviewee(s) participating in the study.

\section*{4.4 The fieldwork}

The plan of action was carefully set up after consultation with the Center for Urban Studies and the Netherlands Institute Turkey in Istanbul. After brainstorming sessions with Dutch archeologist Karin Schuitema and Turkish geographer Eda Yücesöy, a more structured research method was developed. Instead of meticulously replicating Kevin Lynch’s fieldwork, I applied mental mapping to a Turkish context, taking into consideration the potential difficulties respondents might face when drawing up their own maps. Respondents might draw the map of Tophane using different scales and various reference points, which makes it very difficult to synthesize these maps into one general map. As an alternative, based on literature and the information from the Tophane Heritage Study, I set up a predefined map indicating Tophane and its surrounding areas.

The survey was executed in January and February 2014 by using both the snowball method and a combination of workplace and doorstep interviews. The snowball method proved to be quite effective during the fieldwork phase. Inhabitants of Tophane who wanted

\textsuperscript{166} Ibid., 54
\textsuperscript{167} Ibid., 53.
\textsuperscript{168} Ibid., 258.
\textsuperscript{169} Ibid., 259-263.
to cast their vote at the local elections of March 2014 had to present themselves at the *muhtar’s office*\(^{170}\) in order to check whether or not their name was on the list of electorates. The muhtar is often a well-known resident in his or her district, who has the responsibility to issue ID cards or birth certificates. Because of the upcoming elections, a lot of Tophane residents passed by the muhtar’s office. So, on a daily basis I would spend a couple of hours with various muhtars, who helped me a lot by introducing me to potential respondents and clarifying my presence to them. Luckily, people happened to be more than willing to fill out a survey when they noticed from watching others that it appeared to be a relatively easy task. Furthermore, I did many workplace and doorstep interviews. I went to a *çayhane* (teahouse), where predominantly men gathered for a break, to hand out the questionnaire. I also engaged in doorstep interviews by going to local stores in order to interview the vendors over there.\(^{171}\) These respondents often did not mind spending ten minutes filling out the survey, in the meanwhile helping their customers.

The survey was structured as follows (see appendix 1 and 2). In the first part of the survey, respondents were required to rate to what extent they believed a *semt* (neighborhood unit, district) to be part of Tophane. The respondents were presented with an overview map that showed where the districts were located. In the second part of the survey, respondents were presented with pictures of various *işaretler* (landmarks) located in or around Tophane. Once more, respondents were asked to what extent they believed the landmark to be part of Tophane. The question was simple and repeated throughout the survey: When looking at the map, cross what applies most to district x or landmark x:

A - does not belong to Tophane  
B - partly belongs to Tophane  
C - completely belongs to Tophane

The survey data have been used to create maps, utilizing various software programs, all consulted during different phases of the data processing. First of all, the survey data were entered into Excel, which allows the data to be entered in both numbers and letters. The Excel file served as a back up file, if data loss would occur. Secondly, the data was recalculated from alphanumeric data into numeric data to facilitate statistical calculations in SPSS. Since it is not possible to use the letters a, b, or c in statistical calculations, the letters were linked to a

---

\(^{170}\) See section 2.1 ‘Tophane as a mahalle.’  
number to generate numeric data. After the data were prepared, the following formula was set up to calculate the data accurately:

\[
\text{Percentage (p)} = \left(\frac{x-1}{2}\right) \times 100\%
\]

A=1
B=2
C=3

So, for example, if a large number of respondents would rate a district or a landmark with a C (completely belongs to Tophane), the higher the average score for that district or landmark would be, and the more likely it is that that district or landmark is part of Tophane, according to the respondents. I have included one question to test whether or not respondents understood the survey, by including landmark ‘Tophane-i Amire’, which is unmistakably part of Tophane as it carries the name of Tophane. Indeed, almost all the respondents rated this landmark with a C, which made their average answer expressed in a percentage come close to a 100 % ‘Tophaneness’. Finally, the means that emerged from the statistical analysis were joined with a base map in both QGIS and Google Maps Engine, to portray the mean Tophaneness score for each district or landmark, according to the respondents.

Furthermore, the in-depth interviews were conducted between January and April 2014. A semi-structured interview was developed (see Appendices 3 to 5), interrogating people about their life history with regards to Tophane. The advantage of a semi-structured interview was that it allowed interviewees to come up with themes that related to the identity of Tophane. Furthermore, I used the life history method in order to grasp how an interviewee’s life history was related to the history of Tophane and how it (had) influenced his or her perception of the neighborhood.\(^{172}\) The interviews were held in Turkish, English and Dutch, depending on the mother tongue of the interviewees. The interviewees either had the Turkish, Dutch or French nationality and they had various professional backgrounds, ranging from a muhtar to a PHD researcher; the interview length varied from thirty minutes to an hour. Afterwards, the interviews were transcribed by using the software program Audacity. After the transcription was completed, the interviews were reorganized into themes that fit the survey data. The data will be presented in Chapter 5 and will demonstrate how different social characteristics can lead to a different geographical perspective. With the survey alone,

\(^{172}\) Boeije and ‘t Hart, Onderzoeksmethoden, 267.
however, the question of why different characteristics lead to different mental maps among respondents remains unanswered. In order to answer that question, the maps depicting the survey data will be alternated with interview quotes recorded during the interview process. This will perhaps lead to a better understanding as to why certain characteristics influence respondents’ mental maps of Tophane. The concepts emerging from the interview data will be merged with the mental maps to capture the identity of the Tophane neighborhood.
Chapter 5. Results

The following sections will show the outcome of both the survey and the in-depth interviews. The presented maps will illustrate how respondents perceive the identity of Tophane. What is the identity of Tophane? Why are some districts or landmarks part of Tophane and why are other parts excluded? For a clearer insight, each map is accompanied by a brief analysis of the interviews, which may help explaining how the Tophane identity came about.

5.1 General perception of Tophane

In order to understand how inhabitants characterize and perceive Tophane, I will begin with an analysis of its physical structure by using the Lynchian elements described earlier. In Figure 1a, a map of Tophane is included. On this map, a black dotted line depicts the outer limits of Tophane. Based on previous research of the Tophane Heritage Study, and conversations with residents, I concluded that the districts outside of the demarcated area are not likely to belong to Tophane. On the map, the red names in the area enclosed by the black dotted line are the names of the semtler (districts) that may or may not belong to Tophane, an issue that will be clarified in this chapter.

In terms of its physical structure, there are a couple of striking elements to Tophane that one cannot fail to notice, strolling around in the neighborhood. A number of roads serve as major paths in Tophane. The main street, Boğazkesen Caddesi, is located in the center of the neighborhood (see Figure 1a) and connects the massive shopping street İstiklal Caddesi, situated on top of the hill, to the lower lying Kemeraltı Caddesi near the Bosphorus. Both İstiklal Caddesi with its commercial function and Kemeraltı Caddesi with its tramway and highway, seem to be edges. With their size and function, these streets form a physical barrier to spatial behavior and mark beginning of new districts. The district between Kemeraltı Caddesi and the Bosphorus, is called Kemankeş Karamustapha Paşa. Because of the docks and its proximity to the Karaköy ferry station, it appears to have a transportation function whereas Tophane is mainly characterized by its residential area. Finally, one of the most eye-catching landmarks, the Tophane-i Amire (once the Imperial armory and now a Culture and Arts Center) with its view over the Bosphorus, is closely located to a node. Defterdar Yokuşu, Boğazkesen Caddesi and Kemeraltı Caddesi intersect below the hill of the former cannon ball factory. Walking up Boğazkesen Caddesi, this intersection with on the left hand a çayhane and on the right the Tophane-i Amire, one can understand how Tophane has its reputation as a neighborhood where the mahalle culture is still preserved.
Survey data, Tophaneness of districts

For a good understanding of the map analysis, it is, of course, one needs to know the district names of Tophane districts. In Table 1, each numbers is linked to a Tophane district name. The map of Figure 1b shows to what degree each one of these twelve districts, according to all 107 respondents, belongs to Tophane. For every single district, respondents had to rate the ‘Tophane’ feeling the given district evoked in them. The respondents could choose between a) completely dismissing the district from their mental Tophane map, b) partly including it, or c) completely including it. The larger the number of respondents, feeling and indicating a district to be part of Tophane, the higher the average score of that district, and the darker the color of that district on the map in Figure 1b. I have called this the general perception map, the general idea of Tophane, according to all the 107 respondents in the survey.

The first observation to be made is that the districts 1 to 4, Kuloğlu, Katip Mustafa Çelebi, Cihangir and Pürtelaş Hasan Efendi, which were rated rather low by respondents. Their scores fall either in the 0-20 % category or in the 20-40 % category. But that does not mean that 0-20 % or 20-40 % of all respondents believed that these districts are part of Tophane. The score is converted from the total score for districts, converted to a percentage with help of the formula I have mentioned in Chapter 4.

Source: Istanbul Şehir Rehberi, edited by author
The second observation concerns the districts 5 to 12. Their scores were all in the 40-60% or 60-80% category. It means that these districts received a higher score from respondents. However, it should be noted that districts 5 and 6 logically received a higher score; the landmark Tophane-i Amire is located at the border between these districts.

