Tough Turns Fragile:
The Impact of Urban Renewal on Everyday Life in Sulukule

Merve Sayılganoğlu

A thesis presented to the

Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History
at Boğaziçi University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

June 2016

Approvals

"Tough Turns Fragile: The Impact of Urban Renewal on Everyday Life in Sulukule," a thesis prepared by Merve Sayılganoğlu in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts from the Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History at Bogaziçi University, has been approved on 10 June 2016 by:

THESIS ADVISOR

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Cengiz Kırlı _____
Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History
Boğaziçi University

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Prof. Dr. Biray Kolluoğlu _____
Sociology Department
Boğaziçi University

Asst. Prof. Z. Umut Türem _____
Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History
Boğaziçi University

Copyright © 2016 Merve Sayılganoğlu.
Some rights reserved.



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

To view a copy of this license, visit
http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/

Abstract

"Though Turns Fragile:
The Impact of Urban Renewal on Everyday Life in Sulukule"

Merve Sayılganoğlu, Master's Candidate at the Atatürk Institute
for Modern Turkish History at Boğaziçi University, 2016

Assoc. Prof. Cengiz Kırlı, Thesis Advisor

Sulukule has been identified with Romani residents for centuries. An urban renewal project began in the neighborhood in 2005. The project not only transformed the social structure of Sulukule, but also highlighted the social differences and isolation of the former residents.

In this thesis, the outcome of this transformation is analyzed focusing on their exclusion. The post-project situation of the neighborhood is illuminated through studies concentrating on social exclusion and its side effects. The peculiar social structure of the Sulukule Romani community is also taken into account.

48,000 words

Özet

"Dayanıklının Kırılganlaşması:
Kentsel Yenilemenin Sulukule'nin Gündelik Hayatına Etkisi"

Merve Sayılganoğlu, Yüksek Lisans Adayı, 2016
Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü

Doç. Dr. Cengiz Kırlı, Tez Danışmanı

Sulukule yüzyıllardır içinde yaşayan Romanin sakinleriyle bilinen bir mahalledir. 2005 yılında bu mahallede bir kentsel yenileme projesi uygulanmaya başlamıştır. Mezkûr proje Sulukule'de sosyal bir dönüşümün yaşanmasına sebep olmuştur. Aynı zamanda mahalle sakinleri arasında halihazırda var olan sosyal farklılıklar ile Sulukule'nin dışlanmış pozisyonunu daha belirgin hale getirmiştir.

Bu tez, Sulukule'nin yaşadığı dönüşümün sonuçlarını mahalle sakinlerinin dışlanmış pozisyonunu merkeze alarak açıklamay hedeflemektedir. Bu minvalde, proje sonrası dönemi anlamak amacıyla sosyal dışlanmışlık ve türevleri üzerine oluşturulmuş olan çalışmalar göz önünde bulundurulmuş, Sulukule'nin durumu mevcut çalışmalar bağlamında irdelenmiştir. Bu esnada Sulukule'nin özgün toplumsal yapısına da vurgu yapılmıştır.

48.000 kelime

To my Dad
and Alice…

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements *viii*

1 INTRODUCTION 1

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK 7

2.1 Eternal Vulgarity 10
2.2 Pure and Polluted: Connotations and Origins 16
2.3 Warm Circle of the Dirt: Communal Practices in a Stratified Society 24
2.4 Ethnicity as a Burden: Exclusion from Social Space & Citizenship 35
2.5 Romani Settlements, Stigmas, & Strategies to Deal with Exclusion 50

3 CLASS 59

3.1 Literature Review 59
3.2 Method of the Study 64
3.3 Ethnic Identity as a Stigma 65
3.4 Reflections of Exclusion on Class Structure 67
3.5 Originality 69
3.6 Class: Romani, Gypsy or the Rejection of Both 77

4 THE LEGAL SUBVERSION 84

4.1 Urban Renewal or Gentrification 85
4.2 Day-to-day Life Style as Romani Way of Life 87
4.3 Houses with Courtyard vs. TOKİ 94
4.4 Collapse 102
4.5 Gentrification or Subversion 108

5 CONCLUSION 117

APPENDICES

A Fieldwork Questionnaire 126
B Görüşme Formu 132

BIBLIOGRAPHY 138

Acknowledgements

I would first like to thank my thesis advisor Assoc. Prof. Cengiz Kırlı of the Atatürk Institute of Modern History at Boğaziçi University. He consistently allowed this paper to be my own work, but steered me in the right direction whenever he thought I needed it. His critical insights and help were crucial for this dissertation.

Likewise, I would like to thank Jonathan Philips who was involved in the editing for this research project. Without his participation and input, this project could not be realized.

I would also like to acknowledge the help of my family for their kindness and patience throughout this project, Ömer Sayılganoğlu for his menthorship, Ebru Başer for her moral support and prayers. Without Adem Seneman' s assistance in the format and Rıdvan Demir' s insights about legal dimension of this project, this dissertation would be less convincing. I would also like to extend my gratitude to my co-workers and my previous boss Emir Ulucak for their support and understanding as well as Esra Alpay for hosting me in Istanbul with her affectionate friendship.

Lastly, I would like to thank Berna Ergün for her motivation and Mutlu Dursun for all the support throughout this project. I would like to thank Kerem Yıldırım for showing me that some dreams can be true. Without him, this dissertation would not be realized and world would not be such a beautiful place

NOTE: The in-house editor of the Atatürk Institute has made recommendations with regard to the format, grammar, spelling, usage, and syntax of this thesis in compliance with professional, ethical standards for the editing of student, academic work.

1

Introduction

An urban renewal project was declared in 2005 for the historical Romani settlement in Sulukule. It was at the time that the governing Justice and Development Party had started announcing social inclusion politics to eliminate exclusionary practices against ethnic groups such as Kurdish society and Romani communities in Turkey. On paper the urban renewal was targeted at making better life conditions for the Romani people. Bureaucratic steps misdirected the goals of the project, and accordingly, the Romani society of Sulukule suffered even harder situations in addition to the burden of their ethnicity. This thesis analyzes the impact of the urban renewal project on everyday life in Sulukule. While analyzing the research question, it was realized that it is impossible to see the transformation of everyday life without analyzing the specific ethnic identification in the neighborhood. Therefore, the unique ethnic identification of the people of Sulukule will also be problematized.

After the urban renewal project, Sulukule experienced transformation of its residents' social relations and economic activities. In this thesis, dimensions and features of this transformation will be analyzed with respect to social relations within Sulukule's Romani community. The urban renewal project had a negative impact on everyday life in the community. Most Sulukule residents were Romani in 2005, and the whole Roma society experience social exclusion everywhere in the world. When subject of Sulukule project is considered, their position of exclusion should also be included in the analysis to clearly see the consequences of. To understand people of Sulukule position

with respect to social exclusion literature, the second chapter provides a conceptual framework referencing stigmatization, marginalization, and underclasses derived from ethnic exclusion. The aim is to underscore the peculiarity of the ethnic identification in Sulukule, which is strongly related to the neighborhood's ethnic exclusion. In this manner, I will discuss how the social stigma attributed to a group of people constantly affects their self-identification of their ethnicity in ways that can endure for centuries, but also results in a closed community structure.

Exclusion policies related to ethnic stigma are usually practiced due to specific historical or social events. The event could be framed in a transformative or immediate form. The unique aspect of Romani exclusion is that there is no particular historical event or set of events to explain their stigmatization. The only argument that is that they are incompatible with pre-existant social structures. In that respect, the generation of social and cultural frames in society are needed to grasp the issue. In chapter 2, it is referred to Douglas's arguments on pure and impure spaces in the society to grasp the meaning of "purity and perception of danger" in society. Douglas's theory helps us understand the place of excluded people in a society with the analogy of impurity. She analyzes the formation of social taboos by asking in what ways taboos exist in societies and explains the detection of pure and impure spaces. Society's consciousness of impurity becomes concrete especially in the case of excluded groups. They live in segregated spaces, are discriminated against in labor market, and are excluded from public services. The excluded position of Roma in every social context throughout the world proves that Roma society's way of living are placed in impure space. Most of the time, there is a rigid separation between Romani groups' living spaces and those of the rest of society. The rigidness limits Roma participation in external society. The "mainstream" society's consent to interact with Romani individuals is contingent on Romani subjects masquerading in public space, concealing their cultural ethnic codes. In other words, major societies categorically refuse Romanis' ethnic identiy.

Taboo groups are identified with undesirable symbols. Pure images, on the other hand, symbolize holiness. Thus, pure agents and spaces are protected, while impure segments are forced to survive at the margins of society. The segregation of living space is a natural outcome of impure stigmatization. Groups forced to live at the margins generate a unique social structure in their

communities. Through this peculiarity, they become closed, and the social gap between the closed community and the rest of the society becomes larger, reproducing attached stigmas.

These places can be located in satellite cities, but it is not necessary. They can also be in or near the city centers. However, irrespective of the distance of their location, most of the time these places symbolize the margins of the society. For example, black ghettos in the United States or Muslim *banlieue*s in France are located in the centers; but the residents of these places usually become alienated from their host communities and their identity becomes stigmatized, as well, so that they transform into marginalized groups. At the margins, a new set of social and cultural codes is constituted according to the unique aspects of the excluded group, and in the end, they become a closed community. To see the social and cultural codes embedded in the social structure of closed communities, Bauman's arguments explaining the dimensions of in-community structure is given in chapter 2. Due to his explanations of the features of closed communities, survival strategies and economic relations of stigmatized groups in the public arenas can be better conceived. Romani groups construct their closed communities according to their distinctive value system. In this sense, decoding the process by which it is generated on an abstract level helps to grasp the reasons behind their exclusion.

The ethnic exclusion of Romani community is derived from their unique way of living rather than their rejection of the host population's ethnic identity. In other words, their exclusion problem is neither solved through education in the native language nor through self-governance or self-determination processes; rather, the host populations' acknowledgement of their life style is a pragmatic survival tool. Moreover, most of Roma populations in Turkey live at a subsistence level since their labor power is discordant with the labor structure of existing markets, a fact which compels them to hang onto the traditional, historical business lines of their community. Any generally accepted social exclusion theory is inadequate to explain the Romanis' excluded position. Poverty or insufficient education are common results of exclusion, meaning that if the deprivation is eliminated, the position of exclusion will diminish accordingly. However, in Roma society, the alleviation of deprivation is not enough: their way of living is unsalted to existing reproduction processes.

Therefore, a compliation of approaches to the concepts of exclusion and stigmatization will be presented in relation to Romanis' situation.

Although people of Sulukule experience exclusion due to their 'gypsy' identity, they are better off compared to other Romani communities due to the fact that the rest of society has a perception of authenticity and entertainment with respect to Romani residents of Sulukule. Even so, their relatively better situation does not mitigate their exclusion. Four main objectives of this thesis are through the case of Sulukule: (1) how a particular group of people becomes excluded in a given social structure due to inherited features (2) how they develop strategies to get rid themselves of the ill effects of their outcast position, (3) how the relatively better situation of a particular community within an excluded society affects the construction of community's value system and social structure, and (4) in what ways the destruction transforms the social structure within the Romani community. To see in how Romani society broadly experiences social exclusion and its derivatives, such as stigmatization, discrimination, and segregation, explanations of social exclusion will be given in Chapter 2. To this end, Byrne's, Silver's, and Mingione's explanations of social exclusion are presented to broadly understand how social exclusion is mandated against symbolically "impure" communities. Because studies concentrate on the social policy dimension, it will be possible to understand why the Romani community as a whole is incompatible with the social policy perspective. Although this thesis does not delve into the social policy dimension of exclusion, Romani community's incompatibility with the current social policies can also be inferred from such a broader framework.

When the Roma's situation is considered, it will be seen that Roma's agents experience social exclusion to a great extent with all its side effects. Therefore, it is benefited from Wacquant's framework of segregated spaces, since his explanations cover both segregated spaces and the external society's conduct when interaction is needed with these separated spaces. Likewise, Bourdieu's framework of the social construction of segregated spaces is beneficial to understand how Sulukule constructs its cultural and social capital inside of the neighborhood. In addition, studies that concentrate on how Romani society in particular is exposed to exclusionary practices through segregation, discrimination, and stigmatization is explained in chapter 2. Özateşler's framework of "gypsy" stigmatization and Ladanyi's study of the

patterns by which Romani society experiences exclusion will be analyzed. Because most of these studies are influenced by Barth's 1969 study on the procedures of ethnic boundary making, his study is also revisited. Occasionally, the relevant materials are projected onto the empirical findings in the third and fourth chapters.

Sulukule is an important case to observe what I will define as a "gypsy" stigma. In addition, it is a crucial case for scrutinizing how a group that is discriminated against constructs a space for living according to their value system. When I entered the field to collect data for my research, I realized that Romani society has been confronted by exclusionary practices since the earliest days of gypsy settlement in Anatolia; the "earliest day" is a malleable concept outside of space and time for Romani society. This means that neither the practitioner nor the agent subject to exclusionary practices knows the reasons for their stigmatization. The reasons given in the fieldwork consist of biases based on hearsay and myths. However, the myths have a concrete effect on reality. Their ethnic identity is a burden for their survival, and according to them, any struggle they experience probably derives from their ethnic stigmatization. Thus, they generated a sui generis life style that cannot be adapted to urban part of Turkey. Therefore, my thesis is organized around two main arguments: First of all, because of the stigma attached to the Romani community, the Sulukule community became an underclass, which reflects itself on ethnic identification of individuals. Individuals in Sulukule identifies their ethnicity correlated with their economic capital. To elaborate, in the first empirical chapter I discuss why political authorities targeted the Sulukule neighborhood for an urban renewal project, and why former residents thought they experienced discrimination due to their ethnicity. The findings of the fieldwork, conducted to analyze the main objectives of this thesis, are presented in the third and fourth chapters. These chapters are based on the two main arguments regarding peculiar self-identification of ethnicity and the impact of urban renewal. The main purpose of the fieldwork was to analyze the relationship between the neighborhood structure and everyday life in Sulukule. However, the fieldwork results show that this is impossible without mentioning the distinctive ethnic identification of the community and relating this to theoretical accounts about exclusion. The exclusion of residents resulted in an

original neighborhood structure. Therefore, the first empirical chapter was designed to introduce that distinctive way of self-identification on ethnicity, whereas chapter 4 focuses on the impact of urban renewal on the everyday life. For this reason, I concentrate on the issue from another dimension and explain what is supposed to change in the Sulukule community after the renewal project in chapter 4. To this end, I touch on the hidden and obvious aims of the project and try to discover its consequences. My argument is that the indigenous life style of the Sulukule Romani community harmonized with the pre-gentrification neighborhood structure, which is destroyed by the renewal project. I concurrently highlight the importance of the neighborhood structure for the survival of the ways of living that were peculiar to people of Sulukule.

This thesis puts the excluded social position of Romani society at the center of both empirical chapters. It seems that because of the socially excluded position of Romani society, they experienced the contagions of urban transformation more sharply. It should be mentioned that Romani society experiences the results of stigmas much more than the others excluded due to their ethnic identity. The "Roma" stigma has made them a social taboo. A taboo social position refers to an attitude against a groupmembers should be avoided in everyday interaction, as opposed to merely attributing them a secondary social position as other excluded groups generally experience. In other words, Romani society struggle with inflexible social conditions while interacting in everyday life as a result of their taboo social position. Thus, they do not experience upward mobility.

All in all, to analyze the impact of an urban renewal project on everyday life in Sulukule, an examination of the neighborhood's former social structure is vital. Moreover, it is observed that the people of Sulukule who comprise the subjects of this study have been exposed to exclusionary practices for centuries. Two interdependent arguments are established to answer the research question. The first is that position of exclusion results from a distinctive self-identification of ethnicity in the community. The second argument, on the other hand, is that the social structure within the community has an important relation to the neighborhood structure. The urban renewal project thus has a subversive effect on the codes of everyday life in Sulukule.

2

Theoretical Framework

In this chapter, a broad explanation of social exclusion with its side effects such as stigmatization, discrimination, and social segregation is presented. The purpose is to present an extensive background on social exclusion. The projection of social exclusion cannot be understood without comprehending on the attitudes of both the practitioners and subjects of exclusion. In this sense, the process of generating a framework of exclusion is presented to see how and in what ways subjects of exclusion are determined in a given society. To this end, Douglas' explanations of the emergence of pure and impure spaces in society are introduced because the Roma's stigma is coherent with the contamination in the perception of mainstream society. Douglas constructs a framework to grasp how excluded subjects are stigmatized with impurity and how living spaces are segregated for the protection of pure spaces[1].

Once social space becomes segregated, excluded subjects are pushed to the margins of the society. Most of the time, they tend to organize their way of living according to their cultural codes, which are usually the source of their stigmatization. Douglas explains how these cultural codes emerge as impurity, and how mainstream society organizes their public space parallel to the concepts of purity and impurity. After this organization of space, impure subjects

1 Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (New York: Routledge, 2001), 1-5.

become excluded groups. Excluded groups live in segregated spaces and construct a peculiar social structure, which in turn transforms them to a closed community. Bauman"s arguments elucidate the principles, dimensions, and features of closed communities[2]. Because Romani society has been perceived as impure and because they usually live in closed communities, the explanations of Douglas and Bauman help to explain the emergence of Sulukule as a stigmatized, closed community. Moreover, their theories make clear the excluded position of Sulukule residents.

Following the explanations of exclusion, how exclusionary practices are executed in a given society is clarified, concentrating especially on Roma society's experiences of exclusion. Roma society experiences exclusionary practices on a different level than the other excluded communities because the roots of their exclusion are ambivalent. Therefore, existing exclusion theories do not perfectly match with the Roma's experience. For example, Mingione's explanation of social exclusion is based on poverty[3]. The Roma community experiences poverty, too; however, compensation policies are not a solution to the elimination of poverty among Roma. Likewise, Sen introduces a set of inclusionary social policies but these inclusion policies do not make sense when Romani society is considered[4]. To illustrate, a housing project designed according to the needs of the middle-class's are meaningless as long as it ignores the priorities of the Roma's way of living. For this reason, those parts of exclusion theories' relevant to the Roma context are presented in the construction of theoretical framework of exclusion.

