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Abstract

The last decade of the 20th century marks a significant turning point in the evolution of human settlements, defining a new stage in the development of cities. Although all cities in the developed world are redefined in a global society in a stage of reurbanization, the effects of a rapid urbanization process are still going on to be discussed in the developing countries. In fact both processes involve an element of migration defining new enclaves of social polarization on space.

First started from rural to urban areas in the first half of the 20th century, migration has changed its structure in the 1990s, defining two new movements, from small urban areas to big cities and in inner-city areas as a reflection of urban restructuring efforts changing the social topography of cities for the capitalization of global interest. Thus an ongoing urban transformation process with its gentrifying central areas and physically segregated residential areas for a newly increasing high-profile population is in effect not only in the industrialized countries but in the developing world as well.

This paper will describe the reasons of inner-city migration with a brief explanation of its results on the social topography of Ankara, opening a discussion about the elements of social polarization and exclusion on urban space provided by a process of urban restructuring.

1. Introduction

Urbanization is linked with the problematic of development, a term referring both to a level (technological, economic) and to a process (qualitative transformation of social structures, permitting an increase of the potential of the productive forces) (1). Likewise, Berg et al. (2) define urban growth in 1982, as a cyclical process through which nations pass as they evolve from agrarian to industrial societies and see urbanization as a developing world phenomenon.
distinguishing the urbanization bound up with the first industrial revolution in the 19th century from the current developments in urban areas characterized by the process of globalization.

The first type of urbanization was a process of organizing space based on the concentration of industrial activities and a population movement towards the already existing urban areas, providing the labor force essential to industrialization (1). In the last decade of the 20th century, urbanization process has again been characterized by a migratory movement to urban areas but this time it is the internationalization of the labor market in a global environment that shapes the characteristics of urbanization. Berg uses the term of reurbanization in order to define the transformations taking place in the 21st century global cities. In fact, this post-industrial, post-modern metropolis is different from its predecessors, with its revitalized city center of gleaming offices, high-tech transport nodes and secure, privatized shopping malls surrounded by a veritable archipelago of elite enclaves and fragmented neighborhoods (3).

However, the urbanization in progress in the developing countries is not the same of the process experienced by the industrialized countries. By the 1950s, the more developed countries were already highly urbanized, the developing countries on the other hand were just beginning an accelerating urbanization process.

Different concepts were used in order to distinguish the characteristics of urbanization in the developing countries. Castells (1) use “overurbanization” - a term that connotes the idea of a level of urbanization higher than that which can ‘normally’ be attained, given the level of industrialization. Most Turkish writers use “pseudourbanization” to emphasize the problems of rapid urbanization with limited financial resources and institutional developments. These problems are unplanned living environments (squatter houses), increasing urban poverty, increasing amount of waste and pollution, depletion of natural resources and lack of proper sanitation. Nonetheless, the unsustainable consumption patterns of the developing countries will subsequently have detrimental consequences globally as global concern for sustainable development has the objective of improving quality of life (4).

The primary element of urbanization in the developing countries is rural-urban migration that brought another concept to define the characteristics of this process shaped by a new rural population with different life styles from their urban neighbors. Urbanism is the term used to describe the social and behavioral characteristics of an urban way of life which is extended across society as people adopt urban values, expectations and lifestyles and are considered as “citizens” by the majority of urban population.

2. The effect of migration in the 21st century urbanization process

It is generally accepted that migration is more important in the early stages of urbanization. However recent developments in global labor market and the urban
restructuring reflections of the new information society provide a different argument with a differentiating content of migration.

First started from rural to urban areas in the 19th century, migration has changed its structure in the 1980s, defining two new movements first from developing countries to developed countries and secondly from small urban areas to big cities, with the internationalization of the labor market, in addition to a continuing rural-urban migration. However, the mutual interaction between these movements to global cities and the urbanization process which is characterized with the elements of global spatial restructuring, bring another migratory movement in the inner-city, defining a new economic and social topography with an increasing level of polarization on space.

2.1 Internationalization of the labor market

The last decade of the 20th century marks a significant turning point in the evolution of human settlements, defining a new stage in the development of cities in a global society.

The world economy has internationalized in its basic dynamics, it is dominated by uncontrollable market forces, and it has as its principal economic actors transnational corporations that owe allegiance to no nation-state and locate wherever on the globe market advantage dictates (5). So, with the internationalization of business activities, firms are now supposed to roam the globe in search of cheap but efficient production locations that offer them the largest and most secure and profitable return on competitive success (5) thus defining new patterns of production and control of the global capital and new nodes of economic and social polarization with a new geography of differences.