The third observation is that the districts 7 tot 12, located southwest of Boğazkesen Caddesi, on average received a higher score than the districts 1 to 6. It looks as if this street is perceived as a physical barrier, demarcating the border of the Tophane neighborhood.

The fourth and final observation regarding Figure 1b concerns the districts 5, 8, 9 and 10. Although the northwestern district border of district number 9, Kemankeş Karamustapha Paşa, is in fact demarcated by Kemeraltı Caddesi, the congested tramway and highway, this does not significantly influence the Tophaneness score of these districts. Despite the presence of this big path, which could have presented a physical barrier, respondents tended to include districts 5 and 9, southeast of Kemeraltı Caddesi, in their mental map of Tophane. The interview analysis will help to explain why respondents do include districts such as these in Tophane, although these districts may appear to be disconnected from Tophane’s core.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>District name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kuloğlu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Katip Mustafa Çelebi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cihangir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pürtelaş Hasan Efendi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kılıçali Paşa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Firuzağa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tom Tom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hacımına</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kemankeş Karamustapha Paşa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Müyyedzade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bereketzade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Şahkulu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Istanbul Sehir Rehberi
Survey data, Tophaneness of landmarks

This part of the analysis will focus on the Tophaneness of landmarks and will apply the same principle: the higher the score of a landmark, the more likely respondents thought this landmark is located in Tophane or represents the identity of Tophane. Table 1b shows how respondents ranked the Tophane landmarks with the scores descending from high to low. It also shows what type of landmark it is, and in which districts these landmarks are located. Figure 1c shows the Tophaneness of landmarks, according to all respondents. Referring to Table 1b and Figure 1c, I will now analyze how respondents perceived the Tophaneness of landmarks.

Observation 1 Naturally, the iconic Tophane-i Amire, included in the survey as a test case, was recognized as being part of Tophane. A vast majority of the respondents answered the question related to Tophane-i Amire with a C. It also appeared that respondents, in their perception of Tophane, tended to use this landmark as a primary source in their rating of the Tophaneness of other landmarks. Landmarks located in close proximity to Tophane-i Amire such as Meryem Ana Kilisesi or Özel Fransız Lisesi did receive higher scores than more remote landmarks, such as the Cihangir Camisi or Galatasaray Lisesi.
Observation 2 It turned out that landmarks showed a similar pattern as the topography of districts. The nine landmarks that received the highest ranking are located within the districts 5 to 10. Again, Boğazkesen Caddesi seemed to be defining when respondents analyzed the Tophaneness of landmarks. Landmarks southwest of the street tended to receive a slightly higher score than landmarks northeast of the street. Interestingly enough, İstiklal Caddesi has a similar effect on Tophane perception, that is, landmarks located on this street, such as İsveç Konsolosluğu (Swedish Consulate) or Galatasaray Lisesi, were not perceived as being part of Tophane. These two streets appear to shape geographical perception in respondents profoundly.

Observation 3 It does not seem to matter to what category a Tophane landmark belongs. The results do not indicate that landmarks belonging to a specific category (historical monuments, important streets, schools, religious buildings) would have a higher chance of becoming perceived as Tophane. The respondents seem to have ignored the nature of certain landmarks and instead estimated whether or not a given landmark was located in the area they perceived as Tophane. They answered both on the basis of what they believed to be the center of Tophane and on a notion of where Tophane was certainly not located. The maps show a kind of delta or triangle, narrowing when one follows Boğazkesen Caddesi towards İstiklal Caddesi and broadening when one follows Boğazkesen Caddesi down towards the Bosphorus.

Table 1b. General perception of Tophaneness landmarks, ranked from high to low score, expressed in percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Landmark names</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Distr. No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>Tophane-i Amire</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>KılıçAli Paşa</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>Italian Konsolosluğu</td>
<td>Consulate</td>
<td>Tom Tom</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>Meryem Ana Kilisesi</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Kemankeş Karamustapha</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>Özel Fransız Lisesi</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Müyyedzade</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>Fransız geçidi</td>
<td>Shopping street</td>
<td>Kemankeş Karamustapha</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>Serdar i Ekrem Caddesi</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Haçmimi</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>Çukurcuma Camisi</td>
<td>Mosque</td>
<td>Firuzeğ a</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>Güllüoğlu Baklavaçısı</td>
<td>Bakery</td>
<td>Kemankeş Karamustapha</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>Firuzeğ a Camisi</td>
<td>Mosque</td>
<td>Firuzeğ a</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>Kamando Merdivenleri</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>Bereketzade</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>Galata Kulesi</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>Bereketzade</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>Çıhängir Camisi</td>
<td>Mosque</td>
<td>Pürretâş Hasan Efendi</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>Turnacı Başı Caddesi</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Kuloğlu</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>Özel Alman Hastenesi</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>Çıhängir</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>İsveç Konsolosluğu</td>
<td>Consulate</td>
<td>Şahkulu</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Galatasaray Lisesi</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Kuloğlu</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Google Maps Engine, data edited by author
Interview data

So far I analyzed the pattern displayed by the survey data. Now, the interview data will shed some light on the question why people perceive the Tophane neighborhood the way they do. More specifically, the data will give us some insight in the respondents’ personal histories with Tophane, in the way they perceive the history of the neighborhood, and in the location of the borders within the neighborhood.

There is a difference in the way Turkish respondents came to live in Tophane and how foreign respondents found a house or apartment in the neighborhood. For the first group, the social network of family and/or friends seems to play a more important role than the personal history they have with the neighborhood. Songul, the muhtar of Tom Tom, mentions how her partner’s family has been living in the neighborhood for generations:

‘My partner’s family has been living in Tophane for a hundred years. And his father and my mother are still living in the neighborhood. My family still call themselves Tophaneli.’

For the second group, the foreign respondents, a social network seemed to be less relevant at their arrival in the neighborhood; they chose the neighborhood more or less by accident or because of its central location in Istanbul:

---

173 Songul, lives in Tophane.
‘I’ve been living in Tophane since September 2013. I have found my apartment through Facebook. I wanted to live in this area, or at least nearby, and did not prefer Tophane until I found this apartment. I knew the area from the time I worked in the Netherlands Institute, which is relatively close by. But then I knew the neighborhood differently, more as a site to drink coffee.’

‘I am here since September 2012. I’m living together with my boyfriend, who is Turkish. I just found a house per accident.’

‘I came here for the first time in August 2008 and went back to France in 2009 for my Erasmus. The neighborhood gave me a good feeling, it was during the ramadan. It was quiet, different from İstiklal Caddesi. I went back to Istanbul in 2011 and chose the neighborhood again. This time because I liked it before.’

Layers of identity: Physical identity

The Tophane residents reported a feeling of appreciation for Tophane’s central location within Istanbul and its good connections to various means of public transportation. Generally, traveling from Tophane to any other (central) part of the city will take no more than an hour. From Tophane one can reach the vapur (ferry) within ten minutes and thus reach the Asian side of Istanbul within forty minutes. Tophane is situated in the very heavily urbanized, central Beyoğlu district without being too close to Taksim or Taksim square, which is Beyoğlu’s transportation hub. Furthermore, residents appreciate the historical buildings and narrow streets, which in their opinion enhances the neighborhood’s atmosphere. The variety in building structure, the omnipresent panoramic view of the Bosphorus and the narrow, curved streets are considered to be element that give Tophane’s identity its flair.

‘This is a unique place. The historical buildings make it special and should be renovated. The advantage of Tophane is also its close proximity to İstiklal Caddesi and Karaköy. It’s exactly in the middle, everything is close at hand. Public transit is a big problem, but here you are less dependent on that. It’s a very good place. Kumbaracı Yokuşu is a beautiful street. Its atmosphere and buildings, it’s a little bit like Italy. I love the street cats...’

‘The location is fantastic. I think it’s a cozy and very sympathetic looking neighborhood. I love that you can find trendy designer stores next to run-down looking alleys. I like that it can exist side by side. However, sometimes I do think it’s a bit dirty; there are trash everywhere, dust and rubbish. That is a shame.’
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Layers of identity: Social identity

The respondents see Tophane’s social identity both as its strength and as its weakness. The fine thing about the social cohesion within the neighborhood is that it can give residents a feeling of security in the midst of the hectic reality that is called Istanbul. It is good to know your neighbors, to know that someone will look after you, to know that you are known. In other parts of the city this is not always the case.

The heterogeneous composition is a positive aspect of Tophane’s social identity, according to the respondents. However, they emphasize that the gap between different groups can be big sometimes. Even for relatively young Turkish interviewees such as Mehmet and Yasemin, young café owners in Tophane, or Özge, a young master student and resident, these gaps can be difficult to bridge because of prejudice. Özge, for instance, found that she was initially rather hesitant about this strong neighborhood culture. And when Mehmet and Yasemin began to work in the area, they felt that both they themselves and the Tophaneli had prejudices against each other.

“We used to walk down this street a bit reluctantly, with a prejudice against it. But after we began to work here, we went into the street feeling more comfortable.”

“In the beginning, the residents did not like me so much, because I’m not the same as them. I have a piercing, you know. But it was okay, they began to talk to me, I’m able to strike up a conversation with them. I am here now for more than a year, and because it is close to İstiklal it is not so conservative. Life is more, how can I explain it... more open.”