Social exclusion is a popular concept for social scientists. It has been studied in many contexts with different approaches after the 1990's. There are approaches that focus on the reasons for social exclusion, such as class or ethnicity; others link with social exclusion segregation and discrimination. The results converge on a common point: whatever the historical or social context,

2 Zygmunt Bauman, *Community* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001), 1-10.

3 Enzo Mingione "Urban Poverty in the Advanced Industrial World: Concepts, Analysis and Debates," in *Urban Poverty and the Underclass – A Reader,* ed. Enzo Mingione (Massachusets: Blackwell Publishers, 1996), 3-40.

4 Amartya Sen, "Social Exclusion: Concepts, Application and Scrutiny," *Social Development Papers* 1 (2000).

the excluded groups experience certain deprivations, and the most important dimension of deprivation is poverty.

Since the Sulukule case has peculiar parameters, none of these explanation is perfect. First of all, because of the stigma of being "Gypsy"[5], Roma society is confronted with exclusionary practices everywhere in the world, especially when the Romani group is nomadic; therefore, the exclusion experience in Sulukule is not unique. However, because they are settled and specialize in "Romani" businesses such as performing music, they have high social status among Roma groups. Yet still, they generated a closed community due to their stigma and are isolated in the district where Sulukule located, although the district is also composed of other lower-class people. In this respect, none of the exclusion, stigmatization, and marginalization theories are able to fully explain Sulukule's position.

Moreover, since there is a lack of information about the "Gypsy" stigma, it is hard to make precise deductions about the roots of Roma society's ethnic stigma. For this reason, the only way to find the roots of their exclusion is to tease out the narration of "Gypsy" migration.

In the following part, a narrative of migration and the spread of Roma communities are presented, benefiting from the existing information on the issue. Then, a theoretical perspective revisiting conceptual explanations of the parameters of stigmas is established to grasp their roots. The framework below is composed of (1) arguments from the literature of social exclusion and its derivatives such as spatial segregation, marginalization, and stigmatization related to the Roma community in general; (2) the aforementioned concepts including- "underclass" that put the "Gypsy" society at the center; (3) the process of recognizing "Gypsy" within the concepts of purity and pollution; and lastly, (4) the structuration of close communities' social norms and values.

5 Generally, the word "gypsy" has pejorative connotations in the literature. In this study it is used to define the community except from its negative connotations notwithstanding. Romani society consists of different groups such as Romanis, Doms, or Loms. Although, most of the time "Romani" is preferred to indicate the group, but when needed to describe the group's identity, "Gypsy" is used to prevent potential ambiguities.

§ 2.1 The Eternal Vulgarity

The roots of the ethnic stigmatization of Romani society are arbitrary. It is uncertain when they were alienated from social transformation processes. Conventional narrations historicize only the migration stories of Roma society; there are plenty of them though. However, no one discusses when their ethnic identity became the bitter encumbrance with connotations of "shame", "theft", and "immodesty"[6]. The obscure origins of the Romani stigma place their stigmatized situation on an ahistorical level. As a consequence, unreasonable stories were invented about the roots of Romani stigma - stories told in Sulukule society in surprising ways. As a result, identifying oneself as "Gypsy" evokes humiliation.

Most of the time, it is not possible to give historical background about the world's Romani settlements. In terms of its history, Sulukule is believed to be the first and most widely known Romani settlement in Turkey. The recent history, on the other hand, is straightforward: Sulukule is one of the most historic settlements of Romani people, and the neighborhood can be traced back to the Byzantine era[7].

One wonders how long Romani society experienced such exclusionary practices. The answer is not simple due to the lack of the historical information, as mentioned before. Nevertheless, their migration to Anatolia can be historicized in a more concrete way on account of the dialect spoken by the immigrant groups. Most of the Byzantine scholars such as Speck claims that the term *Astingani* had been used to refer the Romani groups in the empire.[8]

---

6 These characteristics are mentioned by respondents in the course of the field work. Some scholars also use them to present how Gypsies are recognized in society. For more info, also see Judith Oakley, "Recycled (mis)representations: Gypsies, Travelers or Romani treated as objects, rarely subjects," *People, Place and Policy* 8/1 (2014): 65-85.

7 Elena Marushiakova and Vesselin Popov, *Gypsies in the Ottoman Empire: A Contribution to the History of the Balkans* (Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2001), 13-18. Adrian Marsh, "The Gypsies of Sulukule: A Thousand Years of Romani Cultural Heritage," *Sulukule Unesco Report* 2008, (2008): 18. Angus Fraser, *Avrupa Halkları Çingeneler* (Istanbul: Homer Yayınları, 2005), 47-8.

8 Marushiakova and Popov, *Gypsies in the Ottoman*, 14.

There are many legends about their inhabitation of Anatolia. The strongest argument suggests that following the Islamic invasion of India, a large group of people who spoke Domari – a dialect of the Romani language – spoken by Dom branch of Roma society- migrated to the Middle East and Asia Minor in the eigth century.[9] This argument claims that the people leaving India within the first quarter of the second millennium belonged to military caste [Kśiatriya].[10] Predicating his argument on the linguistic link between local Indian languages and the Romani dialect, Hancock demonstrates his findings:

> It is maintained that together with Urdu, Romani developed from a contact language… over a millennium ago, from a leveling of the medley of languages spoken on the battle-fields of north-western India. While the speech of those troops who remained in India subsequently normalized in the direction of the surrounding local Indian languages, those who moved away from the area and became linguistically isolated from it, experienced no such metropolitanising factor, their speech and linguistic behavior, as well as their social patterns, developing differently as a result… [R]ather than being an isolated case, language contact situations are typical in India, and [I] propose that the Domari and the Ghorbati languages, as well as others, emerged from the same type of sociolinguistic framework.[11]

The second largest group followed their ancestors in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries during the sultanate of Mahmut of Ghazni.[12] Among them, the largest group was Rom speaking people, and they migrated west-ward as

9 Ian Hancock, "The Emergence of Romani as a Koïné outside of India," in *Scholarship and the Gypsy Struggle* ed. Thomas Acton (Hertfordshire: University of the Hertfordshire Press, 2000), 9.

10 Ibid. p.1

11 Ibid.,1

12 Adrian Marsh and Elin Strand, "Reaching the Romaninlar: A Report on the Feasiblity Studies "Mapping" a Number of Roman (Gypsy) Communities in İstanbul," *International Romani Studies Network Report* (2005): 8.

mentioned before, and passing through Anatolia and taking root in the Balkans.[13] Most survived through certain crafts that are still linked to Romani groups, such as entertainment activities like making music or dancing, fortunetelling, tent making, bladesmithing, and forging.[14] Most of them had adopted the Hindu religion, but there were also a small group of Muslim Romanis. Nevertheless, all of them spoke different dialects of Romani as a mother tongue.[15]

There are many theories about their origin and their reasons for splitting from India. Although the theories vary, scholars agree that the migration was not a single movement, but waves that occurred many times between the fifth and fifteenth centuries.[16]

Even if the assertion that the largest migration wave to the region happened during the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries is true, the first document to mention Romani society in Anatolia is dated 1068: 'The Life of Saint George the Anthonite" was a biographical book, written in 1068.[17] According to this book, "many Astingiani arrived in Constantinapole from Samaria, and most of them had no permanent jobs, wandered around the city, and known with their magical skills". Moreover, *Atsìnganoi* was a derivative of the *Athìnganoi* religious sect known for its atheistic belief system, witchcraft, and fortunetelling aspects.[18]

Interestingly, the people of the Athìnganoi sect were exposed to negative stigmatization, and considered to be cursed, and slaughtered with enormous cruelty.[19] Because some members of the Roma community were earning their livelihood through witchcraft, the whole of Romani society was stigmatized; the name attributed to them had a strong connotation with a group that were thought to be cursed. However, it should be emphasized that such a condescending approach is highly deterministic; it might conceal the reality behind the Romani stigma, yet should be mentioned since some scholars claimed it

13 Ibid., 13.

14 Ibid., 8-9

15 Ibid., 10

16 Marushiakova and Popov, *Gypsies in the Ottoman,* 11.

17 Fraser, *Çingeneler,* 47-8. Marushiakova and Popov, *Gypsies in the Ottoman*, 13.

18 Fraser, *Çingeneler,* 49. Marushiakova and Popov, *Gypsies in the Ottoman,* 14.

19 Fraser, *Çingeneler*, p. 48

happened thusly. Moreover, a twelfth century Byzantine church legislator, Thedore Balsamon mentioned that those of the Atsingiani group should not be let into one's house:

> …A circular letter from the Patriarch of Constantinople, Anastasios I, dating from the first half of the fourteenth century, cautions the faithful regarding the unacceptability to the church of contacts and relationship with various snake charmers, magicians, clairvoyants, bear-trainers and such like, with a special warning against the Atsingani whom the faithful should not admit into their houses because they 'preach about devilish things'… The term 'Atsingani' is used as an unsult in two Byzantine satirical poems from the fourteenth century.[20]

Although their position would be supposed to be better in the Ottoman Empire with its millet system, documents show the opposite. First of all, the social system of the Empire was designed according to people's religion - the privileged, true believers (Muslims), and the others. The law about gypsies (Kanunname-i Kibtiyan-i vilayet-i Rumili) which was proclaimed by Suleiman the Magnificent, Romanis were included in neither of these communities.[21] In other words, Romani society had a special position in the Ottoman Empire. In the law, which also organizes their taxpayer situation, there is a phrase about the "loose women" from among gypsies.[22] This does not mean that the whole of workers in that sector were from the Romani society; however, their separate regulation is interesting. According to this regulation, Gypsies whose wives were engaged in "unlawful occupations" (i.e. prostitution) had to pay more taxes. It can be inferred from the law that most of the occupations of Romani individuals were "dirty" and most of these jobs were categorized as illegal. The jobs were varied and unskilled. If their daily income was deficient, then most of them rounded off the day by begging.[23]

Another critical issue about their position of being discriminated against can be understood from censuses. The censuses in the Ottoman Empire were

20 Marushiakova and Popov, *Gypsies in the Ottoman*, 15.

21 Ibid., 32-33.

22 Ibid., 45.

23 Ibid., 44

conducted in a purposive manner; the state ordered censuses to collect data about the potential for armament and to detect taxpayers. The religion to which groups were attached was important since the military ranks were long composed of only Muslim soldiers. In records from 1831, the distribution of religions among subjects were defined as Muslim, Christian, Gypsy, Judaist, and Armenian.[24] Moreover, the Ottoman administration conducted a census in 1878 just two years after the declaration of the first constitutional monarchy. In this census, the population was separated into Muslims, Christians, Judaists, and Gypsies and nomads; the last group was neither taxed nor recruited for military service.[25] Still, the Ottoman Empire did not view Gypsy society as entirely distinct from Muslims since there are also examples where they were included among Muslim society.[26]

Sometimes they were included neither in Muslim nor any other society, despite the Ottoman Empire's peculiar millet system. The gypsies were distinguished through ethnicity.[27] Although they were treated differently, the Gypsies were able to protect many of their ethnic, cultural features under the Ottoman Empire. Yet, there were many cases when they were sold into slavery.[28]

Actually, their excluded – indeed estranged – position was not unique to the Ottoman Empire. In the Western part of Europe, discriminatory politics against Romani had risen to a crescendo.[29] In the age of nation states, their excluded position transformed into a medium of alienation; they were seen as a society that were to be domesticized, and scholars focused on examining their ways of life from ethnographic perspective. While doing this, most positioned themselves at a level superior to the Romani society: Romani groups were a people to be "tamed". This led a misreading of the Romani life style. Their approach to the Romani way of life was mostly condescending, and most

24 Kemal. H. Karpat, *Osmanlı Nüfusu 1830-1914* (Istanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2010), 72.

25 Ibid., 72.

26 For more information see K.H. Karpat, *Osmanlı Nüfusu*.

27 Marushiakova and Popov, *Gypsies in the Ottoman*, 47.

28 Marushiakova and Popov, *Gypsies in the Ottoman,* 47.

29 Michael Stewart, "The Puzzle of Romani Persistence: Group Identity without a Nation" in *Romani Culture and Gypsy Identity* eds. Thomas Acton and Gary Mundy (Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press, 1999), 84-99.

of them were about the lexicon of Romani language. For example, during twentieth century scholars such as Doris Duncan, Adriano Colocci, Konrad Bercovici, and novelists such as Virginia Woolf produced material that helped reproduce of the marginalization of the Romani way of life.[30] These kinds of studies targeted the Romani language and remarked on the lack of certain words such as "duty", "possession", "responsibility", "truth", "read", "write", "time", "danger", "warmth", "quiet", and "beauty". Among those studies, two clearly claimed that the lack of such words was because in the culture carried by that language lacked such concepts, while the rest made the same argument in a veiled manner. For instance, in his novel *Being a Green Mother*, Piers Anthony portrayed Gypsy subjects with biased and insignificant peculiarities while indicating the Romani characters:

> …the Gypsy language had no words for what in her own were rendered as "duty" or "possession". This was because these concepts were foreign to the Gypsy nature.[31]

A similar stance was seen in Roger Moreau's work, *The Rom,* which claimed:

> One thing the Romani chib never acquired, though, was a future tense. Maybe this was a reflection of their attitude to life?... Neither is there the verb to have or a word for possession in Romanines, which I suppose makes sense if you don't happen to own anything.[32]

On the other hand, Hancock's study on the Romani language and proves that the claimed to be lacking words indeed exist in the Romani language, with their original form.[33]

Erroneous research based on misrecognition and fed by constructed biases led to the reproduction of the marginalized position of the Romani people

30 Ian Hancock, "Duty and Beauty, Possession and Truth: Lexical Impoverishment as Control" (Eds. T. Acton & G. Mundy), *Romani Culture and Gypsy Identity*, University of Hertfordshire Press, Hertfordshire 1999, pp. 183-4.

31 Pierce Anhony, *Being a Green Mother* (New York: Del Rey Books, 1988), 39, quoted in Hancock, *Duty and Beauty*, 185.

32 Roger Moreau, *The Rom: Walking in the Paths of the Gypsies* (Toronto: Key Porter, 1995), 127-8, quoted in Hancock, *Duty and Beauty*, 185.

33 Hancock, *Duty and Beauty,* 186.

in the mainstream society. Obviously, there situation was puzzling in the eyes of the western society. However, the duplication of their obscure image pushed them to the margins of the society, reproducing their ambiguous circumstances.

At this point, one can ask about the society's tendency to marginalize this group of people. Due to a lack of information, how and why from the time of their migration Roma society was determined to be outside the general, which is to say, modernized – societal pattern is not clear. Nevertheless, by analyzing society's creation of taboos, it is possible to make deductions about Gypsies' peculiar position of social exclusion. Therefore, in the following section, the construction of social taboos as well as the structuring of the strict separation between impure and pure is questioned. For this, the formation and procedures of social taboos, as well as the tendency to view certain social beings as "polluting organisms" are explored more deeply. While doing this, my aim is to explain the extreme position of exclusion peculiar to Romani society due to biases and rote premises that are defiled. Here, it should be underscored that studies on taboos and uncleanliness do not generally target Romani society, but it is possible to locate Romani people in the procedures of tabooing practices.

§ 2.2 Pure and Polluted: Connotations and Origins – M. Douglas' Conceptualization of Pure and Impure

The essence in the work of Mary Douglas *"Purity and Danger"* lies in the presupposition of the operability of ideas of contamination in the society. The first is an observable, instrumental feature: the intervening potential of superior groups on the behaviors of those not included in their social order. The second one is expressive: activated in the effort to control "others'" behaviors.[34] The "social order" refers to a phenomenon formed with the basic motivation to protect its members from the danger. She points to beliefs as they "reinforce social pressures: all the powers of the universe are called in to guarantee an

34 Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (New York: Routledge, 1966 -2001-), 1.

old man's dying wish, a mother's dignity, the rights of the weak and innocence."[35]

Society legitimates political powers in a belief system[36] – or at least in an effort to base their actions on the faith codes of the society. Moreover, the reasons ascribed to the "ideal order" lie behind the idealization of "danger"[37] – the signification of the enculturation of the ideal order and the areas to be abstained are vulnerable to idealization by the political actors. Actors may change, but from the beginning, effective practices at the end of an accrued political agenda generally remain the same. They need a foundation that is not only fearsome, but also demonstrates a cache of sanctity.

The instruments, used to conceal misleading by political actors can be called as "dangers." In other words, people – especially politicians – explain their deficiencies and faults by the means of socially stigmatizing others. Thus the idea of contamination "appears as a symbolic response in the social order."[38] In the symbolic meaning framework of society, if the borders of the pure zone are not defended, the indignation of the sacred agent is directed towards the people; therefore, there is a tendency to detect anomic fragments in the social to guard the border of the safe zone. For this reason, society's symbolic reaction to disorders is more critical than straightforward situation. As a result, contaminating factors are pushed to the margins of society.

Pure zones and polluted areas are shaped according to articulated cultural motives. These motives are changeable in different eras. Therefore, it is impossible to precisely conceptualize the appearance of purity and impurity; they are timeless.[39] Nevertheless, reaction against pollution or impurity is a continuous process, as are the responses to anomic fragments. Contaminated elements result in a level of anxiety in society; through this anxiety, members of the society tend to suppress their causes and avoid them in the pure zones. Douglas stresses the propensity of the border–making process as:

35 Ibid., 2
36 Ibid., 2
37 Ibid., 3
38 Ibid., 5
39 Ibid., 6

> The … impulse to impose order which brings them into existence can be supposed to be continually modifying or enriching them… For when I argue that the reaction to dirt is continuous with other reactions to ambiguity or anomaly, I am not reviving the nineteenth century hypothesis of fear in another guise. Ideas about contagion can certainly be traced to reaction to anomaly… And they are more than the discomfiture of the aquarium stickleback with an anomalous member of his species. The initial recognition of anomaly leads to anxiety and from there to suppression or avoidance; so far, so good. But we must look for a more energetic organising principle to do justice to the elaborate cosmologies which pollution symbols reveal.[40]

The polluted parts cannot be thought of separately. In other words, whenever individuals are confronted with the elements of the polluting community, they react as if the individual represented the whole of polluters. Moreover, due to the fact that smearing practices do not happen immediately, it is impossible to notice the procedures by which dirt is formed. In this sense, a historical perspective of the Romani stigma cannot be given; in an uncertain historical context, their "Gypsy" identity was associated with contamination, and it was probably because their distinctive way of life is incompatible with the mainstream social order. Later on, the mainstream society has tended to segregate their public and private spaces so as not to lose the symbolic meanings of holiness in their spaces by eliminating impure factors from the living space.