The new economic environment brings integration of the global labor market and redefines migration to become a global phenomenon which have heightened capital and labor mobility with the concentration of control capability in global cities. Thus, the new economy increases the importance of occupations with a high information and knowledge content in their activity. Managerial, professional, and technical occupations grow faster than any other occupational position and constitute the core of the new social structure (1). The ‘club class’ with managerial expertise, though relatively few in numbers in terms of the global population, are the most obvious manifestation of this inequity in long-term migratory opportunities (5).

In accordance with this argument, the world’s underprivileged and poor have fewer international migratory possibilities nowadays than they had in the past. They have little choice but to remain in poverty (5). Such equity element in migration causes dramatic shifts in the demographic profiles of both developed and developing countries, redefining the concept of development with a new element of global polarization. In fact, globalization with its new elements of employment in an international labor market increases the polarization of poverty in certain areas, between the underdeveloped and developing sections of the world, between small cities and global cities, and between different neighborhoods, rather than providing new global opportunities for labor.
Actually, “brain-drain” from developing to industrial countries (4) and from small urban areas to the global cities and to secondary centers of global control facilities is one of the net indicators of this occasion.

But there is a different argument such as: the basis of the new international division of labor is the direct employment of large numbers of workers in low-cost overseas territories to perform standard production tasks. Low-cost workers in developing countries undertake labor-intensive tasks of manufacture and assembly under the direction of, and to specifications drawn up by, technicians and managers based in the developed world (2). Yet this aspect of the new economic order has not been fully emphasized. However, demand for unskilled labor has been increasing in the urban areas of developing countries in which multinational corporations invest to make use of the cheap labor force and the local facilities. The researches prove this argument as more and more of the world population is still moving from rural to urban areas and from small urban areas to big cities. So one can argue that this development will start a new mass movement from rural to urban areas in developing countries enlarging the informal sector which have arisen within the environment of an undeveloped institutional framework in most of the developing countries.

### 2.2 Inner-city migration

The recent round of capital restructuring has not only engendered structural changes in the spheres of production and circulation but has also rearranged the form of cities (6) for the interests of global capital. It has generally been accepted that the only way that cities can compete in an increasingly unpredictable and globalized economy is by pursuing specific strategies designed to secure competitive advantages over their perceived competitors (3). Thus, more attention has devoted to the transformation of the image of the city for the global capital within the process of “selling cities” with the goal of attracting multinational business, tourists and high-income residents.

Within this environment, capital restructuring has resulted in three significant transformations of the built environment of core cities: the establishment of international producer services in high-rise office towers of central areas, the abandonment of large-scale factories and expansion of small-scale and mixed-use industrial districts and the rise of new immigrant and gentrified neighborhoods (6) reflected on space as high-profile prestige property projects with an increasing element of private investment on public land.

Indeed growth in the number of transnational corporations in major cities has contributed to a rapid growth of high-price real estate market especially with the concentration of the new high-income managerial work force. This new mobile population which is willing to pay extremely high amounts for central location in global cities, brings an expansion in the demand for space and a rehabilitation of developed urban land for new residential uses.

However within this financial and political framework, the priorities of economic growth and investment returns are accorded primacy over social issues of distributional equity. Current experience suggests that such schemes have
widened disparities in wealth and income distribution with increasing values of residential properties. This decreases the amount of affordable housing in central areas resulting in the displacement of most highly disadvantaged populations destroying the various smaller low-income neighborhoods to make room for luxury housing, office space and highways. Massive construction projects of high-income residential and commercial gentrification brings totally new land uses and new social topographies with sharp increases in spatially concentrated poverty and physical decay. The central areas that were once the only areas where low-income residents who could not afford a house in the suburbs were left behind, now turned into prestige areas of the global capital.

So new inner-city migratory movements mostly unexpected before, have become one of the major concepts of the 21st century urbanization process. Notwithstanding different political systems and planning approaches, all cities underwent large-scale transformation through their urbanization experience such as suburban developments and public housing projects. But the 21st century urban restructuring increased segregation in the city immensely like never before along class, race and sexual lines, especially by eliminating the middle-income and providing deep polarization between low and high income groups. The leitmotif of a polarized city is therefore inevitably employed to describe a situation whereby new gentrified spaces are found only a few hundred metres from some of the most deprived areas of inner-city decay, characterized by chronic dependency, poverty and frequent social unrest (3).

3. The evolution of migration within the process of urbanization in Turkey

Three different periods can be observed in the urbanization process of Turkey shaped by the economic and political systems applied after the Second World War; From the end of the War to 1960 during which import substitution policies developed with the first signs of a migration process; From 1960 to 1980 during which a planned mixed economic policy developed together with an industrialization policy and urbanization is characterized by an increasing influx of rural-urban migration; The period since 1980 which has constituted a turning point in the economic development of the country and Turkey has transformed her introvert economic policy to an extrovert one through the application of liberalization policies. According to the 1970 census, only 32.3 % of the population was living in urban areas: The corresponding figure in the 1990 census was 51.4 % with a rate of urbanization approximately 50 per thousand during the 1970-90 period.