Layers of identity: Historical identity

During the fieldwork some interviewees told me me that the conservative nature of a majority of inhabitants has a lot to do with the events of 1955. Especially the young and higher educated Turks pointed out that Tophane’s ethnic make-up used to be different from now. The interviewees, although being in their thirties, suddenly became nostalgic when they started to talk about the old Tophane. They have heard stories from older residents, who can still recall the mix of ethnicities that existed before the pogrom. It becomes clear that although the neighborhood consisted of Jewish, Armenian and Greek minorities, the differences were no obstacle but rather a strength. There was a feeling of unity, which has disappeared with the drastic changes caused by the influx of a more homogeneous type of inhabitants that arrived.
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by train from eastern Anatolia. The typical migrant came from Bitlis or Siirt, two cities in the Kurdish part of Turkey.

‘In one of these apartments lives an eighty seven year old woman, with whom we sometimes have a chat. She told us that in the past the Turks and non-Muslims used to live together, two by two. The Jewish people visited the Muslims during Ramadan to congratulate the Muslims, and during Jewish holidays it was the other way around. At five o’clock in the afternoon, people would gather to have tea all together. But after the September 1955 events, after they left, people no longer experienced that. We certainly did not. Helping others became uncommon. That’s the reason why the old woman believes that it used to be better.’

‘Ak Parti really means the same thing as the previous administration. Actually, there is hardly any difference between, let’s say, the 1950’s and these days as far as the ruling parties are concerned. They are exactly the same, I mean, all thieves. They collect the taxes, all right, but fail to spend the money in the right way. They keep all the taxes to themselves. A good example of these practices recently came out as you may have heard. They found 4.5 million dollar bribery money in the house of a bank director, and this happens all the time. And now, there will be a Galataport project!’

This last quote is illustrative of the abhorrence that is felt by the younger and higher educated interviewees with whom I have spoken. In Chapter 3, I already discussed how the current ruling Ak Parti’s policy does not differ substantially from political parties’ policies in the 1950’s, the only slight difference being perhaps the somewhat less aggressive minority-policy and the more neo-liberal approach to the current economic issues.

*Layers of identity: Political identity*

Since the prevailing ethnic groups in Tophane stem from regions in Eastern Turkey, i.e. the regions bordering Syria and Iran, the dominant political stance amongst residents is rather conservative. This implies that almost everybody votes for the Ak Parti. One interviewee estimated that around ninety percent of the total voter turnout goes to the conservative party. One Turkish interviewee explains how the economic situation may contribute to the high percentage of AK Parti votes in Tophane:

‘I have heard all kinds of things. For example, there is a man who exchanges votes for unemployment money. This man goes to let’s call it party B and says: “I am the leader of 4000 residents living in Tophane. They are going to vote for you and in return for their votes you are going to give me money.” These 4000 people are illiterate, they only breathe, that’s it. People fear poverty, they know that if that person doesn’t go to party B, they will stay poor. The man is doing a good job, he
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offers them money, so this is how they are being cheated. These people are honest people. Within my family I have people who think like this, and in my surroundings there are a lot of people like that, too. Conservative people aren’t bad people. But because they lack information, they accept this.’

Both Mehmet and Frouke notice that Tophane is an Ak Parti neighborhood, and unfortunately only a small minority has the knowledge or capacity to show its discomfort with the conservative attitude during the Gezi Park protests:

‘Being a retailer, I sometimes chat with the other retailers. It’s like I’ve said, there are people who have voted for the Ak Parti. They say: “See, thanks to these Gezi Park protesters we have less work, they want bad things for our country, we are not able to earn money.” We don’t earn a lot of money either, but we think differently about Gezi Park. They don’t think at all about the protesters’ background. For instance, if a Gezi Park protester dies, they call him a terrorist. It has to do with money; everything revolves around money and the support they receive from the Ak Parti. There is a shackle, and that shackle is a money shackle.’

‘I still have the feeling that a lot of people just accept what happens, also with these Gezi Park protests, I find that it is just such a small part of the population. Politically, still, a majority of the population is in favor of the current administration. I don’t know exactly why, people might vote for their wallet. It seems as though everybody improved financially. I actually think people’s standard of living did not improve and that the banks just borrowed money.’

Not everybody in the neighborhood is in favor of the Ak Parti. One of the interviewees, Perrine thinks that there are only a few people that do not fit into the dominant way of life in Tophane. Also for her, Tophane’s identity is rather conservative in a political sense. Especially when it comes to middle-aged and older Turkish women, she believes progressive women to be scarcely spread in Tophane:

‘My landlady is Turkish. She’s this kind of middle-class Turkish old lady, she’s very different, even as a Turkish lady. She doesn’t fit in with the other traditional people in Tophane. She is the only person like that I know of who didn’t vote for the AK Parti.’

**Layers of identity: Geographical identity**

Both the survey data and the qualitative data have shown that respondents and interviewees have a clear idea of the multiple layered identity of Tophane. Most of the respondents express the opinion that the neighborhood represents the conservative and traditionalist part of the Turkish society. A typical Tophaneli is a Muslim from the east of Turkey who knows Arabic

---

183 Mehmet, works in Tophane
184 Mehmet, works in Tophane.
185 Frouke, lives in Tophane.
and disapproves of the consumption of alcohol. The respondents know that both Turkey and, indeed, Tophane have a progressive population, but acknowledge that in Tophane, the conservative majority overshadows this population. Their perspectives of Tophane’s political and social identity are clearly reflected in their mental perceptions of Tophane's geographical identity.

To begin with, the interview data seem to confirm the map data as presented in Figures 1b and 1c. Both Turkish and foreign interviewees, residents or people who work in the Tophane, have a strikingly similar idea of the neighborhood’s physical and social boundaries. As the maps demonstrate to a certain degree, large paths or roads such as İstiklal Caddesi or Boğazkesen Caddesi are also perceived as borders of Tophane by the interviewees.

‘İstiklal Caddesi is a border; Cihangir is a border, Deftedar Yokuşu, Karaköy. They are all borders! Müyyedzade can be the border, Kılıçali Paşa.’

‘I don’t really know if I actually live in Tophane. It doesn’t feel like I’m living in Cihangir, because surely that is not where I live. I live on Boğazkesen Caddesi and I have the feeling that I live on the border of Tophane.’

‘Boğazkesen Caddesi is the limit for us. Between Cihangir and Tophane. Boğazkesen Caddesi is the distinction between Cihangir and Tophane.’

İstiklal Caddesi and Boğazkesen Caddesi form borders to the northwestern and northern parts of Tophane. When it comes to the southeast border formed by Kemeraltı Caddesi with the district Kemaneş Karamustapha, two interviewees end up in a discussion. For them, Kemeraltı Caddesi is not necessarily a border of Tophane. For them, it is unclear whether or not the district Karaköy is part of Tophane:

Louise: ‘On the southeast side it would be more difficult. The distinction between Kemaneş and Karaköy is difficult for me. Kemaneş is along the Bosphorus.’

Perrine: ‘What is the name of the tramway street? Ah, it’s Kemeraltı Caddesi! For me the limit is the tramway station on Kemeraltı Caddesi, the road is the border. But if you ask me, I would also include Karaköy.’

Louise: ‘But for me, it’s after the tramway, after Kemeraltı Caddesi. At least, that’s my perception. For me, you have Karaköy with Gulluoglu and the baklava store, which is Karaköy. But then, after Karaköy, it starts to be Tophane. I think that Tophane consists of a lot of small mahalles.’
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Perrine: ‘Tophane is not a district like Beyoğlu, that’s why the borders are unclear.’

This dialogue between Louise and Perrine shows that although the interviewees have a clear idea about Tophane’s geographical core, they do perceive the neighborhood slightly differently when they talk about the district Karaköy. The neighborhood’s identity is not that fixed, indeed, it is even debatable. The perception of Tophane depends to a considerable extent on the eye of the beholder. Different interviewees gave different explanations for their personal demarcation of Tophane, and by doing so, two of them came very close to a description of what well may be the essence of Tophane:

‘Boğazkesen Caddesi is the distinction between Cihangir and Tophane. It is the spirit as well. It is richer, it’s going up, it’s on a hill. It is the beginning of Cihangir. Do you know what Boğazkesen means? It means cut throat. When I moved to this place in 2008, barely 19 years old, people were anxious about me: why did I choose Tophane? It was very dangerous there. That’s why we use Boğazkesen Caddesi as a limitation. One side is safer than the other, trendier, and richer, less Tophane. The other side is rougher, very gypsy-like.’

‘I have the feeling that my street, Boğazkesen Caddesi, is the border. What characterizes Tophane is the mix: gypsies, migrants from Eastern Turkey right next to designer stores or expensive tourist flats. I know that a lot of apartments are rented out via Air BNB. I suppose, pioneers would reside there. Artists, young students, not the happy few. The happy few would prefer to live in a flat in Cihangır and to have a more luxurious existence. I believe that Cihangır is a socially much more homogeneous neighborhood, a middle-class or even an upper-class neighborhood, whereas Tophane is more heterogeneous.’