Durkheim problematizes the function of belief systems in society and mentions that religions – or belief systems in general – emerged as a set of rules and conventions to please god(s) or alleviate their anger.[41] In this manner, belief systems did not appear for the protection of spirits, but to protect the societal order; shared norms and values are vital for the sustainability of that order as well as for collective consciousness. He believes that the most important function of religions is their power to separate the pure and impure, and emphasizing that the pure is surrounded the prohibitions. The precious

40 Ibid., 4

41 Emile Durkheim, *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life* (Mineola-New York: Dover Publications, 2008), 129.

societal order is harmed whenever the fringes are violated.[42] Consequently, the social space is defined according to its "position to other sites," whether above, below, or in between the pure zones and polluted areas.[43]

To this end, the perception of "dirt" is outside time and space; the details may change, but the formation of dirt remains the same. This formation is related to the conceptualization structure of individuals:

> …[O]ur pollution behaviour is the reaction which condemns any object or idea likely to confuse or contradict cherished classifications
>
> We should now force ourselves to focus on dirt… [I]t appears as a residual category, rejected from our normal scheme of classifications… For it seems that whatever we perceive is organised into patterns for which we, the perceivers, are largely responsible… It is generally agreed that all our impressions are schematically determined from the start… In perceiving we are building, taking some cues and rejecting others. The most acceptable cues are those which fit most easily into the pattern that is being built up… As time goes on and experiences pile up, we make a greater and greater investment in our system of labels. So a conservative bias is built in. It gives us confidence… Uncomfortable facts which refuse to be fitted in, we find ourselves ignoring or distorting so that they do not disturb these established assumptions.[44]

Referring to these schemas, value judgment criteria are standardized and the whole agenda presents the culture of a specific society. The categorization of those criteria set a pre-existing condition. The categories internalized by the culture have authority in the public space. By means of its authority, categories strengthen their position in the social order. Personal acceptance is possible; however, since cultural categories are public issues, they resist immediate change by nature. Another tendency is to evade anomic or abnormal elements in the society: to ignore their existence or to accept them but condemn them

42 Ibid., 132-136.

43 Pierre Bourdieu, "Site Effects" in *The Weight of the World* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), 124.

44 Ibid., 37-38.

for constituting a new reality pattern in which anomic or abnormal issues are included. In this context, economically mobilized people within Romani society reject organic ties to the community, but see no harm in re-naming their ethnic identity. This tendency could be associated with the symbolic connotation of the word "Roma" with respect to societal apprehension. Symbolic expression in everyday communication makes it easier to focus on spaces that can be defined as pure or polluted. Therefore, people tend to maintain rituals in their everyday interactions because ritualism preserves desirable themes while excluding unwelcomed matters.[45] This is why Durkheim claims that religious rituals are effective for constituting social experiences as well as controlling unpleasantries.[46] Moreover, rituals do not only to limit safe and polluted spaces according to a religious perspective; but they also symbolize shared consciousness in the social order. Therefore, the symbols implicit in the social codes –i.e. social norms and values – are most obvious in the limits of rituals.

Modern society has plenty of space for the presentation of symbolic values in action; most of them are linked with the impulse to escape pollution as well with anxiety about danger. Pollution becomes and issue when it is about to create social disgrace: on the threshold of endangering the social esthetic, hygiene, or cultivation. The immediate reaction to the matter of pollution usually appears as social sanctions like gossiping, insulting, or excluding through discrimination. In this context, people that are repressed at the margins of society are referred to as rootless due to their inability or refusal to attach to the patterns of the given society. Their social status is undefined even though their behavior is within the borders of the moral standards of mainstream society. Moreover, society's inclusion strategies are usually formed on the basis of assimilation. In other words, marginalized people can be included on the condition that they re-generate their way of living.

In the social context, troubles come from transforming situations because transformation is not a precise situation, but open to ambiguities. Therefore, the transforming societies are vulnerable to dangers.[47] Forms, shapes, and

45 Ibid., 48-52.

46 Durkheim, *Religous Life,* 223.

47 Ibid., 99.

styles have power. While disregarding the unique authority of margins and the ambiguity of margins, it is hard to determine contaminated space. Society's manner of detecting the borders of dirt becomes visible in the way it attributes control mechanisms in the social system. More clearly, positions of authorities in the social system are equipped (and granted) spirituality. They tend to be pacifist actors in order not to irritate spiritual powers posited between the layers. On the other hand, uncertain, unstructured spaces deliver unconscious powers, and society duly labels the uncertainty as the space of pollution. For this reason, ones whose status is preserved on the ground of ambiguity or uncertainty are claimed to be "witches": the uncertain has always symbolized danger and, accordingly, pollution among the general society[48]. The characterization of Romani society in modern society makes sense because their way of life diverges from modern city life. They are seen as authentic in a dual way. At the first glance, they are associated with impurity and danger: shameless people among whom pickpocketing or kidnapping are presumed to be the norm.[49] On the other hand, their original life style is thought of as authentic and makes them the main theme of many movie pictures. Such attributions and suspicions push Roma society to the margins of the social order. This is because the perception of social pollution represents itself in different manners. As implied earlier, people tend to protect the borders of their pure spaces: the factors thought of as dangerous jeopardize the borders in one way or another. The violation of the borders or the mingling of sanitized spaces with impure subjects awakens people's protective motives drives.[50] In other words, society tends to protect their social life, residential areas, or work places – i.e. the spaces of their structured social system in general – from people that are stigmatized as impure. Furthermore, once a specific group is stigmatized as polluted, there are many constraints on the removal of the stigma.

Modern society codifies dirty jobs with lower classes, and lower classes are usually composed of minority groups identified by their ethnicities. The groups perceived as dirtiest survive in the worst conditions and are thought to be responsible for the dirtiest jobs. Dirt should not be thought of only on a

48 Ibid., 99-101.

49 See also Oakley, *Recycled (Mis)representations*.

50 Douglas, Purity and Danger, 115-129.

materialistic level. Dirty jobs symbolize those that the majority of people in society are unwilling to perform. The understanding of dirty jobs changes in different social contexts. Most of the time they are handled by people who have no class position in the society, and survive as precarious individuals. In this sense, hawkers, cleaners, belly dancers, or pieceworkers are usually from among the lower classes. Roma society receive their shares from this preexistent social codes since they perform these types of work. Moreover, the working space of the underclass is not limited to dirty jobs since performers are usually also aware of niche areas in the job market. Some scholars claim that in different historical contexts Roma society has been vigilant in finding a niche among the host population.[51] In this respect, the states' attempt to domesticize Gypsies falsifies itself. Roma society has actually been very successful in maintaining and protecting their peculiar "way of life" by generating certain strategies compatible with marketable occupations in the social context in which they live; they adapt themselves to changing conditions in different social contexts by finding niches in the job market of a given society. This feature of Romani society can be illustrated thusly:

> …[b]lacksmiths may no longer be in demand but competitively price builders are rarely redundant; the age of the horse has gone and with it the great horse- fairs at which Gypsies excelled but the second hand car market provides new opportunities; mass-produced plastic clothes pegs have long replaced hand-made wooden ones but the housewife who no longer even has a washing line may still buy 'lucky' flowers from a Romani hawker at her doorstep or even have her fortune told. Within the feudal division of labor some Gypsies probably prospered since non-agricultural craft activities such as smithing, tanning, music-making were classified as infamous, or polluting occupations and were reserved for outcastes like the Gypsies.[52]

51 Oakley, "Recycled (Mis)representations," 66. Martin Stewart, "The Puzzle of Romani Persistence: Group Identity without a Nation" in *Romani Culture and Gypsy Identity*, eds. Thomas Acton and Gary Mundy (Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press, 1999), 84. Erdmann Doane Beynon, "The Gypsy in a Non-Gypsy Economy," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 42, No. 3 (1936): 365

52 Stewart, *Romani Persistence,* 84-5.

The reasons behind efforts to domesticize Romani society are not unique to the Romani context. The framework of social perception is structured beyond the control of individuals; in fact, its codes are instituted outside of individuals' existence. The relationship between the signifier and signified is not exempt from social codes arranged during the socialization process. Individuals exclude elements from their social context that are discordant with their customary lifestyle. Therefore, there is a strong relationship between personal concerns and social rituals – like continuous links between personal conscience and societal codes. In other words, societal codes establish personal consciousness, and these codes reshape personal conscience. They are intertwined, affect, and form one another;[53] and they come into existence both in the physical world and in the mind. In the ordering process of the social, pieces that are kept out of public space are again declared anomalous and associated with dirt, impurity, and pollution. They are removed from the reshaped social space. Nevertheless, they maintain their identity during this process. Unfortunately, anything regarded as impure is confronted with a disintegrating, decaying process in one way or another. In other words, they become garbage and start to lose their identity – since garbage is safe only if it exists without identity. In the end, it is transformed into an indistinguishable, assimilated component of society. Douglas explains the general attitude against the stigmatized and polluted:

> In the course of any imposing of order… the attitude to rejected bits and pieces goes through two stages. First they are recognisably out of place, a threat to good order, and so are regarded as objectionable and vigorously brushed away… But a long process of pulverizing, dissolving and rotting awaits any physical things that have been recognised as dirt. In the end, all identity is gone. The origin of the various bits and pieces is lost and they have entered into the mass of common rubbish. It is unpleasant to poke about in the refuse to try to recover anything, for this revives identity. So long as identity is absent, rubbish is not dangerous… Thus a cycle has been completed. Dirt was created by the differentiating activity of mind, it was a by-product of the creation of

53 Douglas, *Purity and Danger*, 130.

> order. So it started from a state of non-differentiation; all through the process of differentiating its role was to threaten the distinctions made; finally it returns to its true indiscriminable character.[54]

In this sense, the idea of pollution should not be reduced to a specific group of people or a specific period of time. Although the methods of handling pollution changes in different social and historical contexts, certain behaviors are conditioned as impure with reference to sacred spaces in the given society. Naturally, this leads stigmatized groups to differentiate themselves through their peculiar lifestyle which maintain their customs. In the end, their excluded position becomes even more visible. The stigmatized are obliged to live at the margins and to set their codes according to their cultural framework. In the following section, the generation of closed communities as well as the meanings of their encoding processes will be analyzed. Doing so provides an analytical explanation for the existence of Sulukule as a closed Romani community. In addition, the construction process of cultural codes in closed communities will better explain the impact of destruction (that is, an urban renewal project in Sulukule case) on everyday life. Z. Bauman's theoretical explanations about the formation of the closed communities will be the focus.

§ 2.3 The Warm Circle of Dirt: Communal Practices in a Stratified Society – Z. Bauman's Conceptualization of Closed Communities

What is pure and impure are made concrete according to cultural constructions within religious rituals.[55] In this sense, human relations are realized within strictly defined borders; people can change strata according to their actions, integrating with or detaching from the rest of the society.[56] In his anal-

54 Ibid., 161-2.

55 Jack J. Lennon, *Pollution and Religion in Ancient Rome* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 5.

56 A. Van Gennep, *The Rights of Passage* (Chicago: 1960), 116-145, cited in Lennon, *Pollution and Religion*, 7.

ysis on the relationship between pollution and religion in ancient Rome, Lennon claims that outsiders from the norm never totally integrate into the social system, as they threaten the social structure as a whole.[57]

Once individuals as a group are excluded from the de facto social system, they transform themselves into a community with certain peculiarities. The community's distinctive feature is an understanding shared by its members, which should not be taken as a consensus. All kinds of agreements and disagreements are defined within the framework of this understanding, and it is the place where "togetherness" starts. Bauman claims that due to this, community "remains united in spite of all separating factors."[58] All of the agreements and disagreements about the community are defined within the shared understanding .[59] In the end, a homogenized community appears, and the members belonging to. It is identified through their features specialized with the community.

Remembering the fact that the social world – whatever the subjects are – is the place of struggle for perceived and political symbols, subjects are imposed as they stand for an advantageous and favored position within their own community.[60] This means that the community provides a "warm circle" to members that are faithful to that circle, even without a logical explanation. Members behave in an ingenuous and self-evident way, but remain unaware of the warm circle that is the identification mark of their community.[61] Tönnies defined this feature as "tacit" because of its obscurity. And because com-

57 Lennon, *Pollution and Religion*, 8.

58 Zygmunt Bauman, *Community* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001), 10.

59 Ibid, 10

60 Pierre Bourdieu, *Pascalian Meditations* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000), 187 quoted in Andreas Wimmer, "Elementary Strategies of Ethnic Boundary Making," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 31/6 (2008): 1025

61 Göran Rosenberg, "The Squaring of the Warm Circle" (talk presented at conference Rethinking the Nation State, Florence, October, 1999), accessed February 12, 2008 http://www.rosenberg.se/_artiklar/bernadotte.html.

munity is tacit and natural, "it won't survive in the moment in which understanding turns self-conscious, and so loud."[62] In other words, once the warm circle's existence is called into question, the meanings of what is shared becomes objectivized and loses its peculiarity:

> Once it starts to praise its unique valour, wax lyrical about its pristine beauty and stick on nearby fences wordy manifestoes calling its members to appreciate its wonders and telling all the others to admire them or shut up – one can be sure that the community is no more. 'Spoken of' community is a contradiction in terms.[63]

The community's survival depends on the condition that it provides for the needs of its members during the course of their lives. If it loses its self-sufficiency, the legitimacy of the community is gone and it will start to disperse. The segregation between "us" and "them" is sharp: "the sameness evaporates once the communication between its insiders and the world outside becomes more intense and carries more weight than the mutual exchange of the insiders."[64] Moreover, the boundary-making process is a never-ending effort enabling the survival of distinctive social orders – and therefore community -based identities- "are after effects or by products of forever unfinished boundary drawing."[65] Although the mentality of community lost its distinctiveness, the study of identity began in such a structure. In other words, identities become more visible as an outcome of boundary-making processes.

The dilemma of modernity was realized before it was too late: modernity was liberalizing the individual on one hand, but creating insecurity on the other. Moreover, early enlightenment philosophers see communities not only as "primitive" structures for development goals, but also as masses to be tamed for use by the system. They did not avoid pejorative statements:

---

62 Ferdinand Tönnies, *Community and Society* (New York: Harper, 1963) quoted in Jonathan Murdoch, "Networking Rurality: Emergent Complexity in the Countryside," in *Handbook of Rural Studies,* ed. Paul Cloke et al. (London: SAGE Publications, 2006), 178.

63 Bauman, *Community*, 12.

64 Bauman, *Community*, 13

65 Fredrik Barth, "Introduction," in *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries,* ed. Fredrik Barth (Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1969), 10.

> Masses are lazy and unintelligent…and they are not to be convinced by argument of its inevitability; and the individuals composing them support one another in giving free rein to their indiscipline.[66]

Governing like an opressor, authority aims to eliminate the distinctive features of communities. In this respect, the goal to transform communities into masses is understandable; masses confront modern capitalism and tend to separate home from workplace, which means that producers can differentiate the sources of their livelihood from [the illusion of] "individualistic freedom". Consequently, moral and emotional about family or neighborly ties are drained. Bauman clarifies the transformation of community members into masses:

> The 'masses' were wrested out of the stiff old routine…, to be squeezed into a stiff new routine…, where their suppression could better serve the cause of the suppressors' emancipation. Old routines were no good for the purpose – they were much too autonomous, governed by their own tacit and non-negotiable logic, and much too resistant to manipulation and change since too many strings of human interaction were intertwined in every act so that to pull one many others had to be shifted or broken. The question was not so much how to make the work-shy keen to work… but how to make them ready to labour in a brand new and unfamiliar repressive setting.[67]

Modern power is related to the management of people, the establishment of rules, the ways of ordering, and the administration of obedience. In this sense, motivating factor in modern society is building -and servicing order. The modern authority repeatedly propagates "deregulation" to sustain the established social system; however, deregulation policies do not target the urbanized, middle-class dimension of modern society, but rather intend to assimilate the town. Bauman implies that only groups not strong enough to resist the policies of modern authority lose their communal identities. In other words,

66 Sigmund Freud, *The Future of an Illusion* (California: Stanford University Press, 1927), 6.

67 Bauman, *Community*, 27.

the urbanized, middle-class can evade the detrimental effects of deregulation policies.

It is possible that community members can generate a different kind of attachment to their social frame to survive in transformed levels of society because of cultural confusion in the new social order.[68] In other words, they may develop a loyalty to the skills that identify their community's codes, thereby authenticating them. Accordingly, they become even more confined to their peculiar social frame. Therefore, inclusion strategies that target the deregulation of communities through highlighting their authentic specialties put members in an even tougher social position.

Underscoring an existing community's inhibiting factors for modernization is a common tendency of modern theorists. As a concept, "modern" needs to be anticipative; to estimate probable outcomes of current practices.[69] By contrast, communalism is the philosophy of weak components due to the provisions of the community's warm circle; which is to say, it is the practical situation of constituents, who cannot act as individuals. In this sense, community means "fraternal obligation on communities to share benefits among their members, regardless of how talented or important they are."[70] Therefore, in the new heterogeneity of the modern era, members who sustain their individuality and are thus successful in developing their conditions like others of their era do not need community. As a result, the sharing principle of community in particular is not accepted in modernized societies. Furthermore, on account of liquid modernity, individuals find their level of aptitude and have continuous opportunities to develop them; no level has to be the final destination. Therefore, the concept of social justice has lost its significance. "Human rights" were gained through collective consciousness, however, individualistic advantage is the gain hoped for when human rights are the issue.[71] In this sense, collectivity again loses its importance in the presence of self-inter-

68 Ibid., 42-3

69 Ibid., 50-1.

70 Geoff Dench, *Minorities in the Open Society: Prisoners of Ambivalence* (London and New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986), 10.