3.1 Rural-urban migration

In the 1940s, two characteristics of economic development encouraged migration away from rural areas to cities in Turkey. One is increased agricultural productivity with the mechanization of agricultural production as more and more agricultural workers were pushed to urban areas to sustain their lives. The other
characteristic is the expanded economic opportunities in the manufacturing and service sectors as the new employment opportunities in the developing industrial sector pulled an important amount of labor force from rural to urban areas. In fact during rapid industrialization based on imported technology and equipment and in view of the limited domestic capital, there was crucial need for labor that was cheap in all aspects such as wages, housing costs, transportation costs, and the like. The rural population provided this much needed cheap and mobile labor.

Anyhow, rural-urban migration has resulted in a significant transformation of the urban environment as the migrants brought their own lifestyles with the development of squatter housing as a solution in face of the ineffectiveness of the ways of legal housing provision in Turkey. So the poor were forced to settle on land which was unoccupied because of steep slopes with the risk of landslides, or ravines that risk being flooded in heavy rains, sites along railway lines and at garbage dumps and close to dangerous industrial plants.

Later although these areas were accepted as the origins of all problems in the cities, political approaches in favor of populism especially in the share of urban rent, have given this population power in the urban land market (7) and squatter population gained a new status with the power of speculation. Within this general setting, squatter housing areas which formed extensive neighborhoods especially in the central locations surrounded by the expanding city, turned into transition areas physically deteriorating and became even more problematic for the future of cities (Table 1). So in the 2000s while the speed of rural-urban migration has been decreasing, the effects of the migrant population have been transforming to formulate new discussions of rent and speculation on urban land.

Table 1: Number of squatter houses and squatter population in Ankara

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Number of squatter houses</th>
<th>Squatter population</th>
<th>% in urban population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>650 097</td>
<td>70 000</td>
<td>364 000</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>905 660</td>
<td>100 000</td>
<td>520 000</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1 236 152</td>
<td>144 000</td>
<td>748 000</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1 701 004</td>
<td>202 000</td>
<td>1 156 000</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1 877 755</td>
<td>275 000</td>
<td>1 450 000</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985*</td>
<td>2 737 209</td>
<td>300 000</td>
<td>1 560 000</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990*</td>
<td>2 836 719</td>
<td>350 000</td>
<td>1 750 000</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The decreasing percentage of squatter population is due to the legalization of squatter areas and the implementation of improvement plans. In 1993, 93% of squatter areas had improvement plans and their physical situation changed in the master plan as a regular housing stock, but their housing types and living standards did not change (8).

3.2 Reflections of the international labor market in Turkey

From 1980s onwards, parallel to extrovert economic development policies, the content of migration gained new elements with the global adaptation policies of
Turkey. The private sector has increased its partnerships with the foreign capital in order to enter global markets and to follow the technological developments. The number of branch offices of transnational corporations has been increasing in certain nodes as the points of integration to the global urban network. Occasionally, this has brought “brain drain” from small to big cities, and from underdeveloped to developed regions as the preliminary element of global economic restructuring in Turkey. Thus, the rate of urban-urban migration in total migratory movements increased from 60% in 1965-70 period to 90% in 1975-1980 period (9).

In this context Istanbul pulls an important percentage of the educated/white collar labor force. According to the 1980 census, 61.8% of the people living in Istanbul was born in another city (9). Ankara in this context is not an attractive city as being the government center of Turkey but it also pulls some managerial work force from the international labor market and other small cities because of its location in the center of some production activities in Central Anatolia. According to the 1980 census, 40% of the people living in Ankara was born in another city (9).

It is a fact that the entrance of transnational corporations into the Turkish market has increasing the percentage of a “club class” and their demand of central locations for office space and high-quality residential areas leading to important transformations on the physical space of some of the cities in Turkey. Istanbul takes the leading role in this transformation process with its gentrifying central areas and physically segregated residential areas of its newly increasing high-profile population. However, Ankara has also been effected from these developments and municipalities are in a race to renew the urban areas within their boundaries. Squatter housing areas especially in central locations are the most appropriate for such renewal efforts. Thus urban restructuring/gentrification or urban transformation projects, have become the preliminary concern of Municipalities since the second half of the 1980s with the goal of transforming deteriorating areas into prestige areas to increase the physical and visual wealth of their city (10).