---

189 Perrine, lives in Tophane
190 Louise, lives in Tophane
191 Frouke, works in Tophane
5.2 Gender

In this section, I will analyze to what extent the first variable ‘gender’ influences perceptions of Tophane, or ‘Tophaneness’. First, the map data for both district Tophaneness and landmark Tophaneness will be described. Then, the interview data will put the survey data into perspective and clarify what might be the cause of the difference between men and women in their mental perception of the neighborhood.

Map analysis

Before making general assumptions about any significant difference in mental perception between men and women, two remarks must be made. First, female Map 2b shows an overall lighter color for Tophane, that is, women less often rated a district positively for Tophaneness. This, however, does not mean that the total Tophaneness rating is significantly lower for women as it is for men. For example, if a district receives a 19% score among men and a 1% score among women, the district is still colored the same, since both scores fall in the same category of 0-20%. Yet one cannot conclude that men and women think similarly about that district, since there is a difference (of 18% in this case). Secondly, when a district receives a 21% male score and 19% female score, that district would appear darker on the male map. The 21% score receives the 20-40% color; the 19% receives the 0-20% color. It shows differently on the map, even though the difference is not big in this case. Therefore, based on the maps, one cannot draw general conclusions about male and female mental perception.

Nevertheless, based on the scores for all districts and landmarks, women tend to answer the survey questions more negatively. This does not apply to the distribution of Tophaneness in the sense that men and women appear to have similar ideas about Tophane’s whereabouts. The core area of Tophane, displayed by Figures 2a and 2b, shows little difference between the two genders. Districts 5 to 10 receive high scores and districts 1 to 4 low scores. Furthermore, Table 2 and Figures 2c and 2d show that as for landmarks, again the core Tophane is in close proximity to Tophane-I Amire, followed by landmarks in the southwest, and ending with landmarks located on İstiklal Caddesi.

When looking at Table 2, one may wonder why women consistently give Tophane districts and landmarks a lower Tophaneness score. Do they believe that Tophane is a smaller area, and that it consists of less districts and landmarks? Perhaps they believe they don't think they know Tophane well and therefore answer survey questions negatively. Perhaps, they truly know Tophane less well because of their domestic existence, or perhaps they know
Tophane better precisely because of having a small radius of action? In the next section, an attempt will be made to explain this gender-based difference in mental perception.

**Fig. 2a. Tophaneness of districts, according to men, expressed in percentage**

Source: QGIS, data edited by author

**Fig. 2b. Tophaneness of districts, according to women, expressed in percentage**

Source: QGIS, data edited by author
Table 2. Tophaneness of landmarks, ranked by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Landmark names</th>
<th>Male percent</th>
<th>Female percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tophane-i Amire</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>İtalyan Konsoloslugu</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Meryem Ana Kilisesi</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Özel Fransız Lisesi</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fransız geçidi</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Serdar i Ekrem Caddesi</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Çukurcuma Camisi</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Güllüoğlu Baklavaçi</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Firuzaga Camisi</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kamando Merdivenleri</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Galata Kulesi</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cihangir Camisi</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Turnaci Başi Caddesi</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Özel Alman Hastenesi</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>İsveç Konsoloslugu</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Galatasaray Lisesi</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data edited by author

Fig. 2c. Tophaneness of landmarks, according to men, expressed in percentage

Source: Google Maps Engine, data edited by author
Interview data: Where are the women?

In this section, both the lack of female respondents in the survey and the difference in survey results will be analyzed. The difference in geographical perception between male and female respondents could be related to the different way finding strategies they engage in. Men tend to apply the orientation strategy, whereas women tend to engage in the route strategy.\footnote{Carol A. Lawton, “Gender Differences in Way-Finding Strategies: Relationship to Spatial Ability and Spatial Anxiety,” \textit{Sex roles} 30, no. 11/12 (1994): 765.} When using the orientation strategy, people maintain a sense of their own position in relation to environmental reference points. In the orientation strategy, survey knowledge is used to create a cognitive map of the environment, which integrates routes into a general network of relationships between networks. Women, on the other hand, tend to use the route strategy to navigate from place to place. Route strategy involves route knowledge, that is, the learning of a sequence of instructions about how to get from one location to the next. Scholars found that survey knowledge in navigation allows for greater flexibility than route knowledge. Individuals who use survey knowledge find more ways to navigate between two points than individuals who rely on route knowledge.\footnote{Ibid., 766.}
Research tends to favor men when it comes to the navigating skills. In a study of McGuinness and Sparks, people where asked to redraw their campus. Men placed more roads or pathways on their maps than women did, and they placed buildings more accurately on map. Interestingly enough, women placed more buildings on their maps. Furthermore, a study by Choi and Silverman has found that men make use of landmarks more often then women do. Possible explanations as to why men tend to be better at navigating or geographical knowledge, focus on *nature and nurture*. One theory suggests that differences in navigating stem from prehistoric times. Men needed to develop their spatial skills to gather and hunt, women stayed closer to home to nurture their offspring and thus did not need to develop these spatial skills. In short, it is in the man’s nature to be better at navigating. Another theory suggests that navigating is a matter of nurture: males have better chances to develop their navigating skills, because boys are more often allowed to engage in environmental exploration than girls are. And this, consequently, affects, or rather, improves their navigating capacities and geographical perception.

When looking at the fieldwork data, the last theory might hold true in a Turkish context. The Turkish society is known to be a masculine society, which is for a large part due to Islamic values. The Islam prescribes that men and women should create a masculine society in which the man is the dominant actor. Special privileges, such as being the head of the family or the supreme heir, are used to enforce this reality. The Global Gender Gap, an index introduced by the World Economic Forum, illustrates the consequences of these values. The index measures the gender-based gaps in having access to resources and opportunities in individual countries; it covers four areas: economic participation and opportunity, educational attainment, health and survival, and political empowerment. The report shows that in 2013, Turkey ranked 120th out of the 136 countries that were compared. In the category ‘economic participation and opportunity’ the country ranked 127th. The index shows that, particularly in comparison with European Union member states, women clearly do not have the same job opportunities as men.

---
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Taking together the dominant position of males in Turkish society and males’ tendency to overestimate their own navigational abilities, it may come as no surprise that men gave Tophane districts and landmarks a higher ranking than women did. Still, this does not necessarily have to imply that men genuinely perceive Tophane to be larger. The higher scores may very well be a reflection of their aplomb, their self-assurance, and their culturally defined attitude that what they know or say must be right. During the fieldwork it was very difficult to find (older) women, who were willing to participate in the survey. Perhaps women were afraid to talk with a foreign, male student. Perhaps Tophane is not ‘understood’ by, or visible to, female respondents because they are invisible to Tophane.

Interviewer: ‘In the survey, thirty percent of all respondents was female, why?’
Yasemin: ‘They live a rather secluded life, because this is a conservative place. Women usually wear the headscarf and go to their neighbors because they have nothing to do, except for being a housewife.’

Interviewer: ‘If I want to interview a woman from Tophane, where should I go to?’
Yasemin: ‘You can see them on the street, I don’t know, they go to the market. But I’m not even able to talk to them.

The French Perrine noticed that it is much easier to find Turkish ladies on the street during local elections, such as the ones of March 2014. She was amazed at the sight of many (older) women that came out to cast their vote:

‘I was very surprised during the last elections, I saw Tophane ladies on the street. When I accompanied my boyfriend to the voting office, you could see all these boys supporting their mums, their grandmothers, all these covered ladies who went outside to go to the voting office. It was the first time I saw so many Tophane ladies on the street. As a rule they are at home. This is something I am always aware of. Every time I have visitors from France I get reminded of how few women there are on the street. I tell them: oh yeah you’re right, I kind of forgot, but it is true.’

5.3 Age

Not much research has been done on the effect of age on people’s neighborhood perceptions. Different age groups perceive neighborhoods very differently, especially in the case of an urban neighborhood such as Tophane. Located in the center of a metropolis, the neighborhoods’ demographics and building structure are altered faster than a suburban neighborhood on the fringe of Istanbul, or a neighborhood of a rural Eastern Turkish city.

However, research has shown that age for instance correlates with feelings of

neighborhood attachment. As people age, their mobility declines and they become more interested in their neighborhood, partly out of necessity. The length of residency also contributes to neighborhood attachment, i.e. when people live in a neighborhood longer; they have time to construct a social network, which increases neighborhood attachment.\textsuperscript{202} Another study in New Zealand found that children drawing mental maps of their country drew more similar maps at an older age.\textsuperscript{203} On the other hand, in one study in Chicago, respondents were asked to draw their mental map of Chicago using the Lynchian elements (paths, edges, districts, nodes). By and large, these maps were strikingly similar, and apparently age, income, or education level had little effect on the amount of Lynchian elements drawn by respondents.\textsuperscript{204} These studies illustrate that the effect of age on mental perception of space is not conclusive. The fieldwork results presented hereafter seem to confirm this.

Below, the survey data have been split up into three age categories (Table 3.1), categories that were equally sized so as to enable legitimate analysis. The table shows the distribution of gender through age in absolute and relative numbers. On the one hand, the male to female ratio in the youngest age category is relatively evenly distributed. On the other hand, when moving to the older age categories, the male respondents are overrepresented. Then, in Table 3.2 and Figures 3.2a-c, the Tophaneness score of landmarks is displayed. The respondents in the oldest age category, rated Tophane landmarks with a higher score than younger respondents. This is consistent with the conclusion in section 2 on gender: male respondents rate landmarks higher than female respondents do. The score is likely to be higher because of the high proportion of male respondents in this age segment and not because of the old age. When looking at the first two age categories in which gender is equally distributed (41% and 35%), the scores for landmarks are very similar, whereas for the oldest age category the scores are much higher. This shows that in these categories age does not lead to a lower or higher Tophane rating.