71 Bauman, *Community*, 58.

est; the struggle is transferred to a fight between justice and equality. Therefore, Fraser thinks that the concept of "justice" should be redefined and redistributed as well:

> It is unjust that some individuals and groups are denied the status of full partners in social interaction simply as a consequence of institutionalized patterns of cultural value in whose construction they have not equally participated and which disparage their distinctive characteristics or the distinctive characteristics assigned to them.[72]

Moreover, individuals or groups desire to be recognized in the existed system of justice. Considering this desire in Fraser's terms, recognition should not be handled through self-realization, but rather embraced with the conceptualization of social justice in order to prevent sectarianism.[73] Moreover, the more a close community is confronted with exclusionary punishments due to their stigma, the more they tend to attach to the unwritten justice system of their own community structure.[74] When the existing social structure is observed, most struggles based on ethnicity or identity are derived from the derogation of social justice. Social justice essentially aims at the elimination of deprivation. But if there is a strong demand for recognition, then there should be deprivation so compel action.[75] In fact, the implied deprivation must be at such an intolerable level that its victims need to present their objection. In this sense, Bauman thinks that those with poor living conditions do not usually attempt to formally complain about their conditions even if the conditions are miserable, particularly if they have experienced them a long time and have naturalized to them. The deprived group does not start a rebellion to demand better life conditions; instead, they resist with immediate changes in life conditions that to which they have become accustomed.[76]As mentioned, Roma

72 Nancy Fraser, "Social Justice in the Age of Identity Politics: Redistribution, Recognition, and Participation" in *Redistribution or Recognition? – A Political-Philosophical Exchange*, eds. Nancy Fraser and Axel Honneth (New York: Verso, 2003), 29.

73 Bauman, *Community*, 77.

74 Dench, *Prisoners of Ambivalance*, 117.

75 Bauman, *Community*, 81.

76 Ibid., 81-2.

society in general have become used to their deprived life conditions as well as their lack of recognition. In fact, they use pejorative statements coined by *Gadjos*,[77] defining other Romani groups just as mainstream society does. In that sense, if a Romani group begins to claim rights with regard to social justice, then it means that there has been an immediate change in their surviving facilities.

Communal values are not the features that must be authenticated. Rather, authorities – as well as the rest of the society – reject communities because of their communal values, though community members cannot escape from them. In Dench's terms, communal values:

> …revolve around group membership from which there is in principle no escape. The involuntary aspect of this is all the sharper for minorities. Group membership is ascribed by powerful collectivities, onto weaker, with little regard for whether there is a subjective basis for the identities delineated.[78]

Communal values are naturally crystal clear to a community's members. For that reason, they are obliged to live apart at the margins of the society, and accordingly, the authority comes to recognize the region that needs to be disintegrated. The core definitions of their difference are activated during nation-building processes, since "nation building meant the pursuit of the 'one state, one nation' principle, and so ultimately the denial of ethnic diversification among the subjects."[79] The differences in dialects and convention of a certain community or local authority are denied. Instead, parochialism or standard memory rituals and narrations are tolerated.[80] However, presenting such national preconditions not only has an impact on communal groups, but also affects the mainstream social system. Dench explains the process emphasizing the involuntarily generated those bracket hypocritical loyalty to the ties granted by birth.[81] As an ideology, nationalism tends to tame the "different"

77 Gadjo: Romani individuals [or Gypsies] call non-Roma [or non-Gypsy] individuals as *Gadjo*.

78 Dench, *Prisoners of Ambivalance*, 23.

79 Bauman, *Community*, 90.

80 Ibid., 91.

81 Dench, *Prisoners of Ambivalance*, 15-6.

in order to convert or at assimilate them into the official ideology. If any resistance is confronted, the authority uses its power to criminalize those who are different; indeed, community leaders are declared terrorists. In this sense, it is understood that nationalism tries to combine all living forms into the same pattern, while communities are principally seen as potential insurgents.[82] In the ensuing process, assimilation policies start with the premise of "integrated citizenship;" but minority members lost in between due to exclusion anxiety never know…

> …[w]hether it is realistic to see themselves as free agents in society, or whether it is not better to let official ideology be damned and to congregate with other people sharing the same experience of rejection. This problem of the relative emphasis to give to personal rather than to collective action is commonplace enough. It is felt in some degree by all members of society. But it is made distinctive and more unsettling for minority individuals by the way in which it ties in for them with a second dimension of choice.[83]

Moreover, in case they agree on assimilation and leave their community, it is possible that they will be deemed suspicious in their new world. On the other hand, groups that reject assimilation instinctively establish community since they can only find shelter within the borders of their native group – despite the limitation of their freedom. In this sense, the confinement of ethnic minorities to their native group structure is the result of expropriation and the policies of the dominant against them. Moreover, groups that experience exclusionary practices have no place to survive except for their communal enclosures. In other words, ethnic minorities tend to remove their distinctiveness through living together with solid standards and staying inside borders drawn by that social order. This is nothing but a survival strategy.[84]

82 Bauman, *Community*, 92.

83 Dench, *Prisoners of Ambivalance,* 156.

84 Bauman, *Community*, 95-6.

In a globalized world, the middle class that has already become self-sufficient does not seek communal ties for security. However, people unable to survive in that same way have to take shelter in the collective way of life of a community. Weeks mentions this tendency:

> The strongest sense of community is… likely to come from those groups who find the premises of their collective existence threatened and who construct out of this a community of identity which provides a strong sense of resistance and empowerment. Seeming unable to control the social relations in which they find themselves, people shrink the world to the size of their communities and act politically on that basis. The result, too often, is an obsessive particularism as a way of embracing or coping with contingency.[85]

Globalization not only affected the security of individuals. It can be observed as a transformation, but globalization can also be said to be the downfall of private space. When the processes of this downfall are looked at in a historical perspective, it becomes obvious that degeneration of society's substructures ruin the superstructure.[86] Accordingly, an individual's operations in private come out in public space. Private space is associated with the naturalized features of the agent, whereas the agent operates according to social codes in public[87]. Thus, the natural is coded within the private, the public is associated with the culture encoded during socialization. As a result, personas presented in public and private areas transformed into different dimensions. The transformation in public and private spaces has an impact on economic institutions, and consequently, agents' sense of belonging decreases. "People's commitments increase to geographic places like nations, cities, and localities."[88] Therefore, sense of place is no longer about belonging, but rather it is about

85 Jeffrey Weeks, *Making Sexual History* (Massachusetts: Polity Press, 2000), part III.

86 Richard Sennett, *Kamusal İnsanın Çöküşü* (İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları, 2010), 126.

87 Ibid., 127-8.

88 Richard Sennett, "Growth and Failure: The New Political Economy and its Culture," in *Spaces of Culture – City, Nation, World,* ed. Mike Featherstone and Scott Lash (London: Sage Publications, 1999), 15.

eighty special sense of belonging to somewhere.[89] This also has an impact on the borders of public and private space. With regard to this confusion of public and private, Bauman claims that the modern state orders people to find dignified space through one's personalized qualifications, although with many empty promises. In other words, the state is inadequate to supply the necessary elements for the decent life of its citizens, and therefore, a sense of security in a particular space is only enabled by the community. Because community means "isolation, separation, protective walls, and guarded gates,"[90] people tend to seek asylum in the protective, safe environment of a community. As Zukin claims, social policies during the 1960s and 70s were concerned with protection reather than integration.[91] The "safe" neighborhoods in which residents eliminate their differences deemed stigmatized, polluted, or dangerous in the social context are the outcomes of such protective policies. The "safe" label is a misconception, since they were established for obligatory reasons. Ghettos or banlieu neighborhoods were the result of policies dedicated to protecting the living spaces of the middle class. Moreover, such policies delinate defensible places, while stigmatizing other kinds of neighborhoods as polluted. The residents of these places were criminalized by the public authorities.[92] The "others" who maintained communal ties were once again discriminated against according to the spaces where they lived.

A ghetto combines spatial imprisonment with social closure.[93] Bauman claims that a ghetto also exists in a homogenized line – including ethno-racial dimensions – in addition to the aforementioned particularities. In such a confined space, it is hard for residents to leave their stigmatized place without leaving behind their stigmas. The residents feel oppressed whenever they leave their criminalized (or stigmatized) living place. When they go out, they are confronted with surveillance and policing.[94] It should be mentioned again that

89 Sennett, *Kamusal İnsanın Çöküşü,* 138.

90 Bauman, *Community,* 114.

91 Sharon Zukin, *The Culture of Cities* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995), 38-9 cited in Bauman, *Community*. 114.

92 Bauman, *Community*, 115.

93 Loic Wacquant, "A Black City within the White," *Black Renaissance* Vol. 2. No. 1 (1998), 141-3.

94 Bauman, *Community*, 118-9.

the "safety" of ghettos is a misconception of both insiders and outsiders; rather, it is a result of socially-structured living conditions. The socially-structured dimension of living conditions is made to seem unimportant due to the misconception. Feeling unsafe outside is reflected by the residents of gated communities. On one hand, people feel unsafe leaving their luxurious living conditions behind the gates; on the other, escaping poverty can make people feel unsafe. In other words, conceptualizing residents' anxiety when they venture out of their living space on the basis of "safety" demonstrates the similarity of the emotional situation of rigidly different communities.[95]

In such social confinement, residents of an unsafe neighborhood automatically become excluded from the labor market and engage only with the preexistent lines of business ascribed to their community. In this respect, ghettoization also means the identification of the territory of a useless labor force; it is an organic part of a waste-disposal mechanism generated by productive forces.[96] Besides, it is a space where individuals share the stigma and public humiliation. Therefore, it is possible that individuals in the hyper ghetto may generate grudges against each other. By all means, it transforms its positive features.[97] Ghettos, the inner city, banlieus, or shantytown - whatever they are named- segregated areas have become the places where urban violence is directed at stigmatized people. The stigmas seem to be structured without reason, but individuals' different way of life stigmatizes them as polluted. In order to protect the pure places (i.e. those untouched by the "different"), neighborhoods that are stigmatized as dirty are obliged to become closed and not commingle with the rest of the society. Naturally, people generate a communal tie with their neighborhood or cling to pre-existing communal codes from their religious, ethnic, or racial backgrounds. In this context, a ghetto community should not be seen as a frame in which communal emotions peak; rather, "it is a laboratory for disintegration, anomie, and atomization."[98] Spatial outcasts

95 Ibid., 118.

96 Ibid., 120.

97 Loic Wacquant, "Decivilizing and Demonizing: The Remaking the American Ghetto," in *The Sociology of Norbert Elias,* eds. Steven Loyal and Stephen Quilley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 113.

98 Bauman, *Community*, 122.

are not only reflected along the lines of business, but along many other dimensions linked with everyday life and survival activities.

All in all, the drive to construct a closed community to maintain life compatible with cultural codes - even when it disregards physical conditions- is the result of continuous practices of exclusion by the host society. There needs to be focus on the parameters of the construction of exclusionary practices. To analyze differences in social exclusion approaches, the following section revisits theories about the concept. This makes clear the relationship between the excluded position of Romani communities and the features of their closed community.

§ 2.4 Ethnicity as a Burden: Exclusion from Social Space and Citizenship

Roma society experience exclusionary practices differently from other excluded groups. Because they are confronted with stigmatization, discrimination, marginalization, segregation at the same time, it is impossible to understand the Roma's situation with discrete argumentation about exclusion. Thus, an integrated exclusion framework is provided to explain Roma's exclusion.

2.4.1 *Spatial Segregation of the Stigmatized: The Burden Doubles*

The difference between the modern and primitive is minute. Considering that attitude toward stigmatized groups remains constant in history, it can be said that the modern is differentiated while the primitive is stationary.[99] Human beings tend to categorize themselves in particular groups by nature, and the most obvious groups are "modern" and "primitive:"

99 Douglas, *Purity and Danger,* 14.

> [H]uman groups tend to stay apart… The fact is adequately explained by the principle of ease, least effort, congeniality and pride in one's own culture.[100]

As a result of their natural inclination to separate, social categories, preconditions, and biases exist,[101] and members of social groups act according to these categories. Moreover, their dealing with the other is structured by means of these categories, which result in the reproduction of the prejudices and categories and constitute distinctive social spaces, as well.

The diversity among the social spaces of social groups is reflected in the physical world; thus, social groups as well as their members must find private sites within this reflection in accordance with their acquisitions subject to social status, economic position, or nationality. As an outcome, invisible hierarchies are established. [102] In this sense, the phenomenon of exclusion is a result of the tendency of social groups tendencies to position themselves as below or above. According to these tendencies, the naturalization processes of their customary ways of living become visible. The reasons for people's choice of physical space are linked to the features of their social space. Bourdieu explains this tendency:

> …Reified social space (that is, physically realized or objectified) appears as the distribution in physical space of different types of goods and services and also of individual agents and of physically situated groups (as units linked to a permanent site) that are endowed with greater or lesser possibilities for appropriating these goods and services (as a function of both their capital and the physical distance from these goods, which also depends on their capital). The value of different regions of reified social space is defined in this relation between the distribution of goods and services.[103]

---

100 G. Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice* (Massachusets: Addison-Wesley, 1954), 18 quoted in Juan A Perez et al., "The Taboo Against Group Contact: Hypothesis of Gypsy Ontologization," *British Journal of Social Psychology*, No: 46 (2007): 249.

101 Perez et al., "The Taboo," 49-250.

102 Bourdieu, "Site Effects," 124.

103 Ibid, 124-5.

In the end, the separation between different social groups is made concrete; the residential areas of upper classes, lower ones, and the underclass become strictly divided. Even though different groups may live close together within the same neighborhood, the borders of the social spaces are impossible to eliminate. Moreover, the marginalized residential areas become so evident that no one except the marginalized will live in these places. Advanced marginality happens in places perceived as isolated by both insiders and outsiders where the large part of society refuses to live. In this sense, territorial separation is the clearest way to observe how stigmas attributed to a specific group are reflected concretely in the physical world. "Penalized cities" as Wacquant calls them, become a permanent element of urbanity: stigmatization is practiced against residents both from below in daily interactions and from above through mass communication. Most residents of those places have already come face-to-face with social stigmas because of race, ethnicity, migration status, or poverty. This means that their stigma doubles due to their place of residential. Wacquant calls this position the "blemish of place" emphasizing the similarity of stigma of the neighborhood with stigmas due to race or ethnicity.[104] In other words, individuals from the ghetto[105] must challenge the burden

104 Loic Wacquant, "Territorial Stigmatization in the Age of Advanced Marginality," *Thesis Eleven*, No. 91 (2007): 67.

105 Ghettos' roots are based on the medieval ages. In the records, it is said that ghettos became visible in 16th century and was segregated residential areas for Jewish society in Europe. However, it is known that Jewish seclusion preexisted before the ghettoization because of Jews' peculiarity in communal organization. For example, there was a Jewish neighborhood in 13th century Cologne. In 1555, Paul IV exiled 200 Jewish people in Rome to the worst part of the city and declared that part of the city was ominous. After the Jewish ghetto's formal establishment in addition to their exile from Spain in 1492, the church tended to segregate Jewish neighborhoods. In 1480, it was prohibited for Christians to live together with Jewish people in Toledo. As a consequence, social ostracism became common and continued for a long period. And besides, Jewish ghettos were useful for the zealots who desired to slaughter Jewish society. Ghettos resulted in great isolation, but worse part was to force increasing Jewish population in a very compact area. In the earlier times ghettos were not slum areas. But eventually, they turned into slums. For example, there were 4000 people living in 190 flats in the Frankfurt ghetto. In the Rome ghetto, there were 10000 people per square kilometer. In order to worsen the bad reputation of ghettos, brothels were also established right in their borders. Police force was also another element of oppression. Nevertheless, the ancient conventions

of this stigma because social space plays a role in determining one's identity formation, social relations, and information management.[106]

The segregation of living spaces due to differences in social space leads to the limiting of social contact between segregated groups and rest of the society.[107] While the other's "otherized" position is granted, the walls between different layers in the hierarchized society become denser.[108] As a natural consequence, each social group generates their own cultural norms which makes outsiders of the rest. In other words, circumstances of spatial segregation "may create social situations which lead to the reproduction of a new cultural order,"[109] and thus a gap between the community and rest of the society is induced.

The objectification of social contradictions is not limited to physical space, as might be expected. They are reproduced through language used in everyday life, and are vulnerable to reproduction due to social categories: "The great social oppositions objectified in physical space tend to be reproduced in thought and in language as oppositions constitutive of a principle of vision and division, as categories of perception and evaluation or of mental structures."[110] That is to say, living space can be seen as a determinant of social exclusion and therefore has a negative (or positive) impact on an individual's honoring. [111] The most undesirable places are the residential quarters of the most "impure" social groups, who are also deprived of the symbolic means of social space.[112] In other words, the stigma inherent to a group becomes objectified in their places of residence. It is the point where social exclusion starts:

---

survived thanks to the thick walls of ghettos that made government surveillance difficult. For additional information, see Israel Abrahams, *Jewish Life in the Middle Ages* (London: Macmillan Company, 1919)

106 Wacquant, "Territorial Stigmatization," 67-8.

107 David Byrne, *Social Exclusion* (New York: Open University Press, 2005), 115.

108 Ibid., 117.

109 Ibid., 126.

110 Bourdieu, "Site Effects," 125.

111 Loic Wacquant, *Urban Outcasts – A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007), 67.

112 Bourdieu, "Site Effects," 127.

> The stigmatized area symbolically degrades its inhabitants, who, in return, symbolically degrade it… Bringing together on a single site a population homogeneous in its dispossession strengthens that dispossession, notably with respect to culture and cultural practices: the pressures exerted at the level of class or school or in public life by the most disadvantaged or those furthest from a "normal" existence pull everything down in a general leveling.[113]

If there is a stigmatized territory as "lawless zone" or "outlaw estate," then stigmas ease authority's judgments about the space and its residents according to law and social norms. As a result, people in the stigmatized territory become even more marginalized.[114] It is a vicious cycle: On the one hand, the stigmatized are restricted to the margins of the society. They generate cultural codes peculiar to their community. On the other, overcoming their stigmatized situation is almost impossible due to inflexible social biases. Yet still, some social groups maintain their lives alone these inflexible social borders. How is it possible? Stigmatized or marginalized people are generally associated with danger. To illustrate, whenever a Romani peddler appears in the "purified" zones, people tend to hide their belongings. They are categorically afraid of Romani beings. However, they still position themselves on the upper stratum, related to the communal understanding about the marginalized. The following sections deal with this understanding.