3.3 Urban transformation projects and an unexpected level of inner-city migration in Ankara

At present the squatter housing neighborhoods are located in eight administrative districts in Ankara. In five of these, urban transformation projects (UTPs) are in effect in addition to the projects of the Greater Municipality of Ankara (Table 2). In all of the projects, a public-private participation model has been encouraged in order to enable contracting firms to undertake construction by sharing the rent to achieve a self-financing mechanism. Besides, the projects added public participation to their organization models to prevent public resistance to transformation (10).
Table 2: Squatter housing stock and urban transformation projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative district</th>
<th>Existing squatter housing area (ha)</th>
<th>Existing squatter housing population</th>
<th>Number of UTPs</th>
<th>Population increase with UTPs (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altındağ</td>
<td>1668</td>
<td>159,126</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>206.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çankaya</td>
<td>2171</td>
<td>53,101</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>210.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etimesgut</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>32,942</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gölbashi</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamak</td>
<td>4147</td>
<td>210,187</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>569.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keçiören</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>118,295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yenimahalle</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>194,839</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Municipality of Ankara</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11,819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (10)

All of the municipalities give great importance to their transformation projects and see them as their most successful studies for the betterment of the physical space of their city together with finding a solution to the squatter housing problem. However, the finished projects show that although these areas transformed into more liveable areas and so increased urban quality, they led to an unexpected inner-city migration movement just in the case of gentrification projects in the European and American cities.

One of the goals of the municipalities was not to dismiss the original population of the project areas by giving them a share from the transformed area but this could not be achieved in the long-run. First the tenant population has not been considered as project participants so an important number of people have been dismissed from project areas. Later, as the project areas were centrally located so have locational rent, they gained prestige with the new projects and both the land and flat values increased to two-three times. Thus, a second group of people sold or rented their houses with speculative reasons.

On the other hand, the proposed populations were more than the original population and the new prestigious areas pulled a higher class of people with increasing population densities thus adding one more level to the speculative value of the project areas. Occasionally, first the contradictory elements of ways of life between the original and the new populations and secondly the inaffordability of the maintenance costs of the new houses led to the dismiss of a fourth group and 80-90 % of the original populations was dismissed in total.

There is an important point that the project participants who were dismissed from project areas mostly chose squatter houses again to resettle, first because they were cheaper, secondly because squatter housing offers them the life they get used to. In fact, squatter housing is more affordable so they can use the rest
of the money for other reasons and it reflects their own cultural formations to be the continuation of their rural lives in the city.

Conclusively, urban transformation projects of Ankara municipalities create two inner-city migration movements; first the movement of original project participants from project areas to the other squatter housing areas in the city or to peripheral residential areas with lower values of housing; and secondly, from middle-and high-class residential areas to the project areas with the increasing prestige of these locations. On the other hand, the areas they left behind are settled by the middle-income groups. The second type of movement can be considered as related with the economic and social developments reflecting on the locational preferences of the citizens. But the first movement was totally unexpected as the municipalities thought that the original populations would be integrated into the new environment they would create.

Before these projects, with the spread of cities, squatter housing areas become an integrative part of the city in physical terms as there were middle- and high-income neighborhoods nearby. So, in Turkey noone could feel a physical seperation of the socio-economic groups. But today one can clearly identify a dual structure in urban areas of wealth and poverty, the gentrified residential areas of the high-income population and the residential areas of the poor with increasing densities as a result of the newcomers from the gentrified project areas.

4. Concluding remarks

In simple terms, gentrification is the upgrading of housing and retail businesses in a neighborhood with an influx generally of private investment. It is a contributor to the diversity, the great mosaic of the city. But the new urbanism embodies a widespread and drastic repolarization of the city along political, economic, cultural and geographical lines. As a matter of fact, the Turkish experiences prove the fact that the whole urban geography undergoes a restructuring with an unexpected level of inner-city migration. Problems such as the inabilities of the squatter population which form an important amount of the urban poor in Turkish cities, to integrate into the social life of the city deepen with their dismiss from the new urban landscape. Transformation projects lead to social exclusion and to an economic and social inaccessibility of a diversity in space.

Short and Kim describes quality of life as the existence of affluent natural amenities (beach, lake, etc.), mild water (sun, warm climate), health services, low cost of living, wide range of housing options, friendliness and distinct lifestyle advantages as high quality of cultural and recreational activities and historical heritage but they do not consider equity in terms of accessing to these qualities. Increasing the quality of living is one of the aims of all governments but recent developments show that both qualitative and quantitative interventions of increasing urban quality do not necessitate that these can be achieved by all. On the contrary, although urban restructuring provides better living environments thus increase the elements of urban quality but these are
point-specific interventions which are chosen with the check of the landscape for profitable reinvestment. They decrease the amount of affordable housing, push different income groups to segregated areas, separate their ties on urban space. Thus such projects create an image of quality further deepening social exclusion and polarization on space. The qualitative and quantitative differences worsen the position of the urban poor and polarization of the poor deepen the conditions of poverty.
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