Finally, when looking at the differences in district or landmark perception, as shown in Figures 3.1a-b and Figures 3.2a-c, age differences do not seem to have a substantial effect on mental perception of Tophane. The data show that Tophane, though not being an administrative unit with fixed borders, is in fact perceived as such by the respondents.

Although people belong to a different (age) category, they indicate with great precision what makes up Tophane and what does not.

### Table 3.1 Proportion of gender in age groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Male (%)</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Female (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 and older</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data edited by author

**Fig 3.1a Tophaneness of landmarks, Young (18-30), expressed in percentages**

Source: QGIS, data edited by author

**Fig 3.1b Tophaneness of landmarks, Middle aged (30-45), expressed in percentages**

Source: QGIS, data edited by author
Fig 3.1c Tophaneness of landmarks, Old (45 and above), expressed in percentages

Table 3.2 Tophaneness of landmarks, ranked by age, percentagewise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Landmark name</th>
<th>Young</th>
<th>Middle Aged</th>
<th>Old</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tophane-i Amire</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Italian Konsolosluğu</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Meryem Ana Kilisesi</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Özel Fransız Lisesi</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fransız geçidi</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Serdar i Ekrem Caddesi</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Çukurcuma Camisi</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Güllüoğlu Baklavacı</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Firuzaga Camisi</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kamondo Merdivenleri</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Galata Kulesi</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Çihangir Camisi</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Turnacı Başi Caddesi</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Özel Alman Hastenesi</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>İsveç Konsolosluğu</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Galatasaray Lisesi</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: QGIS, data edited by author

Source: Data edited by author
Fig 3.2a Tophaneness of landmarks, young (18-30), expressed in percentages

Source: Google Maps Engine and author

Fig 3.2b Tophaneness of landmarks, Middle aged (30-45), expressed in percentages

Source: Google maps engine and author
5.4 Residency

The last variable that has been assessed is the residency status of residents. The data of Tophane residents has been compared with the data of outsiders, that is, people who do not live in Tophane. The number of residents amounted to 61, that of the outsiders to 46. It should be noted that among the group of non-residents there were a lot of former residents, some of whom had been living there for decades. By comparing these two groups, the relation between living or not living in a neighborhood and the geographical perception on that neighborhood will be tested.

In Figures 4.1a and 4.1b, the Tophanness of districts according to residents and non-residents are compared. The maps show that residents include fewer districts into their Tophane mental maps than non-residents do. For them, the area seems to be smaller. The districts numbered 5 to 9 are equally often included into the core Tophane area by both groups. In Table 4.1, the Tophaneness of landmarks is ranked. One landmark that stands out is the Italian Konoloşluğ; residents give it a Tophaneness rating of 70.5%, non-residents 49%. This landmark, then, might serve as a test to distinguish the real residents from the non-residents. But again, these differences are minimal. Whatever someone’s gender, age, or residential status, most respondents agree on the Tophane core are, as is displayed by the fieldwork maps.
Fig 4.1a Tophaneness of districts, according to residents, expressed in percentages

Source: QGIS, data edited by author

Fig 4.1b Tophaneness of district, according to non-residents, expressed in percentages

Source: QGIS, data edited by author
Table 4.1 Landmarks, ranked by residency, percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Outsiders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tophane-i Amire</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Italian Konsolosluğu</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Meryem Ana Kilisesi</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Özel Fransız Lisesi</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fransız geçidi</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Serdar i Ekrem Caddesi</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Çukurcuma Camisi</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Güllüoğlu Baklavacı</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Firuzaga Camisi</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kamondo Merdivenleri</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Galata Kulesi</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cihangir Camisi</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Turnacı Başı Caddesi</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Özel Alman Hastenesi</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>İsveç Konsolosluğu</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Galatasaray Lisesi</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data edited by author
Fig. 4.2a Tophaneness of landmarks, according to residents, expressed in percentages

Source: QGIS, edited by author

Fig. 4.2b Tophaneness of landmarks, according to non-residents, expressed in percentages

Source: QGIS, edited by author
5.5 Origins
The political events of the 1950’s influenced Tophane’s identity profoundly. After the pogrom of 1955 and the subsequent eviction of non-Muslim minorities, the neighborhood saw a sharp increase in immigration from eastern Turkish immigrants. Because of the drastic change in Tophane’s population composition, an old layer of the neighborhood’s identity was erased and replaced by a new layer. Over time, the former migrants settled and are now inextricably linked to the identity of the neighborhood. Presumably because of the scale of eastern Turkish immigration, the perception of Tophane’s identity changed. In this section, I will try to ascertain to what extent population characteristics may influence neighborhood perceptions, by examining the survey and interview data.

In Table 5, the top eighteen cities of Tophane residents’ geographical origins are displayed. The table shows that, apart from Istanbul, most people have origins in the eastern parts of Turkey. A relatively high number of respondents indicated in the survey that they had roots in Siirt. A couple of respondents indicated that they originated from Erzincan and Diyarbakır, the latter being located in the Kurdish part of Turkey. Figure 5 shows the map that corresponds with the table data. In this map, the bars change color and height, according to the survey’s geographical background data. The yellow color represents Istanbul, the purple Siirt, the orange – although tucked away behind Siirt – represents Bitlis. The more to the east, the higher the bars, and the more likely it is that a survey respondent has family origins in that city.

‘There are a lot of residents from Bitlis and Siirt, Arabic and Kurdish. And there are also residents from Izmir, the Mediterranean region, like a mosaic. These groups from the East support each other. They all have their own separate organizations, the Kurds, the Arabs. But why? What are Kurds, what are Arabs?’

‘It’s a small village, it has a strong identity, but you can feel it’s a bubble. I remember my landlord, when I first entered my Erasmus in 2008. I was really a foreigner, discovering Turkey. After my Erasmus he said: “Congratulations, you have entered the bubble!” I would not say it’s a Turkish bubble. It’s more an Arabic bubble, it’s more selam alaikum than merhaba, they have Arabic roots.’

Most interviewees make mention of the Eastern Turkish geographical background of Tophane residents, and of the strong identity these people demonstrate. Both the Turkish and the foreign respondents point out that there are a lot of residents from eastern Turkish and especially Arabic speaking parts of Turkey. They do appreciate the diversity of having both

205 Halil
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the eastern Turkish community and the Mediterranean Sea region community concentrated in one neighborhood. The various groups, however, though being from one and the same nation, are seen to exhibit very different cultural characteristics.

‘They are more withdrawn. They don’t interact with people from a different culture. I mean, we, people from the West of Turkey are different, we are more sociable. They are more conservative.’

Yasemin thinks that the conservative attitude of the eastern Turkish residents can be traced back to their education level:

‘There is an interesting mahalle culture, but cut off from the outside. Others do not blend in. Foreigners are not able to participate! I think they don’t want it, they don’t want “foreign thoughts”. We are in contact with artists that live here and go to the theatre because they are more open-minded. Basically, their education level is low. Educated people get along with everybody much better. It’s these people who come from Siirt and Bitlis that do not mix, it’s a different culture.’

Table 5. Geographical background Tophane residents, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memleket</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iskenderun</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mersin</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mardin</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaziantep</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veznecik</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trabzon</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antakya</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatay</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adana</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konya</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kastamonu</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayseri</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivas</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokat</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SAS, data edited by author

---
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5.6 The Galataport project

In this last section the past urban transformation in Tophane is linked to contemporary and future urban transformation projects in the neighborhood. Interviewees express their thoughts and feelings on urban transformation in Tophane over the last couple of years. Next, the interviewees’ perception of the Galataport project will be analyzed. When it comes to this project, there is a considerable gap between the hopes of the interviewees and their expectations, between the desirable outcome and the actual one. To conclude with, the interviewees have been asked to voice their views of the near future of their neighborhood and that of Istanbul. How is the Gatata Port Project going to affect Tophane’s identity? And what impact will urban transformation have on the identity of Istanbul?

‘Tophane has changed a lot. During the Ottoman times it was a very mixed neighborhood. After 5/6 September 1955, the non-Muslim minorities were sent away from here and their places went to people from Siirt and Bitlis. This was the first change. The second change, the transformation we are now observing, is that refined, cultured people started to discover Tophane and opened up cafés, ateliers, and theatres.’
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In this quote, Yasemin sums up two important changes in Tophane’s identity in one breath. The recent urban transformation process in Tophane impresses all interviewees, both by what it has done to the identity of the neighborhood in the last couple of years and by the mere pace of it.

Typically, the identity of a neighborhood consists of two components: the physical structure and the social composition. The physical structure comprises such matters as the dominant building type, landmarks like buildings of historical or social significance, or the street pattern. These elements characterize a neighborhood’s identity, and a change in one or more of these elements can alter the identity of a neighborhood. The social structure is both the people in a neighborhood and their composition. Factors such as age, gender, income, and education among residents shape the identity of a neighborhood, and any change in the prevailing social composition influences a neighborhood’s identity.