2.4.2 *Dimensions of Exclusion: The Given Becomes the Burden*

First the borders are set, then exclusion is practiced. First, the set borders are internalized, then, exclusion is experienced. In the border-making process, different parameters are used. Most are given identities that are resistant to change, such as ethnicity, race, gender, or religion. In the ensuing process, segregated places become the subject of social exclusion, automatically or through policy-making. Segregated places refer to the margins of a social context. People living in segregated areas are usually have no chance for upward

113 Ibid., 129.

114 Wacquant, *Urban Outcasts*, 67.

mobility. In addition, they constitute a socially "underclass." There are numerous studies investigating the situation of these places with theoretical frames such as "social exclusion," "underclass" or "marginality." Among them, the most relevant for the social context of Roma society will be revisited to give a better, more extensive understanding of the current situation of people of Sulukule.

Scholars dealing with the concepts of "social exclusion" and "underclass" can be divided into two camps: On one hand, there are scholars who rigidly define "exclusion" and "underclass." On the other, some claim that both the understanding and effects of social exclusion and the underclass vary from nation to nations.

In this context, varied explanations of social exclusion mechanisms are understandable since a paradigm means "a constellation of beliefs, values, and techniques, and so on shared by the members of a given community.'"[115] Besides, the situation analysis of excluded groups should not be limited to the terms "social exclusion" or "underclass" particularly since they mean different things in different political contexts.[116] Thus, explanations in the following section should not be limited to the codes of concepts. I draw from those studies of exclusion and underclass that best explain Sulukule. In the end, I will show what features the studies have in common and introduce an original paradigm of stigmatization that is dedicated to explaining Sulukule's excluded position.

Exclusion in its simplest form refers to deprivation of the necessities for survival. Silver arrays the items as "a livelihood; secure, permanent employment; earnings; property, credit, or land; housing; minimal or prevailing consumption levels; education, skills, and cultural capital; the welfare state; citizenship and legal equality; democratic participation; public goods; the nation or the dominant race; family and sociability; humanity, respect, fulfillment,

115 Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structures of Scientific Revolution* (Chicago: International Encyclopedia of Unified Science by University of Chicago Press, 1970), 175.

116 Hilary Silver, "Culture, Politics, and National Discourses of the New Urban Poverty" in *Urban Poverty and the Underclass – A Reader*, ed. Enzo Mingione, (Massachusets: Blackwell Publishers, 1996), 108.

and understanding." [117] One may be deprived of just some of the items mentioned at the above; one's excluded position may differ in different societies. However, the critical point here is that when the degree of deprivation rises to a level that it negatively affects individual's dignity, then social exclusion arises.

Although it is widely accepted that exclusion starts with a shortage of income – i.e. one switches to being poor and then experiences exclusion– how to handle the concept of "poor" is still ambiguous. For example, it is unknown how to describe people that obtain their basic needs, yet are still unable to integrated socially. Mingione underscores the elusiveness say of in defining the elements of exclusion as follows:

> It is known, for example, that the elderly have a low amount of needs when physically autonomous and well integrated in family, friendship and neighborhood networks, and, conversely, they have a high number of requirements when chronically ill, non-autonomous and socially isolated. Then there is the serious controversy over whether resources should be considered insufficient when they do not provide for anything beyond pure survival or, rather, when they do not permit integration into the community in which the poor live and nonexclusion from the same minimum opportunities and rights of the nonpoor; hence the still open debate on the concepts of absolute and relative poverty.[118]

Similarly, different countries attribute different meetings to the concept of exclusion. To illustrate, in France exclusion means "rupture of the social bond of

117 Hilary Silver, "Reconceptualizing Social Disadvantge: Three Paradigms of Social Exclusion" (Ed. Gerry Rodgers and others) *Social Exclusion: Rhetoric, Reality, Responses*, International Institute for Labour Studies, Geneva 1995 cited in Amartya Sen, *Social Exclusion: Concepts, Application and Scrutiny*, Social Development Papers No: 1, Asian Development Bank, 2000, p. 60

118 Enzo Mingione, "Urban Poverty in the Advanced Industrial World: Concepts, Analysis and Debates," in *Urban Poverty and the Underclass – A Reader*, ed. Enzo Mingione (Massachusets: Blackwell Publishers, 1996), 4.

solidarity."[119] The poverty measurement instruments of welfare capitalism only question whether poor people can survive at the minimum level; they ignore social exclusion parameters such as stigmatization, cultural bias, or discrimination.[120] Because of this lack, the concept of social exclusion was revisited in the early 1990s, such that exclusion started to refer to long-term and recurrent unemployment, as well as instability in social relations.[121] With the expansion of social exclusion and underclass studies in large cities, a new perspective on urban poverty has been generated, and at the center of these studies are the social relations of excluded groups instead of the subsistence level of low-income groups. Especially in cases of instable in social relations, exclusion means breaks in social and symbolic relations. In this sense, early twentieth century explanations of poverty-based exclusion oversimplified the experience of excluded people to mere deprivation and relative poverty. Moreover, as soon as social exclusion is explained on the basis of low income, marginalized groups become degraded since their social needs are ignored.[122] Still, poverty is an important outcome of long-term social exclusion. Moreover, changes in the population and environment create new forms of vulnerability. In this sense, the multi-dimensionality of social exclusion becomes visible; most of the time, people are deprived along many dimensions at the same time, which means, "exclusion happens at each level of society."[123] Groups that experience exclusion in many of these areas inevitably become an underclass. Most of the time, deviant groups are associated with "underclass."[124] According to many studies conducted in the United States, social attitudes among the

119 Silver, "New Urban Poverty," 109.

120 Mingione, "Urban Poverty," 8-9.

121 Silver, "New Urban Poverty," 121.

122 Mingione, "Urban Poverty," 8-14.

123 Arjan De Haan, "Social Exclusion: Enriching the Understanding of Deprivation," Studies in Social and Political Thought 2, (2000): 26.

124 Hilary Silver and S.M. Miller, "Social Exclusion-The European Approach to Social Disadvantage", *Indicators*, no. 2 (2003): 9.

underclass are not different from the middle class; yet particularly conservative groups insist on "the fact that many of the poor are individuals whose strong endorsement of mainstream values has not relieved their poverty."[125]

Nevertheless, the underclass is not seen as deviant unless they generate a cultural construction. For example, poor white, Protestant, American groups in the United States are seen neither as an underclass nor as deviant. When poverty is experienced due to ethnicity, it is confronted with spatial segregation, leading to the marginalization of segregated groups:

> Distance is not spatial or geographical, but social. The 'urban underclass,' the 'ghetto poor,' the banlieues are the Other. They are 'over there,' 'someone else's responsibility,' 'out of sight, out of mind.'[126]

The gap between excluded groups and the rest of society is not the result of differences in income level, but originates from spatial segregation constructed around cultural differences on the basis of religion, ethnicity, or race. Among them, the making of an ethnicity is a limited, finite, and often indiscriminate process: shared mentalities then manage ethnic categorization.[127] However, categorical ethnic distinction is not about deprivation of mobility, contact, or information; yet it still in exclusion and a closed incorporation, through which categories survive in spite of the fact that subjects are constantly changing.[128] In this sense, ethnic groups are social categories, and these categories are used to ascribe social status to their subjects.[129] In other words, exclusion based on ethnicity is an outcome of attachment to an existing social order; it is not because of a lack of social interaction or acceptance, but loyalty to preexistent social codes embodied in the social system. Even if the rest of the society refuses to interact with segregated groups, cultural differences survive in the borders of spaces. Barth explains:

---

125 Silver, "New Urban Poverty,". 126.

126 Ibid.,126

127 Andreas Wimmer, "Elementary Strategies of Ethnic Boundary Making," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 31: 6 (2008): 1026.

128 Barth, *Social Exclusion*, 10.

129 Herald Eidheim, "When Ethnic Identity is a Social Stigma," in *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*, ed. Frederik Barth (Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1969), 39.

> Ethnic distinctions do not depend on an absence of social interaction and acceptance, but are quite to the contrary often the very foundations on which embracing social systems are built. Interaction in such a social system does not lead to its liquidation through change and acculturation; cultural differences can persist despite inter-ethnic contact and interdependence.[130]

In this context, it is clear that ethnic boundaries are the fruits of ascribing and identification actions by society, and they are handled according idealization of pollution and purity. Acceptance of such idealized features results in a lack of understanding about everyday practices in excluded areas; it is vital to observe ethnically segregated places' ethnicity-based practices in order to understand how boundary-making processes are managed.[131] Moreover, the process of internalizing existing boundaries can be understood through the construction of majority groups on a national level. The constitution of the majority on the national level has rarely been able to successfully include all groups living in the society. Rather, it resulted in the further alienation of communities that could not be resolved in the amalgamation.

The survival of an excluded group implies the maintenance of set boundaries. Cultural factors and the cultural character of the group members that define the boundaries may change or transform – even the organizational structure of the group may change –, but the continuity of the boundary between members and outsiders indicates that focus should be on the boundary itself rather than the particular cultural differences ascribed to excluded groups. The social codes that belong to excluded spaces are automatically directed according to features inside of the boundaries. Thus, a peculiar organization of behavior is set that seems odd to outsiders. At the same time, when they venture outside of the boundaries, members of the ethnic community are judged according to shared prejudicial criteria.[132]

---

130 Barth, "Introduction," 10.

131 Frederik Barth, "Enduring and Emerging Issues in the Analysis of Ethnicity," in *The Anthropology of Ethnicity: Beyond 'Ethnic Groups and Boundaries,* eds. Hans Vermeulen and Cora Govers (Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis, 1994).

132 Barth, "Analysis of Ethnicity," 14-17.

The majority determines the sub-categories in different contexts; these sub-categories then become the minority groups, which will be the subjects of different implementations.[133] Among these sub-categories, interdependence and symbiotic connections increase when there is a complementarity between the groups. If not, ethnic identity is ignored in social relations for the survival of the interaction. Ethnic groups therefore live together in some social contexts and interact without inter-ethnic relations. Cultural differences are not derived from local-organizational contexts, but originate from preexistent codes in the social system. Pariah groups can be given as an example; they are condemned, blamed, and refused in public space, but are used for dirty jobs. In this case, polluted features attributed to each sub category are internalized and the recognized by other ethnic groups. Romani society usually survive in this kind of interaction.

Barth claims that the population that excludes them usually maintains the barriers of ethnic groups.[134] When the pariah attempts to mix with the mainstream society, the problem is reduced to throwing off the stigma by faking another identity. They know the cultural codes of the host population as well as their impure stigma. On the other hand, these kinds of paradigms treat social exclusion only at the theoretical level and prevent the self-criticism process of the host population.[135]

Moreover, inclusion strategies are generated over a background of assimilation. In other words, the host society accepts excluded minorities on the condition that they assimilate their peculiarities. Assimilation is only accomplished on the behavioral level. In other words, the members of the excluded group behave like "the others" to cross boundaries. However, behavioral or identificational assimilation is a common strategy among stigmatized communities.[136] On the other hand, excluded groups generally resist assimilating their cultural codes; they refuse to surrender these codes that are implicit to their everyday life. [137] Romani groups usually tend to adopt such a strategy to

133 Wimmer, "Ethnic Boundary Making," 1035.

134 Barth, "Introduction," 31.

135 De Haan, "Social Exclusion," 28.

136 Wimmer, "Ethnic Boundary Making," 1039.

137 De Haan, "Social Exclusion," 29.

survive according to their own social codes, and they are unconcerned about their excluded position. Most of the time, they survive at the margins of the social structure; they accept exclusion and ignore their stigmatized position. They internalize social segregation to maintain their peculiar way of living. It is common among the members of host societies that they protect their personal belongings such as purses or mobile phones when they encounter a Romani in public space. It is probably a reflex: the result of learned social codes. Most of the time, the Romani ignores, as a result of having internalized the stigma. As mentioned before, faking it in public space by assimilating themselves at a behavioral level becomes naturalized among the excluded.

Both assimilating and exclusion are dynamic processes. Whenever a group is unable to synchronize themselves with the changing structure of the society, they become excluded. Yet the process is not immediate. Byrne's argument is crucial in the sense that whenever an exclusionary practice is implemented with respect to a certain group of people, there is a way to manipulate the exclusion through mainstream discourses and legitimation.[138] This tendency may lead to the internalization of the stigma attributed to an excluded group, and they may behave accordingly. As a result, surviving at the margins of society can become a natural part of their life journey. Across generations, they may be deprived of opportunities provided to other groups. In other words, they may not be aware of their social position.

Most scholars claim that deprivation is transmitted from one generation to the next, which can be an explanation of the argument that explains the roots of social exclusion in genetic and cultural terms.[139] Some scholars call this the "culture of poverty". Likewise, Ladanyi and Szelenyi mention the term with reference to Lewis, saying that most of the time the culture of poverty is "a coping apparatus that helped the poorest of the poor living in the poorest countries to get by when key social institutions failed to provide for their livelihood."[140] They also claim that a certain group of people might experience

138 Byrne, *Social Exclusion*, 2.

139 Ibid., 133-4.

140 Janos Ladanyi and Ivan Szelenyi, *Patterns of Exclusion: Constructing Gypsy Ethnicity and the Making of an Underclass in Transitional Societies of Europe* (New York: Colombia University Press, 2006), 5.

just one dimension of the exclusion, and takes the Jews in medieval Europe as a good example. They experienced social exclusion while maintaining economic capital.[141] The position of people that experience social exclusion in multiple dimensions is explained through the concept of "underclass:"

> An underclass is constituted by persons who are likely to remain unemployed and poor for their entire life because of their lack of education and marketable skills, and whose children are likely to be locked into a similar social position, thereby becoming separated from the rest of society as the 'untouchables,' the 'undeserving poor,' or the 'no-hopers.'[142]

The components of the concept explain socially and economically excluded societies that have their own peculiar culture of solidarity. In this sense, the underclass does not refer to the whole of the Roma society; rather, it refers to Romani communities in which social isolation is coupled with marginal economic status.[143]

In this sense, marginal economic activities are a necessary element when defining "the underclass" in theoretical terms. Obviously, the marginality of their lines of business are the result of long-term exclusionary practices, yet the adaption process from a marginal to an underclass position remains ambiguity:

> What distinguishes members of the underclass from those of other economically disadvantaged groups is that their neighborhood or social milieu uniquely reinforces their marginal economic position or weak attachment to the labour force. The dual problem of marginal

141 Ibid., 11.

142 Michael Stewart, "Deprivation, the Romani, and the Underclass," in *Postsocialism: Ideals, Ideologies and Practices in Eurasia*, ed. C.M. Hann (London: Routledge, 2002), 136.

143 Gabriela Mirescu, "Introduction" in *Social Inclusion and Cultural Identity of Romani Communities in South-Eastern Europe*, ed. Gabriela Mirescu (Bern: Swisspeace, 2011), 6.

> economic position and social isolation in concentrated deprivation areas is an important distinction that cannot be captured by the standard designation 'lower class.'[144]

Consequently, scholars tend to emphasize that members of "the underclass" live at the margins of society with a distinct culture, and that these places are "the trope of disorganization and collapse of social institution." Stewart claims that such deterministic argumentation is erroneous since Romani society is able to successfully organize their way of life, but in a different way than their "respectable" neighbors.[145]

On the other hand, Ladanyi and Slezenyi maintains that "the underclass" position becomes reified when the social exclusion coincides with economic exclusion; by contrast, economic and socially included people comprise the mainstream middle class. They claim that the underclass is a category that carries particular features of class and Caste, cultural social stratification system in India. The untouchables are people belonging to the lowest social class and experiencing extreme social exclusion. Obviously, Ladanyi and Slezenyi are making an analogy to the caste system in their analysis.

> Members of this class [underclass] are typically poor people from an unprivileged ethnic group; poverty and ethnicity interact and reinforce each other. The social exclusion of the underclass is deeper and more rigid than for other groups, which are structured by the logic of class formation. In this respect, the position of the underclass is similar to that of castes… However, unlike the under-caste, members of an ethnic group are not excluded in toto [total]. The economically successful members of the ethnic minority are able to escape the ghetto. While they may be unable to fully integrate into the mainstream, they successfully distance themselves from the poor members of their own ethnic group.[146]

144 William Julius Wilson, *The Truly Disadvantaged- The Inner City, the Underclass and Public Policy* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1987), 258.

145 Stewart, "Deprivation," 140-2.

146 Ladanyi and Szelenyi, *Patterns of Exclusion*, 15.

Furthermore, this kind of structural formation of the underclass leader results in the culture of poverty. Ladanyi and Slezenyi highlight the instruments of the culture of poverty: its values and habits such as rampant unemployment, transmission of the poverty from generation to generation, and residential segregation are not the reasons of the chronic poverty, but the consequences of it.[147]

As a consequence, excluded groups come up with unconventional economic activities by withdrawing from the market economy. In addition, people become excluded because of their dissimilarity to mainstream culture. In other words, they are also confronted with cultural exclusion. According to Byrne, cultural exclusion refers to the cultural insufficiency of excluded people caused by the contrast between their consumption patterns and the characteristics of industrial city zones. [148] In this sense, cultural capital plays an important role in accessing the labor market. In its simplest form, cultural capital as a composition of cultural tastes.[149] Gough et. al. widens the term attitudes on life and work – eliminating the technical skills – and underscore that cultural capital is required in childhood in which family and the neighborhood play an important role. They also argue that cultural capital is class specific because it is inherited. This inheritance leads to instinctive solidarities among members of excluded communities.[150]

When the cultural codes are constructed with a stigma, the survival of excluded communities in the external world becomes defensive. Wacquant explains this tendency by observing the everyday communications within segregated regions. He thinks that people living in segregated areas have a strong feeling of abasement due to regional stigmatization. This feeling has consequences for social relations or everyday communications. Moreover, there is a cohesion between places of symbolic humiliation and squalidness, which means that owners of capital avoid investing in those neighborhoods.