Most of the respondents seem to appreciate the changes in Tophane’s physical structure. In the past, the neighborhood used to be more impoverished, with gecekondu type of buildings begging for renovation and with roads in need of repair. There were only a few cafés, restaurants, and shops. According to one interviewee, Tophane was a place where men were either gathering to drink tea in a çayhane or were getting a haircut in one of the thousand barbershops. Nowadays a lot of new restaurants, coffee houses and designer stores have opened up. The interviewees are rather pleased with these changes.

‘A lot of things have changed; compared to the past it became more international. They renovated houses; the rent prices went up because of the foreigners. You used to pay 500 Turkish Lira per month for a room, now it is 1500. In my opinion, it improved for the better, there’s a better atmosphere. The quality of the people improved. It’s no problem that the rent prices rise, because it will mean that more educated people will come, people who speak multiple languages, etcetera.’

Changes in the social structure or composition of the neighborhood are the underlying cause of the material changes. A new group of people arrives to the neighborhood, foreigners or people with a high level of education, and they alter the neighborhood’s identity. Some interviewees regret the changes that the new residents bring along. Songul, the muthar in Tom Tom, appreciated the mahalle culture, the feeling of being known by your neighbors. But at the same time she appreciates the positive effect the newcomers have on the physical structure of Tophane: the environment looks cleaner, buildings are being refurbished and new designer stores and cafés open. However, they have little to do with the old mahalle culture in
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Tophane. Another interviewee, Özge, also regrets the disappearance of the mahalle culture. Tophane somehow preserved the old Turkish mahalle culture, but it now has to give way to the İstiklal life, the commercial lifestyle that is slowly but surely creeping down from Istanbul into the slopes of Tophane. Özge underlines, however, that change is not a bad thing *per se*, and that in a metropolis like Istanbul change is inevitable:

‘Unfortunately, there is no way to protect the mahalle culture; we cannot build a wall around it. If Tophane were to be part of top-down urban renewal projects, like the ones in Tarlabasi, it would be worse. There, they kicked out the poorer ones from the neighborhood. In Tophane, it’s natural, on the one hand, because things don’t change on a structural level, but unnatural, on the other hand, because the capital owners buying the houses are outsiders again. But it’s inevitable, I don’t know if it’s a good thing or a bad thing but change happens in the city.’

**Expectations**

The interviewees think the Galataport project is shrouded in mystery. Judging by what they have to say about the project’s details during the interview sessions in February 2014, it becomes painfully clear that they know little to nothing about the project. The interview quotations are therefore solely based on what they have heard on the grapevine and on their own version of a realistic scenario, not on what actually will happen. The expectations with regard to the project, range from hardly none whatsoever, to the prospect of a total transformation of the neighborhood.

‘Yes, the Galataport project is going to be realized, they are already working on it near the seaside. They are restoring the buildings beautifully. In the future, a lot more cruiseships could come in, which would mean a lot of money and a better atmosphere. I am expecting a big influence from the project.’

Özge, the young interviewee and sociology student who lives in Tophane, shows her dismay at the Galataport project. She expects that a part of the Golden Horn is going to be affected – in actual fact the main site will be around the old Tophane port. The project developers will construct hotels, restaurants, supermarkets, and parks, according to the plans. According to Özge, the project is a way to commercialize the area, but not to the benefit of the inhabitants of Tophane. She believes that even though the Galataport project is not meant for the inhabitants of Tophane, it will affect their neighborhood profoundly. She thinks that a lot of buildings will be destroyed, and replaced by luxurious hotels.
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Information provision

Many of the interviewees indicate that they are dissatisfied with the poor information provision about the Galataport project and the degree of transparency towards residents. The Dutch Frouke claims that compared with the Netherlands the level of information in large-scale urban transformation projects such as the Galataport project is poorly organized. If a project like that were to be organized in the Netherlands, they would start with handing out flyers to inform citizens about the project’s size, duration, and realization. She also mentions that she would not know whether Turkish residents have other information channels to learn about the project and how it is going to affect their lives. In this context, Özge says:

‘The first plan is an offer to the municipality, which the municipality simply accepts. The second plan is a map that presents citizens with a kind of overview of the plans. The third plan is the plan that has nothing to do neither with the first plan nor with the map. They just construct whatever they want, although they don’t have the approval of the municipality, and this is happening now.’

The Turkish interviewees indeed have to go through a lot of hassle to find out more about the project’s details. Quite often the Internet offers a solution. Özge, for example, found out on the Internet that a lot of project developers involved in the project have connections with the Ak Parti. Özge: ‘For twelve years they have almost changed everything in Turkey, all their families are working in constructing companies and they earn a lot of money.’ The following comments illustrate the interviewees’ general impression of politics in their country and of the role the government plays in large-scale urban transformation projects such as the Galataport project:

‘If you try your best you can find information on the Internet. Who bought the land? Who is going to implement the project? When will it be finished? And so on and so forth. I am not even bothered, actually. I am not interested, because in this country, when you start a war against something, you will see that you won’t be able to change a single thing.’\(^{211}\)

‘There is no democracy in Turkey. The generation before me said that, and the generation before that generation said that. I’m thirty-one, and I haven’t seen it. Because this is what we are, a third world country.’\(^{212}\)

Citizen participation

Now, the question arises what the Turkish government should do to increase citizen participation and to include citizens in urban transformation processes. After all, the citizens
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of Tophane are the ones who have to live with the consequences of the Galataport project. Recently, there have been some initiatives to increase transparency and citizen participation. There are some grassroots movements, and they may not be as big as they are in more developed countries, but if nobody attempts to organize citizens into collectives and to start a dialogue with the current government, nothing will ever change.

‘I think there is a large gap between the local politicians and citizens. I believe that if citizens were more included, if citizens were allowed to participate in the Galataport project, more people would benefit. They, too, might have some idea of what they want for their neighborhood...But citizen participation is just lacking here in Turkey.’

‘The Turkish government doesn’t care. They should ask the people what they want, its a very basic thing. It happens everywhere. Just ask people what they want. Of course, they want to keep or reconstruct their own houses, but people should be included, and this never happens in Turkey. I think the Galataport project directly belongs to the government. There is an organization called Tmob, a Turkish architectural and engineering organization, which has provided the municipality with many documents on illegal projects. But the municipality did not listen, it tried to stop Tmob. Tmob has lawyers, who have the power to bring projects to the court, but unfortunately the organization isn’t powerful enough.’

Implications for the residents

The interviewees stress that the Galataport project’s realization will have positive implications for some Tophane residents and negative implications for others. The interviewees think that the homeowners will be the winners, finding themselves in a position to leave Tophane wealthier than they arrived. They can sell their house and live a very wealthy lifestyle in another part of the city or even another part of Turkey:

‘For example, a house that would have cost 40.000 Turkish Lira ten years ago, now sells for 650.000. And this is why people are moving; they can make money out of it. I mean, if they can sell a house here and buy three on the Asian side, or six in their hometown, it makes sense.’

Yasemin thinks it is especially bad luck for the Jews and Armenians that were evicted fifty years ago. After their eviction, people from Siirt and Bitlis took their houses. They came from the east of Turkey, and as the current homeowners these families are the lucky ones to profit now.
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The renters, however, are in a less comfortable position. Without any legal protection from the government, their future looks grim. If they cannot afford the rent prices anymore, they have to leave Tophane and look for cheaper housing elsewhere. Most of the interviewees know of people who watched the Galataport project unfold and their rent prices rise. Perhaps, from a western perspective, one could feel sorry for these inhabitants, who have to leave the neighborhood that they might have grown attached to. The interviewees, however, offer a different perspective on that matter, suggesting that some renters might even prefer to move:

‘The renters slowly but surely started to move. They have to move. I guess, they move to more livable districts, such as Kasimpaşa or Umraniye. I know a lot of people like that. They expected this project, how can you not expect it?!’

‘I know of renters who moved to Eyup. I think Turkish people are not in the habit of regretting much. They are pragmatic. They wouldn’t move to a place where they didn’t know anyone. Their sons were in Eyup, they had family members there, so it did make some sense to move.’

**Tophane: Visions of the future**

At the end of the interviews I was curious to learn how the interviewees envisaged the future of Tophane and that of Istanbul. Interestingly and, perhaps, surprisingly enough, most of the interviewees had a clear idea of what they thought was going to happen. They believed that in the near future both the housing stock and the population composition are to change profoundly.

The housing stock is going to be refurbished by the new residents, who will buy the buildings from the current homeowners. Interviewees expect that because of this urban transformation – which will happen gradually, not being part of a large-scale, top-down government plan – the neighborhood will become increasingly popular among storeowners. As a result, the neighborhood can expect more galleries, design shops, and sophisticated stores. Most of the interviewees support this upgrading, looking at the neighborhood as a whole:

‘I want the Galataport project to be opened. They should not pay attention to the “history of Tophane” or the “ancient culture of Tophane”. History, history, what is history? Let them widen the streets and fix them, so people will be able to walk more. They pay attention to historical preservation, but we want a more liveable place like Cihangir. When you enter Cihangir, you feel like you’ve entered civilization.’

---
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‘I support the Galataport project. This place needs to be renovated. All the buildings are impoverished and therefore worthless, it looks ugly. This project might have a positive influence. Let there be more cafés and galleries, it will look more like civilization.’

Of course, the population composition will also change as a result of this gradual transformation process. The interviewees realize that with the influx of new, foreign residents, the urban transformation process will eventually lead to increased rents, which will force many renters to move away from Tophane. The neighborhood is currently characterized by a variety of divergent groups with considerable income and education differences. The forced exodus of poorer residents might improve the quality of the neighborhood as a whole, but simultaneously cause a change in Tophane’s identity. The neighborhood will become much more homogeneous.

‘Tophane will become richer, more foreign. From what I’ve seen so far, the buyers are mostly rich foreigners, or Turks living in the United States. They buy the buildings and turn them into luxurious apartments. Or, they invest here and continue living abroad. Of course, Tophane’s culture will change. But it has already lost its culture after 6/7 September 1955, when they expelled the non-Muslim minorities.’

‘My guess is that more art galleries will open their doors in Tophane. The Siirt and Bitlis people will go, and the people who were forced to move will return. I mean, the Jews and Armenians, they will return to maybe buy properties. They already own ninety percent of Galata, next to Tophane. By the way, some properties were actually bought by Dutch real estate companies, Vastned and Grontmij. I used to work there, so I know.’

*Istanbul: Visions of the future*

‘The future of Istanbul looks very bright. I think it will be unparalleled. The third bridge is a fantastic project, the third airport will be unbelievable, and Turkey will really profit from it. I think the prime minister is doing a lot of good things for Turkey.’

For some of the interviewees the future of Istanbul looks very bright. As it is for Songul, the muhtar in Tophane, who cannot leave her mahalle and wants Tophane to stay like a mahalle in the future. However, there are interviewees who would disagree with that, they have a very different opinion of what the future holds in store for Istanbul. These interviewees tend to be less supportive of the Ak Parti and more in favor of the Gezi Park protests. They believe that during the last decade, since the Ak Parti came to power, urban transformation has not
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necessarily been beneficial to the city of Istanbul. What worries them most, is the uncontrolled population growth:

‘What will happen to Istanbul in the years to come, is really on my mind. Sometimes I look at the city in the evening and I see a sea of lights abi [brother], like the stars. People living on top of each other, like a clew of people. There is such a clew of people, and more and more are coming. But Istanbul no longer wants them, Istanbul is saturated. The more there are, the less of a city Istanbul becomes. It already started to become nothing, like with the Ağaoğlulu buildings. It’s nothing but concrete, nothing but disgusting blocks. Everything is grayed out.

The population growth is seen as the cause of Istanbul’s current major problems. It is becoming almost unlivable, with too many people living on a small space. The population growth has a negative impact on the amount of green space and public transit. The interviewees repeatedly stress that the current government urgently needs to address these issues to keep the city livable:

‘There is no green left and that’s why I hate to go to Istanbul’s city center. It says on the Internet that in capitals of advanced countries, New York or Amsterdam, for example, there is seven percent green space. In Istanbul, it is one percent. What does one percent mean, brother? One percent?! There are twenty million people, sharing one percent of green space! Istanbul is now impatiently waiting for an earthquake. Sometimes I am praying for it, if Istanbul would be leveled to the ground for a large part I would be relieved.

‘What I think is going to happen? I think Istanbul will become an impossible place to live, because it will become part of resource consuming projects. They destroy the nature, the upper classes will have something, sure, but the lower or middle classes cannot survive anymore. They won’t benefit from these changes. As a human being you need a connection with nature. I think we are not going to be human anymore, we will be mutants because of the crowded traffic and the lack of nature.

When I start discussing the third bridge and the Marmaray underground with the interviewees, some show their frustration. The current solutions of the government to the increasingly congested roads are not sustainable and only generate more traffic the interviewees believe. And to the regrets of the interviewees, a big part of the northern forest had to be cut to give way to the third bridge.

‘Thanks to the government and a mistake in their calculations, they cut 160,000 trees. It's the year 2014 in the 21st century and they make the wrong calculations?

---
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mean, this is very stupid. Istanbul will not be livable anymore. I don’t want to be rude, but the ones ruling over us are bad people.  

“You know that the Bosphorus is a very valuable ecosystem and now they are building this third bridge. Let them build more trains, metro systems. The traffic will only increase. I do not wish to use the Marmara under the Bosphorus, because I don't trust it. They opened it before they were completely finished with the construction works. The future of Istanbul? More concrete, more buildings, less nature. This is why I feel sad about Istanbul.”

More investments in public transit are needed in Istanbul, so say the interviewees. Because of the third bridge, a very valuable ecological system has been destroyed and it is doubtful whether the third bridge will actually help to reduce Istanbul’s traffic. There exists a fear among interviewees that the third bridge might actually increase traffic jams, because people assume it will end traffic jams and thus become more motivated to take their car again. Nevertheless the interviewees come up with a couple of solutions to make the city livable again:

‘Let them build a metro like in London or Paris. If you build a metro like that, traffic problems can be avoided, because people no longer want to use their cars.’

‘I think Istanbul is going to improve a lot, but what do I expect? İnşallah a small earthquake, maybe not a big one, I do not wish a big earthquake for everyone, because everything can collapse here. During the last earthquake a lot of houses collapsed.’

The future of Istanbul looks bright to some, but bleak to others. The city needs pragmatic solutions, immigration to the city should be brought to a standstill and people should be discouraged to take the car. In comparison with other world cities, Istanbul only has a minimal transportation system, which does not meet the demands of the millions of travelers. To conclude with, two interviewees made a sharp distinction between their expectations and their, between what they think will happen and their idea of what Istanbul and Tophane should look like in the future.

‘I expect that it’s going to be more difficult for the poorer ones, the gap between the rich and poor will further increase and some districts are going to be reserved to the richer classes. It’s happening already around Beyoğlu, the neighborhoods are transformed to richer areas. It will happen to Tarlabası, too. I also think it’s alarming that there is so little green space available and that so little has been done to increase the green space. It’s all economics. I think traffic is going to be an immense problem.’

---
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Maybe they can implement solutions like in London or Paris. People have to be stimulated to use alternative means of transportation.’

‘I hope they will try to fix the public transportation issues and slowly but surely I can see that it is improving. Of course, they should have done that fifty years ago... I think it’s going to change drastically in the next twenty years, so that you can live in a cheaper part of the city and still get around quickly. I really hope so.’

'My hopes for what is going to happen? I want to see a city as part of nature. Of course, urban development is inevitable, but we can try to preserve nature or reorganize the streets, the apartments. In my fantasy there are no TOKİ flats. That is not social housing, it just destroys nature, it always lacks playing gardens, green space, and it’s lifeless. They are like gated communities, they don’t have any real connection with the city, they never think about the residents’ living conditions. Many inhabitants end up leaving this Toki housing because it’s impossible for a human to live there. I hope people can survive in Istanbul in a green, organic, and connected city.’

---
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Chapter 6. Conclusion

In this thesis, I have examined in detail how the current identity of Tophane has evolved over the years as a consequence of historical and geopolitical developments. The physical structure of the neighborhood is imbedded in the Ottoman history, in the centuries when Tophane was constructed in the shape of a maze with narrow, curved streets. This type of neighborhood structure, the mahalle, is still present in Tophane. In that sense, the physical structure has not been altered significantly, and current inhabitants still do relate to the mahalle culture.

The socio-ethnic composition has changed considerably in Tophane, both as a result of historical developments in Turkish history and because of its proximity to the port. In the 15th century, for instance, the neighborhood saw the arrival of Judeo-Spanish refugees who had successfully fled prosecution during the Spanish Inquisition. Moreover, the neighborhood was home to a great Greek and Armenian community, which would last well into the 20th century. After the 1955 pogrom, this community was evicted and replaced by migrants from eastern Turkey, causing the neighborhood to loose its heterogeneous identity.

Now, in the year 2014, the AK Parti’s neo-liberalist policies add a new historical layer to Tophane’s identity. With high hopes of the large-scale Galataport project, investors have been keen to renovate run down buildings, open up galleries and buy out homeowners. For the homeowners the situation has proved to be profitable as property prices have skyrocketed in the past decade. However, for the renters, often poorer, the perspectives are less hopeful. These residents find themselves forced to move elsewhere, unable to pay the climbing rents any longer. Thus, the Galataport project, not even finished yet, has already affected Tophane’s identity, now that the poorer residents and some of the homeowners move out. Whether we like it or not, sooner or later changes seem to be inevitable in neighborhoods of densely populated cities.

It goes without saying that the Turkish government has to be careful in its approach to urban transformation in Tophane and be mindful of its potential implications for the neighborhood. Fortunately, renters in Tophane will most likely not undergo the rather inelegant treatment that renters in the Tarlabası neighborhood received, since Tophane will not be completely restructured by the Galata Port Project. Nonetheless, without any legal protection whatsoever the renters in Tophane are now faced with the discomfortable prospect of having to relocate as a result of the rising rents. It would not damage the image of the Turkish government if, instead of moving poor residents away from the city center, it would help those residents by taking more care of their neighborhood and improving their livelihood conditions.
It would be interesting to examine whether the findings of this case study could be applied to similar cases in other research. Although the example of Tophane with its specific history and geography may be unique, the variables that have been analyzed do occur elsewhere. Studies consisting of a larger dataset could give a more exact picture of the effects of variables such as age, gender, and education level on the mental perception of neighborhoods in the light of urban transformation. It is my hope that this research has shed some light on this mechanism. In particular, the difference in mental perception of Tophane between men and women is remarkable and requires more analysis.