147 Ibid., 17.

148 Byrne, *Social* Exclusion, 143.

149 Pierre Bourdieu," The Forms of Capital" in*Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, Ed. J. Richardson (New York: Greenwood, 1986).

150 Jamie Gough, Aram Eisenschitz, and Andrew McCulloch, *Spaces of Social Exclusion* (New York: Routledge, 2006), 110-1.

Wacquant stresses that because residents are permanently excluded from the capitalist labor market due to racial or ethnic stigmas, informal sectors are extensive in those places as, residents have to find a way to survive.[151]

The Romani community experiences social exclusion in multiple dimensions. Most of the time they live in segregated places, are discriminated against in labor market, and their interactions with other people in public space are stigmatized. The label of pollution is reproduced in the social structure; people of the host society avoid touching them. Therefore, the continuity of peculiar features implicit in their cultural structure is established in closed communities. Even though their neighborhoods may be in city centers, the borders are well known, such that neither the community members nor outsiders violate them. Thus the "margins" may be constructed even in the heart of the city. In the following section, the ways Roma society experiences social exclusion will be analyzed, and the survival strategies in their closed communities will be introduced.

§ 2.5 Romani Settlements, Stigmas, and Strategies to Deal with Exclusion

In general, Romani societies have always been segregated. Most of the time they are excluded from mainstream class structure. They continuously maintain their peculiarities in every state.[152] On the other hand, Romani society is not homogenized. In addition to different subgroups such as Romani, Domari, and Lomari, they settle in different localities according to their economic and social capital such as with educated Romani and poor Gypsies.[153] They maintain a socially stratified structure in-group, even though the rest of the world generalizes them as "Romani society," a tendency results in Romani groups

151 Loic Wacquant, "Ghettos and Anti Ghettos – An Anatomy of the New Urban Poverty," *Thesis Eleven* 94/1 (2008): 40-1.

152 Michael Stewart, "Romani and Gypsy "Ethnicity" as a Subject of Anthropological Inquiry," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 42 (2013): 413.

153 Christian Giordano and Andrea Boscoboinik, "The Romani: "Problemé: Ethnicisation or Social Marginalization?" in *Social Inclusion and Cultural Identity of Romani Communities in South-Eastern Europe*, ed. Mirescu (Bern: Swisspeace, 2011), 16.

being seen as "alien."[154] In fact, there is strong "us" and "them" discrimination within the group. "They" not only refers to gadjos (non-Roma people), but all the rest that have a stereotyped image. The distinction between "us" and "they" leads to judgement and value criteria of "others," emphasizing differences:

> The "other Romani" may also include the traditionalist Romani in contrast to the "modern" Romani, the poor Romani in contrast to the wealthy Romani, the Orthodox Romani in contrast to the converted Pentecostal Romani, the ordinary Romani in contrast to those who have positions, resources, or are actively engaged in NGOs or political parties .[155]

On the other hand, whatever their sub-group, the Romani neighborhood constitutes a marginalized place of the highest level in various societies. Even in their presumed origin –India – they are seen as the dirtiest part of the social scheme.[156] A subgroup of Romani society called Dom serve all other Hindus and are responsible for menial duties,[157] which implies that they are at the bottom of the social pyramid.

The neighborhoods of the Roma are assumed to be dangerous for the security and welfare of outsiders; moreover, these places are stigmatized as hotbeds of crime, deviance and informal relations. As a result of this perception, Romani neighborhoods usually suffer from infrastructural problems, insufficient housing, and ghettoization.[158] Özateşler explains this degree of exclu-

154 Stephane Laederich, "Romani Cultural Identity," in *Cultural Identities of Romani*, ed. Mirescu (Bern: Swisspeace, 2011), 22.

155 Giordano and Boscoboinik, "the Romani," 16.

156 That Gypsies' motherland is India is ambiguous. It is believed that they spread to different regions of the world in migration waves (w.n.).

157 Erdmann Doane Beynon, "The Gypsy in a Non- Gypsy Economy," *American Journal of Sociology* 42/3 (1936): 359.

158 Başak Ekim Akkan, Mehmet Baki Deniz, and Mehmet Ertan, "Sosyal Dışlanmanın Romanin Halleri," (İstabul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi - Sosyal Politika Forumu, 2011) 49.

sionary practices as exclusionary violence, which refers to the multidimensionality of violence.[159] Because of exclusionary violence, the formation of the neighborhoods is important to the Romani community, since they construct a shared identity in the neighborhood and become a close-knit community.[160]

Such a hostile reaction against Romani settlement did not occur immediately, nor is it operative on all levels of social relation in everyday life. However, whenever a conflict is experienced between the Romani and others, the Roma stigma is activated and the articulated social gap between Gypsies and non-Gypsies becomes the reason for adverse reaction. Özateşler defines this interaction between two groups as a "labeled interaction," which prevails because of the "existing hierarchized and limited relations between Romani and the rest of the local society."[161] On the other hand, since Romani communities survive in an atmosphere of uncertainly due to their day-to-day life style, protection, security, and justification of living spaces is synonyms with the protection of the community.[162]

The stigmatization of Romani neighborhoods as nests of crime adversely affects the participation of Roma in urban life outside the neighborhood. In other words, the stigmatized neighborhoods of the Romani people dissociate the community from the city; the stigma of their living spaces not only makes them permanently shunned to those living spaces, but also isolates and enlarges the gap between the Romani community and the rest of the society.[163]

All of these conditions resulted in a high rate of poverty among Romani society such that most people of Romani origin thought that Romani meant "poor." This is reflected in daily slang. Besides legends that their roots are unknown, there are also many idioms –most in adjective form - that denigrate Romani identity. "Roma" is not only a word for the ethnic roots of a particular

159 Gül Özateşler, *Gypsy Stigma and Exclusion in Turkey, 1970 – The Social Dynamics of Exclusionary Violence* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 1.

160 Udo Mischek, "Mahalle Identity – Romanin (Gypsy) Identity under Urban Conditions" in *Gypsies and the Problem of Identities,* eds. Adrian Marsh and Elin Strand (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2006), 157.

161 Özateşler, *Gypsy Stigma*, 5.

162 Akkan et al., *Sosyal Dişlanmanın Roman Halleri*. 36.

163 Özateşler, *Gypsy Stigma*, 16.

group of people. It is also used as an adjective in order to describe people who have characteristic traits such as greed, eagerness, and spitefulness. For example, in the 2000 release of Turkish dictionary of Turkish Language Association, "Romani" was defined as "A group of people that maintain nomadic lifestyles in the different parts of the world and are considered to originate from India." However, this was not the only definition: Romani was also defined as "a person who is a dark-skinned, stingy, shameless, unashamed."[164] In fact, "dark skinned citizen" had been used in official documents for years. Obviously this term is used to separate Romani from the rest of the society.

Moreover, there are many Turkish idioms that disparage Romani identity such as "Gypsy debt", "Gypsy wedding," and "Gypsy quarrel." "Gypsy debt" refers to a debt that is tripled by other debts; "Gypsy quarrel" refers to an overly violent fight; and a "Gypsy wedding" refers to something that is not managed in accordance to its appropriate form.[165] When all are taken together, it can be inferred that "Romani" – as a concept – means something undesirable and outside the normative borders of society.

The general attitude of the society towards Romani people supports this inference. To illustrate, there is an undoubtly religio-centric axiomatic argument that Romani people do not belong to any religion.[166]

The main reason that gypsies have been dragged into the slums of urban areas is an ancient stigmatization practice. Most of the time, the belief with regard to their slums is that "one should not even wander around the place."[167] In short, they are the local "untouchables." According to Özateşler, the construction of local "Romanness" is affected by perceptions, stereotypes, stigmas, and discrimination at the national level. Because there is little social interaction between gypsies and the rest of the society resulting in a huge gap

164 Mustafa Aksu, *Türkiye'de Çingene Olmak* (İstanbul: Kesit Yayınları, 2006), 36.

165 Ana Oprişan, "An Interview of the Romaninlar in Turkey" in *Gypsies,* eds. Marsh andStrand, 166.

166 Elin Strand, "Romanlar and Ethno-Religious Identity in Turkey: A Comperative Perspective," in *Gypsies*, eds. Marsh and Strand, 98-100.

167 Akkan et al., *Sosyal Dışlanmanın Roman Halleri*, 34-6.

between Gypsies and other people, the tools of stereotyping survive and recreate themselves, as well.[168] This has an impact on the Romani people's ways of earning money. As a result of strong social exclusion, they survive through informal works such as porterage, scrap dealing (*hurdacilik*), waste collecting, and fortunetelling, all of which are undesirable and hard, unsafe, and unhealthy working conditions.[169] Whether they choose to live under those conditions or are forced to maintain such lifestyle is debatable, but they were called as "working paupers" in Akkan and other's study.[170] Considering that economic activities are the most crucial determinant of social position, gypsies stand on the lowest step because of their economic activities.[171]

In most parts of the world, Romani groups are identified by their lines of business. For example, in Turkey Romani groups include *sepetçi* (blacksmith), *elekçi* (sieve-maker), or *kalaycı* (tinsmith).[172] In Sanskrit, "dom" (name of a Romani group) is a derivative of "dum", which means sound.[173] Clearly, all of their lines of business are in the informal sector, low profile, "dirty" jobs with hard conditions. They attend to such jobs due to ethnic-based social exclusion, poverty, socio-economic conditions, skills, and personal as well as communal desires.[174] Yet still, because they tend to be invisible in wider society, there is little ethnographic study about their way of life.[175] As mentioned before, they maintain their own cultural codes in every social structure that they live in. Such groups tend to take up niche business, recognizing the macro economic system. In order not to be confronted with racism or exclusion, they internalize the dominant social codes of the given society. Since they tend to be invisible, they are always moving from one place to another, and therefore they produce creative strategies for their survival. They sometimes exploit the

168 Özateşler, *Gypsy Stigma*, 4-5.

169 Akkan et al., *Sosyal Dışlanmanın Roman Halleri,* 49.

170 Ibid., 62.

171 Özateşler, *Gypsy Stigma*, 10.

172 Özateşler, *Gypsy Stigma*, 37.

173 Beynon, *Gypsy*, 360.

174 Gül Özateşler, "Gypsies in the Economy of Turkey: A Focus on Gypsy Flower Sellers in Two Central Districts of İstanbul," *New Perspectives on Turkey* 51 (Fall 2014): 133

175 Stewart, "Romani," 418.

macro society's attributions to their identity; for instance, they occupy fortunetelling or magician niche markets thanks to magician images.[176] Nevertheless, it is impossible to determine whether they choose these sectors voluntarily or if it is an obligation for their survival:

> Social exclusion interacts with the construction of Romaniness in a manner that situates Gypsies within the sector. Romaniness is established along with the profession and in just such a construction: it is Romaninticized in such a way as to demonstrate Gypsies' "natural" compatibility with an adaptation into the business. In this way, the nature of Romaniness is believed to provide a potential that would answer to the requirements of the profession. Individuals, moreover act on the idea of this nature so as to formulate their group identity, make professional choices, and achieve success in the sector. On the other hand, the social exclusion that Gypsies have historically faced becomes a structural factor influencing their level of education, socioeconomic conditions, and limited choices within the economy.[177]

According to this argument, it seems Gypsies become excluded due to non-human peculiarities attributed to them. The majority becomes superior to Romani society through animalizing the Romani groups.[178]

Although the roots of the Romani stigma are unknown, negative stereotyping has been maintained for centuries. One of the contributors to its survival is media. The misrepresentations of Romani subjects in the media have a strong impact on individuals' perceptual frames. In other words, encoding a "Romani" image on the Romani stigma makes the audience decode the messages in a discriminatory way. "Gypsies steal babies, are work-shy, and remain locked in some primitivised past, while feared as menacing invaders of others' territory."[179] Recycling such prejudices affects on the increase of the social gap between Romani populations and the restof society. For example, the bias that

176 Oakley, "Recycled (Mis)representations," 66-9.

177 Özateşler, "Gypsy Flower Sellers," 139.

178 Perez et al., "The Taboo," 251.

179 Oakley, "Recycled (Mis)representations," 65.

Romani populations live as vagabonds is incorrect; only 1% of total population continues to live as vagabonds.[180] Moreover, because of this recycling process, Romani populations cannot escape the social situation they are stuck in. Because they are discriminated against educational life, they do not obtain higher-level educations. Because they are excluded from labor market, they have to continue in niche in economies. Because the rest of the population avoids touching them in public space, they have to construct a closed community.

> Within…[a] secondary labor market and its lower class conditions, Gypsies develop their own "habitus" … Gypsies' cultural framework in relation to their class position within the Gadjo-dominated society and economy is intertwined with their Romani identity. The act and take positions of agency in the sector in accordance with their Romani identity, their socio-economic position, and the social exclusion that they face. Their lower- class position, exclusion, and limited cultural capital lead them to a poor educational background, skills less suitable for the primary labor market and limited access to formal jobs.[181]

The Romani use these categories as self-definition tools to separate themselves from the rest of society. Practices that can be interpreted as exclusionary policies have their own symbolic meanings. The Roma generate a peculiar self-identification discourse on ethnicity because they become an underclass in the society in which they live. Whenever they attempt to be assimilated to this class structure, they have to acknowledge the "underclass" label or pretend to assimilate their cultural peculiarities. They construct strong solidarity since this is necessary for the excluded community's survival in ethnic-based economies. They construct an original lifestyle, in sync with their neighborhood structure, since it is impossible to survive behind ethnic boundaries without generating strategies to implicitly protect them in everyday interactions. As mentioned initially, this thesis analyzes these points through the case of Sulukule. In the following chapter, the peculiarities of the self-identification of ethnicity in Sulukule will be examined. In the following chapter, on the other

180 Laederich, "Romani Cultural Identity," 27.

181 Özateşler, "Gypsy Flower Sellers," 140.

hand, the transformation of solidarity dynamics after the urban renewal project will be presented.

§ 2.6 Conclusion

This chapter presented a broad review of theories on social exclusion in order to scrutinize the Romani experience. First of all, the origin of excluded groups was explored. The emergence of the social framework through which groups become excluded from public space was analyzed by revisiting Douglas' argument about perceptions of the pure and impure in society. According to Douglas, the social order is constructed to legitimate exclusionary practices. Subjects of exclusion are determined by their incompatibility with preexistent codes in a given society. Incompatible groups are usually associated with impurity in the symbolic meaning structure of society. Likewise, their living spaces are usually associated with pollution. On the other hand, pure spaces are associated with holiness and hygiene. Society tends to rigidly separate pure and impure spaces. Once this separation is set, symbolically impure subjects are forced to live at the margins of society. In addition, interaction with the polluted spaces is generally avoided. Thus, the social gap between "pure" and "impure" spaces continually grows.

Because they are pushed to the margins, excluded groups usually construct a peculiar social space. The value system in this space is in sync with the cultural codes of the excluded group. The continuity of life within the borders of this system transforms the group into a closed community. To interpret the emergence of Sulukule as a close community, Bauman's approach to the closed community system was introduced. The community becomes so homogenized because of the ever-growing gap between community and the rest of the society that the individual members of a specific community are identified with the attributed features of the community. Due to these aspects, community members are easily recognized in the public space. These processes – i.e. the transformation to a closed community constructing a peculiar way of life within the community borders, and being identified with the attached stigmas– is a general pattern among Romani communities.

In the last part of this chapter, patterns of exclusion were reviewed by revisiting studies on the issue. Because Sulukule's experience of social exclusion is strongly related to its identification as impure by the host population and its excluded position cannot be explained by a specific event. The explanation of exclusion is insufficient. Likewise, because the Sulukule community has a relatively better standing among other Romani groups, exclusion studies, which focused on "Gypsy" exclusion do not reflect Sulukule's experience. Therefore, a patchwork of theories on exclusion and stigmatization were presented in relation to the Romani's situation, following from Bauman's explanations of closed communities. The members of an ethnic community are seen as outsiders in a given society since their way of living is thought incompatible with mainstream social structure, and how they experience exclusion and what kind of strategies they generate will be understood.

In the following chapters, these arguments will be supported by empirical findings from fieldwork. In the related sections, principle components of the theoretical explanations will be related to the findings of this fieldwork.

3

The Identification of Ethnicity of Underclass

This thesis has two main arguments. In this chapter, the argument that the underclass position of Sulukule resulted in a peculiar self-identification of ethnicity within the community will be analyzed. To this end, the findings from the themes of identity and urban renewal project will be used. Respondents' self-identification of ethnicity is sufficient to understand their economic class position within their community. This chapter provides a framework based on self-reported discourses about the identification of ethnicity in Romani community of Sulukule.

The survey used in the fieldwork was designed to discover identification of ethnicity within the community and the impact of the urban renewal on the everyday life of the Romani community of Sulukule. In the following section, the background of the fieldwork will be given, explaining the methodology used in its design.

§ 3.1 Literature Review

Plenty of studies have been conducted to explain Romani society's position of exclusion. Most of them concentrated on the "Gypsy" stigma and its reproduction. These studies mainly explain Romani's stigmatization by focusing on their way of life. Romani's stigmatization is conceptualized in two categories. In the first, scholars explain the roots and the emergence of the Gypsy stigma.

They concentrate on the migration narratives of Gypsy society to reveal why Roma society is discordant with the societies in which they settled. In addition, these studies analyze the myths on which Romani stigma was constructed.