Furthermore, it is my hope that this case study will be replicated in the future in the form of a longitudinal study. With the Tophane project, I have tried to decompose the various aspects of the Tophane identity, as its residents and other users perceive it. The mental mapping method is (almost) an art. It is not easy to depict what kind of images actually exists in peoples’ minds, but mental mapping can be a great tool in this portrayal. This study makes clear that there is such a thing as a Tophane identity, that it does exist in the minds of people, and that it can be displayed and debated about. It would be interesting to keep track of how the mental perceptions of the respondents and interviewees will evolve during the years to come, especially after the Galataport project will be finished.

In conclusion, I expect the neighborhood Tophane to transform from a heterogeneous neighborhood with a wide variety of residents into a more homogeneous neighborhood with a significantly wealthier and homogeneous type of resident. During the interview sessions, a couple of interviewees told me that some of the new buyers of houses and properties had a Jewish background. It would be wonderful if some of the future residents were part of the minorities that once left Tophane. Perhaps, then, Tophane will never loose its identity completely.
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Appendix 1. The survey - questionnaire

A) Birinci bölüm: Mahalleler
Haritaya bakarak size göre uygun olan cevabı işaretleyin lütfen. Tophane hakkında fikrinizi öğrenmek istiyorum, bu bir sınav değildir.

1. Tophane’ye ait değil.
2. Kısmen Tophane’ye aittir.
3. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.

1. Sahkulu
   A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
   B. Kısmen Tophane’ye aittir.
   C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.

2. Tom Tom
   A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
   B. Kısmen Tophane’ye aittir.
   C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.

3. Firuzağa
   A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
   B. Kısmen Tophane’ye aittir.
   C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.

4. Kuloğlu
   A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
   B. Kısmen Tophane’ye aittir.
   C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.

5. Katip Mustafa Çelebi
   A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
   B. Kısmen Tophane’ye aittir.
   C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.

6. Cihangir
   A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
   B. Kısmen Tophane’ye aittir.
   C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.
7. Pürtelaş Hasan Efendi
A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
B. Kısメン Tophane’ye aittir.
C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.

8. Kılıç Ali Paşa
A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
B. Kıメン Tophane’ye aittir.
C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.

9. Hacımimi
A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
B. Kıメン Tophane’ye aittir.
C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.

10. Bereketzade
A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
B. Kıメン Tophane’ye aittir.
C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.

11. Kemankes Kara Musafa Paşa
A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
B. Kıメン Tophane’ye aittir.
C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.

12. Müyyedzade
A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
B. Kıメン Tophane’ye aittir.
C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.

B) İkinci bölüm: İşaret

1.
A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
B. Kıメン Tophane’ye aittir.
C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.
2.
A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
B. Kismen Tophane’ye aittir.
C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.

3.
A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
B. Kismen Tophane’ye aittir.
C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.

4.
A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
B. Kismen Tophane’ye aittir.
C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.

5.
A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
B. Kismen Tophane’ye aittir.
C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.

6.
A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
B. Kismen Tophane’ye aittir.
C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.

7.
A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
B. Kismen Tophane’ye aittir.
C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.

8.
A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
B. Kismen Tophane’ye aittir.
C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.

9.
A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
B. Kismen Tophane’ye aittir.
C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.
10. A. Tophane’ye ait değil. 
B. Kısmen Tophane’ye aittir. 
C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir. 

11. A. Tophane’ye ait değil. 
B. Kısmen Tophane’ye aittir. 
C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir. 

12. A. Tophane’ye ait değil. 
B. Kısmen Tophane’ye aittir. 
C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir. 

13. A. Tophane’ye ait değil. 
B. Kısmen Tophane’ye aittir. 
C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir. 

14. A. Tophane’ye ait değil. 
B. Kısmen Tophane’ye aittir. 
C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir. 

15. A. Tophane’ye ait değil. 
B. Kısmen Tophane’ye aittir. 
C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir. 

16. A. Tophane’ye ait değil. 
B. Kısmen Tophane’ye aittir. 
C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir. 

C) Üçüncü bölüm: Sokaklar


1. Maliye Caddesi
A. Topahan’ye ait değil.
2. **Yüksek Kaldırım Caddesi**
   A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
   B. Kısmen Tophane’ye aittir.
   C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.

3. **Galip Dede Caddesi**
   A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
   B. Kısmen Tophane’ye aittir.
   C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.

4. **Kumbaracı Yokuşu**
   A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
   B. Kısmen Tophane’ye aittir.
   C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.

5. **Hoca Ali Sokak**
   A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
   B. Kısmen Tophane’ye aittir.
   C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.

6. **İstiklal Caddesi**
   A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
   B. Kısmen Tophane’ye aittir.
   C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.

7. **Güneşli Sokak**
   A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
   B. Kısmen Tophane’ye aittir.
   C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.

8. **Akarşu Yokuşu**
   A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
   B. Kısmen Tophane’ye aittir.
   C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.

9. **Cihangir Caddesi**
   A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
   B. Kısmen Tophane’ye aittir.
   C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.
10. Turnacı Başı Caddessi
A. Tophane’ye ait değil.
B. Kısaca Tophane’ye aittir.
C. Tamamen Tophane’ye aittir.

Genel bilgi

Yaş

Cinsiyet

Meslek

Memleket

1. Tophane’de oturuyor musunuz? Hayır cevabı verince iki’ye doğru gidiniz.

Evet

Hayır

Kaç yıldan beri Tophane’de yaşıyorsunuz?

Tophane’deki sokağınız?

2. Hangi semtte oturuyorsunuz?

Bu semtte kaç yıldan beri oturuyor musunuz?

Semtiniz’deki sokağınız?

Anketi doldurduğunuz ve vaktiniizi vererek yardımcı olduğunuz için teşekkürler.

Eklemek istediğiniz bir şey varsa buraya yazabilirsiniz.

İyi günler!
Appendix 2. The survey - supplement

District map of Tophane
## Appendix 3. Interviewees and background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Hometown</th>
<th>Relation with Tophane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Songul</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Muhtar</td>
<td>Ağrı</td>
<td>Lives in Tophane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehmet</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Freelancer</td>
<td>Denizli</td>
<td>Works in Tophane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halil</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td>Osmaniye</td>
<td>Works in Tophane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasemin</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Freelancer</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Works in Tophane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oğuzhan</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Musician</td>
<td>Denizli</td>
<td>Lives in Tophane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frouke</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>PHD history</td>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>Lives in Tophane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Financial officer</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Lives in Tophane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perrine</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Lives in Tophane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Özge</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Denizli</td>
<td>Lives in Tophane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4. The interview - English version

General information

Name..................................................................................................................................................
Age..................................................................................................................................................
Gender................................................................................................................................................
Profession...........................................................................................................................................
Education...............................................................................................................................................
Town of origin.....................................................................................................................................
Date of interview..................................................................................................................................

History

1. How long have you been living/working in Tophane?
2. Why did you, or your parents, decide to move to/work in Tophane?
3. Do you have friends or family that are living/working in Tophane as well?
4. Do you have friends or family from your hometown living/working in Tophane?

Present

5. What changed in Tophane after you started to live here?
6. What do you think of these changes?
7. Which places in Tophane do you visit frequently?
8. Where do you think the borders of Tophane are located? Why there?
9. What do you like about Tophane?
10. What don’t you like about Tophane?

Future

11. What are your expectations for the future of Tophane?
12. What are your expectations for the future of Istanbul?
13. Would you like to continue living in Tophane?
Appendix 5. Röportaj - Türk versiyonu

Genel bilgi

Adı........................................................................................................................................................................
Yaş........................................................................................................................................................................
Cinsiyet.............................................................................................................................................................
Meslek............................................................................................................................................................
Eğitim..............................................................................................................................................................
Memleket..........................................................................................................................................................
Röportajin tarihisi..................................................................................................................................................

Tarihi

1. Kaç yıldan beri Tophane’de oturuyorsunuz ya da çalışmıyorsunuz?
2. Neden siz ya da aileniz Tophane’ye taşınımaya ya da çalışmaya karar verdiniz?
3. Tophane’de çalışan/oturan aileniz ya da arkadaşlarınız var mı?
4. Memleketinizden başka kişiler Tophane’de oturuyor/calışıyor mu?

Şimdiki zaman

5. Tophane’de oturmaya/çalısmaya başladığınızdan beri burada ne değişti?
6. Bu değişiklikler hakkında ne düşünüyorsunuz?
7. Tophane’de en çok nerelere gidiyorsunuz?
8. Tophane’nin sınırları size ne resi? Neden orası?
9. Tophane’de neleri seviyorsunuz?
10. Tophane’de neleri sevmiyorsunuz?

Gelecekte

11. Tophane’nin geleceğiyle ilgili beklentiniz nedir?
12. Istanbul’un geleceğiyle ilgili beklentiniz nedir?
13. Tophane’de oturmaya devam etmek ister misiniz? Neden?