On the other hand, the studies in second vein emphasize how Romani subjects experience stigmas from their excluded position within the social order. Scholars in this group describe different social and cultural orders and explain how Romani groups construct the borders of their peculiar community in a given society. The objectives of these studies derive from Romani groups' exclusion experiences and explain the emergence and operation of exclusionary practices and policies. Furthermore, the reproduction of the Romani stigma in everyday life practices and discourses is included in these studies. This section will present an interpretation of previous studies, especially those that focus on the current excluded and stigmatized position of Romani society. To this end, particularly ethnographic studies that targeted the context of Turkish Romani and conducted will be elucidated. Among them is Gül Özateşler's study of Gypsy stigmatization will be examined. Following Özateşler's conceptualization, Deniz Akkan and others' study will be introduced. Lastly, Kolukırık's and Mischek's research will be summarized.

The most important point in Özateşler's study is her conclusion about exclusionary violence, which should be understood as a "multidimensionality of attacks." Most of the studies that concentrated on ethnic exclusion ignore other parameters except for ethnicity. Özateşler not only includes ethnic stigmatization, but also exclusion, discrimination, and segregation as side effects of ethnic stigma. In her opinion, such ethnic categories as "Turkishness" or "Gypsiness" should not be taken as given identities. Rather, they should be analyzed within the context of their impact on social interaction and its evolving features, such as social constructions. The social interactions affected by stigma are vital to understand a stigmatized groups' situated-ness due to the fact that such interactions also operated within the community. These interactions sometimes erupt into violence as mechanisms for rule-making or rule-

changing.[1] Exclusionary violence against and within the community sometimes increases to the point that even the community will force the dislocation of some of their members from public space. In other words, during social crises, it is possible that a marginalized community commits violence by marginalizing its own members. As a result, the most marginal of a marginalized group are betrayed.

Another important point of Özatesler's study is the position of Gypsy stigma in Turkish society. She underscores that exclusionary practices are activated when conflicts occur between Gypsy groups and the host population. Exclusionary practices, which sometimes take the form of violent behaviors, are usually operated through stigmatizing expressions. Most of the time Gypsy groups remain obedient to protect themselves from exclusionary violence. When violence is activated, they switch among the social categories of Roma society such that they categorize the entire community as Romani or Gypsy; they adopt the identity that can protect themselves from the violence. Özateşler perceives such categories as primordial and states "the use of categories in general should be conceived as instruments in hierarchizing social relations."[2]

Due to the existence of these social categories, boundary making becomes everlasting. Özateşler concludes that boundary making emerges as a strategy of the Roma to eliminate exclusionary violence. According to her observations, there are five of strategies:

> …[T]hose that seek to establish a new boundary by expanding the range of people included; those that aim at reducing the range of the included by contracting boundaries; those that seek to change the meaning of an existing boundary by challenging the hierarchical ordering of ethnic categories; those that attempt crossing a boundary by

1 Gül Özateşler, *Gypsy Stigma and Exclusion in Turkey, 1970 – The Social Dynamics of Exclusionary Violence* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 2-5.

2 Ibid. 5-7.

> changing one's own categorical membership; those that aim to overcome ethnic boundaries by emphasizing other, crosscutting social cleavages through what I call strategies of boundary blurring.[3]

It can be inferred that switches between categories are especially likely when there is a safety dimension to a given social category.

All in all, Özateşler's contribution to the framework of Gypsy society's exclusion is that all exclusionary practices and their side effects – such as discrimination, segregation, and most importantly stigmatization –are considered according to the categorical perception of the mainstream society.

In Akkan and others' study, the experience of how categorical perceptions against stigmatized groups are experienced by the Romani is presented. The main objective of the study is to grasp different dimensions of exclusion among the Roma. To this end, Akkan and her team conduct research in various Romani neighborhoods. According to their findings, Romani exclusion is strongly corelated with spatial stigmatization, and exclusion is operated categorically in the context of ethnic identity. Moreover, although in some cases Romani adopt the strategy of switching identification discourses (e.g. Şıhbızıns or Romani), mainstream society categorizes them as either Romani or Gypsy.[4]

Host populations stigmatize Romani groups' segregated living spaces and tends to avoid the residence these spaces in everyday life. Roma's living spaces are criminalized, and –relatedly– stigmatized as polluted. An indication of their stigma of impurity was exemplified by mainstream society's warning "not to get close with the sample's neighborhood" during Akkan and others' fieldwork. In this context, they concluded that spatial and ethnic stigmatization are the main determinants of the problems that Romani society confront in everyday life. According to Akkan and others' study, such problems included discrimination in the labor market, exclusion from health and education services, and stigmatization in public space.[5]

---

3 Ibid., 12.

4 Başak Ekim Akkan, Mehmet Baki Deniz, and Mehmet Ertan, "Sosyal Dışlanmanın Roman Halleri" *İstanbul: Sosyal Politika Forumu* (2011): 97.

5 Ibid., 98.

Another finding of their study should be underscored because it is related with both the categorization of identity and the actualization of these categories in everyday life. In their study, it was observed that Roma maintain their attachments to their close community. On the other hand, the rejection of ethnicity is a common way to escape the social gap between Romani closed communities and the mainstream social order. This dilemma is a result of the experience of discrimination to which they have been exposed because of "being from Romani neighborhood."[6]

Their study is revealing in that even in the categorical perception framework, "Romani" or "Gypsy" are not taken into account as ethnic identities. Rather, these are associated with different understandings in the eyes of Roma. In Akkan and others' study, most of the time "being from [among the] Romani" was identified with poverty. This is also mentioned in Ladanyi and Szelenyi's study; in which they take Romani groups in post-Soviet societies into account. Due to the stigma – authentic or impure – Romani identity is not taken as an ethnic category, neither in the discourses of the external social order nor Romani society.

Kolukırık conducted research in İzmir and Tarlabaşı[7] in order to present an extensive explanation of the culture, identity, language, and history of Gypsy society.[8] The study's main objectives are (1) what are the main characteristics of socioeconomic and cultural features in Gypsy populations; (2) how are cultural forms and perception frames on Gypsy society are built and operated; and lastly, (3) what is their position on organizing their community to express their peculiarities within a given society. His primary contribution to the literature of the exclusion of Gypsies a photographic exploration of Gypsy groups' socio-economic situation, even though the sample of the study was limited with Tarlabaşı and İzmir-Bornova. In addition to this, he concluded that the ethnic identification of Romani differs in different social circumstances. They tend to switch the name of their ethnic identityto Romani or

6 Ibid., 99.

7 Tarlabaşı is a neighborhood in the district of Beyoğlu-İstanbul, which is identified with Gypsy residents. There is currently an urban renewal Project underway in the neighborhood (w.n.).

8 Suat Kolukırık, Dünden Bugüne Çingeneler, Ozan Yayıncılık, İstanbul 2008, p. 18.

Gypsy as the situation warrants. He mentions that the Roma think that Romani is the politer expression of Gypsy identity. Still he claims that the different nomenclature of Romani identity is normal since they have already been called different names in different social contexts.[9]

The last study was conducted in the neighborhoods of Bülbül and Tophane.[10] What Mischek concludes is that in Bülbül, Romani groups live together with Kurds whereas they cohabit with Arabs. In both locations, there are conflicts due to economic resources and housing facilities. Romani groups conceive of the others as dangerous due to their political power. Yet still, Roma were able to protect their cultural order in the given urban spaces. The ethnic identification of Romani agents is maintained through an emphasis on their sense of belonging: Turkishness.[11] This can be inferred as a strategy to eliminate their excluded position by discriminating against other non-Turkish ethnic groups.

In this section, I make a glimpse of ethnographic studies conducted among Turkish Romani groups. In the following section, I will present the findings of my ethnographic study conducted in Sulukule.

§ 3.2 Method of the Study

To accomplish the goal of this thesis, fieldwork was designed and conducted according to qualitative research principles.[12] Between March and June 2015, Sulukule was visited five times. In these field visits, six former Sulukule residents became respondents. To secure respondents, a snowball technique was used. Two of the respondents were women. Most of the interviews were conducted in a coffee house, the clients of which were mainly Romani, former Sulukule residents. Although not the entire questionnaire, some questions

9 ibid, pp. 62-69

10 These neighborhoods in the district of Beyoğlu are a famous destination for the migratory groups (w.n.).

11 Udo Mischek, "*Mahalle* Identity *Romani* (Gypsy) Identity under Urban Conditions," in *Gypsies and the Problem of Identities – Contextual, Constructed and Contested*, eds. Adrian Marsh and Elin Strand (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2006), 159-162.

12 See Appendix 1 for the full questionnaire.

were also directed to other people beyond the main 6 respondents. The answers became satisfactory by the end of the sixth interview. Furthermore, clients in the coffee house that listened to my interviews claimed that they experienced similar processes, both with regard to their self-identification and their relation to the project. Therefore, the interviews were stopped after the sixth interviewee's experiences. Also, one of the brokers that invested in Sulukule's mass housing project was briefly interviewed in the second field visit.

The questionnaire was designed around three main themes; identity, urban renewal, and neighborhood solidarity. Questions on the first theme evaluated the respondents' attitudes toward being a Romani individual. The findings regarding their self-identification are the main objective of this chapter. Likewise, how respondents dealt with the urban renewal project vis-à-vis their Romani identity was investigated.

§ 3.3 Ethnic Identity as a Stigma

In the segregated places of the Roma, both the members of the communities and outsiders are aware of Romani stigma. More precisely, the Romani space is supposed to be an impure area in the eyes of mainstream society; they do not want to share this living space. As a result, the Roma are conscious of the fact that they have to live as a closed community to maintain their cultural structure.

As mentioned, there are concrete examples showing hostility toward Romani community all around the world. For instance, in England, members of the Romani community are stigmatized as "folk devils."[13] Similar examples can be observed all around Europe, such as Romani identity is described as "idiots" and "mental retards." [14]

In Turkish case, the stigmatization of the Romani community is more visible in daily conversation than in state policy. Official sanctions against the

13 Joanna Richardson, "Talking about Gypsies: The Notion of Discourse as Control," *Housing Studies* 21: 1 (2006):78.

14 Funda Gençoğlu-Onbaşı, "The Romani Opening in Turkey: Antidiscrimination?," *Turkish Studies* 13: 4 (2006): 601.

Romani community were eliminated in 2006, yet other regulations still effectly discriminated against the "Gypsy" identity. Up to that time, the most concrete discriminatory legal action against the Romani community was Article 4 of the settlement law, enacted in 1934, and administered until its redaction in 2006. In the article, especially the nomadic Roma were targeted. There was a statement that "Those that are not bound to the Turkish culture, anarchists, itinerant gypsies, spies and those that have been deported, shall not be accepted as immigrants into Turkey,"[15] which implied not only the exclusion of nomadic Romani from the Turkish society, but the denial of the equality of Romani people with non-Romani citizens. Inevitably, that such a statement was included in an official legal document resulted social exclusion. In addition, some respondents claimed that in the early years of the Republic, there was an extra statement on the national identity cards of Gypsy citizens that indicated that the holder was a *kıptî* (I have not seen official documents that prove what I heard in field). [16]The goal of such sanctions is to assimilate the bête noire into an idealized social system, ignoring their peculiarities. The antipathy was towards their archaic, irregular lifestyle was never explicit, of course. The anomaly attributed to their cultural identity was never alluded to by policy makers.

In 2009, the Turkish ruling government declared a "Roma Opening" social project to eliminate ethno-religious discrimination against the Roma. The project was followed by other "opening" projects aimed Armenian, Kurdish, and Alevi societies.[17] In the 2009 European Union Progress Report, Turkey was criticized for its inefficacy at eliminating the marginalized and excluded position of the Romani community. The report claims that Romani society is confronted with marginalization and exclusion in terms of education access, health services, the labor market, and social space. With respect to housing, the report emphasizes that Romani groups "continued to face demolition of

15 The full article is at http://ifcext.ifc.org/ifcext/spiwebsite1.nsf/0/2c048b972359e8a4852576ba000e2534/$FILE/Part%20D%20%20Turkey%20RAP%20Ann.%20Annex%203.2.pdf

16 Kıptî refers to the people of ancient Egypt. It is a medieval definition in which pejorative statements were included (w.n.).

17 Gençoğlu-Odabaşı, "The Romani Opening," 599.

Romani districts under urban renewal programmes in various towns."[18] Also, the Law on the Movement and Residence of Aliens is mentioned in the report since it "authorises the Ministry of the Interior to expel stateless and non-Turkish gypsies and aliens that are not bound to the Turkish culture, thus promoting discrimination against Romani (EU Report, 2009)." This proves their position as outcast in the Turkish context since they are categorized differently from other stateless individuals. It is emphasized in the report that the displacement of Romani populations due to urban renewal and gentrification projects is eminent.

The "opening" project showed how the Roma are excluded and discriminated against in Turkey. Their excluded position is not a new social phenomenon. In the eyes of the Roma, Kurdish and Turkish populations are seen as the upper crust and first-class citizens of Turkey.[19] Their recognition of their own ethnic identity differs among different Romani groups.

As a result of their exclusion and stigmatization, it is unsurprising that Romani society in Turkey constructs a peculiar self-identification of ethnicity inside of their own communities. This tendency will be analyzed through the case of Sulukule in this chapter. The argument is that due to their excluded social position as pariahs, such ethnic-identification discourses were generated within the community. Romani individuals' economic status becomes visible through their discourses on ethnic identity. In other words, when Romani positing themselves as upper, middle, or lower strata, their self-positioning is reflected in their identity-defining process, such as *Romani or Gypsy*. The analysis of the Sulukule case below gives a broader explanation of this argument.

18 Commission of the European Communities, *Turkey 2009 Progress Report - Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2009-2010* (Brussels, 2009): 29.

19 Selin Önen, "Citizenship Rights of Gypsies in Turkey: Romani and Dom Communities," *Middle Eastern Studies* 49/ 4 (2013): 612.

§ 3.4 Reflections of Exclusion on Class Structure

Considering that economic status is the most precise determinant of social strata, the Romani community may be supposed to comprise the lower of society if considered as components of mainstream social class. However, real experience does not concur: they have stood outside the mainstream stratification regardless of their economic status. As a result, they become underclass. As long as the people of Sulukule maintain their peculiar way of living, their underclass position will not be transformed even if their economic activities are similar to those of the mainstream middle class. Economic activities make no change in the deprived position of the people of Sulukule. In addition, the experience of belonging to a Romani community differs in Turkey. The settlement tendency, labor status, and location of the neighborhood can be seen as determinants in the social stratification processes. First of all, nomadic Roma groups are seen as the lowest segment of their ethnic group. Even settled Romani groups avoid interacting with them. In fact, they reveal an exclusionary discourse when comparing themselves with nomadic groups. As Önen states, "when they are nomadic, they are simultaneously insiders or outsiders."[20]

Secondly, the character of the lines of business with which they are occupied are more significant determinants of social status than economic capital. Most of the time, Romani agents attend to "dirty" jobs due to their ethnicity based social exclusion, poverty, socio-economic conditions, and personal – communal desires. Most of the time they have limited access to attain formal employment opportunities, as Özateşler claims. Therefore, the type of employment they attain is a determinant of the way of self-identification of ethnicity in the Sulukule community. Romani individuals that earn their livelihood through a regular income are at the highest status since this means they are recognized by bureaucratic authorities, and their being as an individual has superseded their ethnic identity. In this context, individuals employed in the jobs identified with the Romani community comprise the middle strata.

Thirdly, the location of the neighborhood is notable for Romani society. Compared to other Romani settlements, Sulukule has a better position due to its historical background and a history of "taverns" identified with the name

20 Önen, "Romani and Dom Communities," 611.

of the neighborhood. Still, it should be noted that Sulukule survived as a closed community for centuries until its destruction; thus, the members of the community preserved their underclass position.

In Sulukule, an original way of self-identification of ethnicity that is only meaningful for the Romani community of Sulukule draws attention. Considering its uniqueness, it is impossible to claim that it was constructed through elimination of economic capital. Sulukule residents define their ethnicity through a discourse based on the host population's framed biases, which results in exclusionary practices in the context of the impure "Gypsy" stigma. The argument of this chapter thus becomes meaningful: because of the "Gypsy" stigma, the Sulukule community became an underclass in society. As a result, individuals generated an original way to define their ethnicity that takes a mixture of identification of ethnicity and economic capital. To elaborate, I will benefit from the parameters that affected most the generation process, such as establishment of a permanent business in the place, living space or the sitation of the holding niche among the others.

§ 3.5 The Originality

All of the strata mentioned above are observed in destructed Sulukule. People told their stories comparing their current situation with the past. Thus, both the past identification of ethnicity and the present one are accounted for.

Before the urban renewal, Sulukule had a prestigious position among Romani neighborhoods. The people of Sulukule were not surviving in the poorest conditions in the poorest region. In other words, the former Sulukule was not precisely equivalent to a ghetto; yet it presented some characteristics of ghettoization. For instance, other than Roma, the rest of the society refused to live there; likewise, the mainstream population did not interact with the neighborhood on a daily basis except for commercial activities and was reluctant to integrate with the community. Moreover, the neighborhood is identified with its "Gypsy" citizens and is therefore always recalled as a "Gypsy neighborhood." The impure stigma of the "Gypsy" population is associated with the neighborhood. In this sense, "modern ghetto," which refers to the

context of segregated places both in territorial and social structure, is consistent with for Sulukule. Likewise, "advanced marginality" becomes concrete in the case of Sulukule, since both neighborhood insiders and outsiders of the were aware of the isolation of the neighborhood. No one except for Roma consented to live in Sulukule because the stigma of Sulukule had emerged from the social and cultural background of the residents and physical space. This duality of the stigma doubled Sulukule's excluded position. As a result, it experiences the "blemish of place".

The stable homogeneity of the neighborhood even after migration waves proves its blemished position; even outsiders that migrated to Sulukule from other cities belonged to the Roma community, though they did not have any organic connection to the neighborhood except for their ethnicity. This means that the borders of "polluted" space had been strictly drawn in the social order. In this social order, the protection of "pure" or "sacred" space is vital since "if the borders of pure are not protected, trouble appears in the external society." This is in line with Douglas' statement on border-making procedures presented in the Chapter 2. Moreover, Douglas stresses that the external society tends to legitimate their protective actions as the natural impulse to avoiding from "danger". As a "Gypsy" neighborhood, Sulukule's marginalized position is explained due to the mainstream society's avoidance of "danger."

In spite of the neighborhood's ghettoization and residents' extremely position, the people of Sulukule did not experience extreme poverty. Through the interviews, it is understood that the poverty level was manageable before the urban renewal. They did not live in luxurious conditions, but they were accustomed to "round off the day," through their crafts one way or another. Because informal businesses enabled them to "round off the day," they never tried hard to be integrated into the labor market. It is not known whether they did not give it a try due to their archaic, excluded class position or whether they resisted due to attachment to their peculiar lifestyle. Still, one respondent claimed they experienced stigmatization due to the lack of academic, Romani scientists. Younger generations tend to obtain a higher education, and the decision-making processes of the educated after their education is complete should be observed – whether they will choose to attach to the modern capitalist market or not. For now, former Romani residents of Sulukule claim that they used to work in their favorite job – performing their arts- and surviving

among the people of their own community. When their talent for musical performance was questioned, the answer was always the same: it was given to Roma society. This tendency to explain talent through endowment, also reproduces the stigmas attached to Romani identity. Özateşler claims that identification of the Romani ethnic identity with certain lines of employment not only intensifies the level of the stigma, but conceals the fact that they attend to that these kinds of occupations due to their ethnicity-based social exclusion. In this sense, as mentioned in the theoretical framework, Bauman's claim that "communities do not question their social / cultural codes since the members thought that they were given features, which were built as it should be" becomes rationalized.

It should be underscored that Sulukule is the most famous residential area of the Romani community. It was not classically "ghettoized" in the same way the theories claim nor other Romani neighborhoods experienced. The state did not push them to live in this "penalized city" as Wacquant calls it, but rather, the state left Sulukule to survive on its own. In other words, Sulukule experienced a kind of "natural" segregation. As a result, the emergence of a distinctive solidarity culture became visible in Sulukule. The solidarity is strictly identified with the closed community structure of Sulukule, which means that only the members of the community comprehended the encoded norms and values of everyday life. In the Sulukule case, the community differentiated itself through this shared-ness, and its reflection was most visible in the solidarity culture built in the neighborhood according to shared cultural norms.

The solidarity culture was not limited to the everyday life of the people of Sulukule. In addition to its social dimension, its reflections could be observed in economic practices. Most people of the Sulukule were employed in the informal sector, and most of the time they supported each one another when needed or acted collectively to draw the attention of customers'.

3.5.1 *Fame (Stigma) Becomes Subsistence*

Unsurprisingly, due to impure stigma attached to the Romani society, the people of Sulukule did not establish formal businesses most of the time. As Doug-

las states, the perceptions of pure and pollution are built from the start schematically. When the individuals start to perceive the external world, they also begin to build their consciousness schemes. Thus, segments that are incompatible with the scheme become stigmatized, and stigmatized ones are categorically refused. Douglas' statement is realized both among members of the mainstream society and among Sulukule residents. Because they were strongly aware of their stigma, they did not take part in the formal labor market. Instead, the informal economy became significant in the neighborhood contrary to the conventional rules of the free market. Most community members earned their livelihood by playing instruments, singing, and dancing. They performed their art legally until the prohibition of distinctive taverns in Sulukule at the end of the 1990s. They used to pay taxes in addition to obtaining necessary legal permissions. The Romani residents of the older Sulukule were aware that the taverns were shut down because of the stigma attributed to the "Gypsy" entrepreneurs who owned these establishments.

Though there were no illegal activities going on under the rooves of these taverns, the governors tried to abolish them even as they persuaded the Romani community to maintain their unusual lifestyle, in which singing, dancing, and other performance activities were seen as "natural fragments of life." The "natural fragments of life" discourse is important because the Sulukule community becomes excluded exactly due to these fragments. Bauman's claim that in closed communities, members usually generate communal ties with the features that cause their excluded position can be observable in Sulukule. Most respondents mentioned that their talent for music is a given part of their character; such activities can be thought of as organic parts of their nature – so much so that most sing and play even at funeral ceremonies. The composition of entertainment with occupations is a natural fragment in Sulukule. This aspect is a reason why host population see Sulukule as dangerous because the role of modernity itself was afraid of fun and playfulness. Sulukule was known as the center of entertainment activity, and residents do not complain about that reputation. Some residents mention that they used to earn their livelihood in their favorite profession. They appreciate it and have generated a harmonious, symbolic relationship within its confines. The most obvious part of the people of Sulukule lifestyle was their reputation for entertainment. They talk about their fondness for entertainment in a Romaninticized way. To illustrate,

whenever they referred to the "taverns," which were symbols of Sulukule, they used positive statements. Moreover, it seems taverns were an actualization of their community's "warm circle." Because they experienced exclusion is such a harsh way, taverns – which were seen as authentic even by those perpetrating exclusion – reinforced their sense of belonging to their community. All the interviewees in Sulukule talked about taverns in a respectful manner, regardless of whether they adopted or refused Romani identity.

Almost all of my respondents had a relation with taverns in one way or another; some were property owners, and some used to sell their products there at night. According to some, criminalizing taverns was a milestone in the history of Sulukule; afterwards an urban renewal project that intended to disintegrate that milieu was inescapable. In other words, the main intention was the displacement of those in the neighborhood; making of taverns illegal was the first step. The process that followed was the criminalization of Sulukule. Before it became a "den of iniquity," it was stigmatized as a place of crime.

Almost all respondents mentioned that after police chief Süleyman Ulusoy (nicknamed *Hortum*[21] Süleyman) became responsible from Sulukule's taverns, everything changed. Taverns became identified with illegal activities such as prostitution and drug trafficking. They think that taverns turned into a government target, and the dispensing with of these places became legitimate in decent society.

Unfortunately, Süleyman Ulusoy's policing resulted in a negative perception about taverns. They were swiftly labeled as illegal establishments. People who used to earn their livelihood from those houses were in predicament of having to work as informal workers. Dancing, singing, or playing were not only peculiar, artistic values, those activities were their "bread and butter." They were earning money from their vocation. They maintained those activities not because they liked them, but to survive. One of the respondents mentioned the obliged informality of taverns at that time as:

21 *Hortum* means hose in Turkish. Because there are many stories that he used hose as a beating tool at the processes of questioning, Süleyman Ulusoy was nicknamed as Hortum Süleyman (w.n.)

> *Think about a woman who had nine children, but had nothing to eat in their house. She thought, "If only I would had a client, could perform with my daughters in our dance costumes, and earn our daily bread!" They had to maintain their job informally.*

He continued to explain the taverns' condition before they became illegalized:

> *If he [Süleyman Ulusoy] had not come here, the culture of taverns would have survived. All of the taverns were paying their taxes. How was that? Consider that I would take my sunflower seeds to eat while I was having fun. My uncle used to sell socks in front of the taverns. For example, the women were working; they set a table, prepared special meals. At midnight, there were women who carried sütlaç [a kind of rice pudding] to the houses. There was a bus station and people were waiting there with their mini-buses to drive the patrons home in exchange for a small amount of money. Everyone had something to do there. They were harmless. People were eating and having fun. [Emphasizing the high quality of the places] The dancers were dancing in dancer costumes.*

Some of them worked all together in these taverns as a family, whereas there were also cases in which the father was the musician or only the daughter worked in the taverns as a belly dancer. The vital point is that in interviews they strongly rejected accusations of prostitution in the taverns. They claimed that they were not despised areas in a global city; they were a brand identified with Sulukule until Süleyman Ulusoy became obsessed with them. In their opinion, managers of these taverns were beneficial to everybody; they helped other residents to sell their wares inside the houses. Additionally, they enabled the growth of a particular sense of solidarity as one of my respondent stated:

> *You could ask for money [from the managers of taverns] when you were in need. They asked to the old women to work together like "Come and work with me. Set the tables [for the meals], and I will pay you." There was such kindness. Sulukule was a part of history. People knowing its history kept the culture alive by opening the taverns.*

In Sulukule, this kind of instinctive solidarity gives life to the street. For example, one of the respondents mentioned that even if the person in need of a

day's wage was physically disabled, neighbors gave them a hand without any expectation that would sell their petty products around the neighborhood. According to her, the needy were asked to cook something, which could be sold in the streets. The neighbor could sell it and they would help each other to round off the day.

Another respondent told about those days:

> *You know, there is the Rio Carnival every year; there was a Rio Carnival each-and-every night in Sulukule! We were earning money by doing our favorite job. Sulukule taverns could have been restored in a more modern and authentic way.*

After the prohibition, they started to go around the nightclubs of Taksim and Kumkapı, performing as per diem employees. None of the Romani of Sulukule thought it was dishonorable or shabby to amuse other people through performing music or dance. They emphasized that they were earning their livelihood in their "favorite" line of business. The prohibition eliminated their performances within the borders of Sulukule, but did not eradicate the activity itself. The performers changed their location, but the occupation remained the same.

The younger generation's situation is different from former generations. Besides the fact that their parents and ancestors grew up in the unique solidarity culture of the former Sulukule neighborhood, the younger generation does not attend to neighborhood solidarity. Most youth are motivated to attain a higher education to have a better social status through education level. Obviously, they grew up listening how their families survived stigmatization, ridicule, and finally criminalization, although they did not experience these first hand. Moreover, at a certain point, they had to leave their obsolete neighborhood and maintain lives among the *gadjo*, which resulted in a different self-awareness compared to what they understood from their parents' stories. Probably, they experience the Gypsy stigma in a different and more lucid form. Both the youth and older generations do not want to experience further exclusion and racial stigmas. Even if their goals are similar to their parents who stayed in Sulukule and lived as a close community, the youth are going to be challenged to maintain lives amongst the *gadjos*.

According to the respondents, the "culture of poverty" –as Ladanyi calls it- has been experienced in Sulukule as an obligation, as a natural process of the residents' lives. Nevertheless, the inherited part of that culture is not poverty per se; the inherited lifestyle that resists modernization is that the community remains excluded from the modern capitalist market. In other words, the situation of Sulukule is as a bilateral composition: on one hand, they resist modernization due to an archaic day-to-day lifestyle, transferred to the community from previous generations. They survived with particular crafts such as basketry, portering, and performance arts. Their tendency to avoid the capitalist labor market could be placed "underclass." The "underclass" is composed of those that remain unemployed or poor due to a lack of education and marketable skills. The next generation of "underclass" becomes locked into the same level of deprivation. This locked position in particular separates them from the rest of society as "untouchables," "undeserving poor," or "no-hopers." When I asked whether they were obliged to live this way – or if this was their decision- most replied that it was their nature. The difference of cultural capital was so internalized that the Roma think that their incompatibility is something natural. But because of their insistence on this lifestyle, they were excluded from the market and from the mainstream society. When their exclusion from the social space for inside with their exclusion from the market, their "underclass" position becomes strengthened. The concurrence of exclusion in the labor market and in social interactions along with an impure stigma attached to the community as a whole reduces their class position to underclass. In other words, there is a vicious feedback loop: They are excluded from the market, which naturally results in the segregation of their neighborhood, which in turn constitutes a sui generis solidarity culture confined to the neighborhood. They then resist the pre-determined norms of the system such as regular income, resulting in lack of interaction with surrounding communities. And as a result, Sulukule residents rationalize their survival with the principles of day-to-day life within the boundaries of the neighborhood.

§ 3.6 The Self-Identification of Ethnicity: Romani, Gypsy or the Rejection of Both

When nomadic Romanis settled down –whether in ghettos or somewhere else –they form an underclass instead of a class-based hierarchy. Regardless of the former features of Sulukule, the people who used to live there were not the untouchables of society, through most experienced being underclass wage laborers because of their distance from the modern capitalist system. Due to the similarities of their fates, they continued compensative collaboration practices among themselves to find food or accommodation. Moreover, people in Sulukule who were able to save some income for more than a day preferred not to leave their segregated neighborhood, but instead established small enterprises such as internet cafés, coffee houses, and pool halls. Yet, most are used to rounding off the day with day labor.

Determining the way of self-identification of ethnicity within the Sulukule community is challenging. One reason is that they live in a segregated area at the heart of Istanbul (which means their land is valuable). But their day-to-day lifestyles are discordant with the norms of a globalized city –having a regular income and being a regular consumer. Furthermore, even as the market value of their former houses skyrocketed, the community in the neighborhood was closed to strangers. To illustrate, one respondent claimed that in Sulukule, there were only six families that did not belong to the Romani community among the nearly 600 families.

In Sulukule, the community became an underclass. Moreover, among the Sulukule community, there was a visible lack of apprehension about their strata in the context of the social stratification of Turkish society. In other words, it was that community members did not worry about rising to upper stratum of Turkish society. It is not known whether this nonchalance was the result of archaic stigmatization of the "Gypsy" identity; the community seemed to disregard their position of underclass. However, this did not prevent the organization of a *sui generis* way of self-identification on ethnicity within the community. Still, while delimiting their social space, they position themselves as Bourdieu predicts, in relation to others, whether below, above, or in-between. Moreover, Bourdieu's explanation presented in the second

chapter makes sense when Sulukule's peculiar way of identifying their ethnicity is considered, since he underscores that people tend to classify themselves even at the neighborhood level according to their access to the market of goods and services. In Sulukule, a similar discourse emerged in which Roma define their ethnic identity parallel to their access to the market. Their economic capital can be deduced through their encoding of their ethnic background.

The only observable identity code was individuals' ethnic background, and the encoding ethnic origin was the strongest element of Sulukule's social stratification. In other words, the aforementioned *sui generis* self-identification of ethnicity in Sulukule strongly correlates to the economic condition of the individual. According to one's economic condition, the perception of one's ethnic origin as well as the name given to that origin is inclined to shift. The ranges shift changes from embracing the Gypsy identity by equating it with being "Romani," to separating "Romani" from "Gypsy," to rejecting outright. The propensity of accept or refuse the identity is strongly correlated to the economic condition of the individual. In other words, the better the individual's economic condition and access to economic resources, the more the individual tends to reject being called "Gypsy."

Three statements arose during the fieldwork interviews when respondents were asked to define their ethnicity. In the first, people claimed that being a Gypsy or being Romani refer to the same thing. According to them, because of semantic confusion regarding the word "Gypsy" –namely negative attachments to its meaning, - rich Gypsies refuse to be called as "Gypsy" but rather, prefer to live as "Romani." As expected, I did not make interviews with the whole of the Sulukule community. Nevertheless, when I piece together respondents' attitudes about their ethnic identity with stories I heard during the fieldwork, it can be concluded that as economic conditions worsen, individuals have less of a problem being called "Gypsy." To illustrate, if one earns their livelihood through an occupation that is attributed to the Gypsy community, such as performing or portering, then it is no problem to claim that Gypsy and the Romani means the same thing.

Second, there were people who refused to say they were Gypsy, but were at peace with their Romani origins. The people that belong to this group usually earn their livings as registered shopkeepers, which means they are on the

border of the formal sector. The business types vary, such as being owner of a pool hall, real estate agency, internet café, or coffee house. They do not constitute the upper class among the Sulukule community; however, they can survive without focusing too much on their livelihood. An interview I conducted with one of them started with the question: "Are you a Gypsy?" The respondent was driven to anger, refusing that she was a Gypsy. I think she perceived the question as a snide remark. However, by the end of the conversation she mentioned that she was proud of being a Romani as well as belonging to the Romani community. The interesting aspect of her perception of being a Romani was that being Romani had no ethnic connotation for her. The elements of ethnic identity were almost totally eliminated. When asked to define what being a Romani meant, she answered:

> *I do not know what Romani or Gypsy means. When I think about being a Romani, the only thing that comes to my mind is musical instruments. Do you understand? The only thing we do as Romanis is to dance at weddings. We hold our weddings with musical instruments for sure. Music and musical instruments are the only concept particular to our Romani culture. We love instruments, dancing, and entertainment. It is part of our lifestyle. This is the Romani culture from us. What else is meant by Romani culture, I do not know… I identify myself as Romani, and there is nothing humiliating in its meaning. This is Romani culture. I like listening music and weddings. They [the rest of the society] call it Romani culture, but it is as I have told you.*

Likewise, respondent Y, who proudly identifies herself Romani but angrily rejects being "Gypsy," claimed that only Romani people lived in Sulukule Street, whereas the "Gypsy group" lived near the city walls in hovels in units of ten to twelve families. This means that even inside Sulukule there was a group who were excluded from the Romani community because of their Gypsy stigma. According to Y and her friend G, this group –marginalized and excluded as "Gypsy," – was also excluded from the solidarity network of the neighborhood. Y explained their situation as follows:

> *Because of ten to twelve families near the city walls, there are people who thought that the whole neighborhood was a Gypsy region. They are not*

us, and they are doing all the negative things attributed to our neighborhood.

Moreover, their statements reproduce the "Gypsy" stigma is also reproduced within the Sulukule community. The misrepresentation of "Gypsy" identity so penetrated society, even the owners of the identity refuse it due to its pejorative meanings.

If one belongs to the middle stratum of Sulukule's stratification system, there is a tendency to attach the ethnic identity to the lifestyle. Furthermore, there was a tendency among this group that negative reactions towards the Romani people were because of daily deeds in the community, such as the way of using language. In her opinion, those negative reactions could be pacified through rehabilitation of the communicational use of language. To illustrate, when I asked whether people in Sulukule are confronted with negative reactions in their daily life because of their Romani identity, she replied me:

No, never. Some Romanis speak with an exaggerated Romani dialect. For example, they use beya, mare[22] *and so on. I do not use these words, for example. My family members, including my nephews and nieces, also do not use these words. If we did not scold my nephew when he used these words, they might continue speaking the dialect… I never use beya in my conversations. In fact, if someone uses it, I get upset. I do not like it. But some [Romani] people use it, and are confronted negative reactions [because] they were unable to improve themselves.*

She continued her argument by mentioning again that in her opinion, "Romani means to have fun."

The last case is much different from the previous ones owing to the total rejection of one's ethnicity. Before the interview, others claimed that the respondent had Gypsy origins. However, during the interview, he claimed that he was neither Romani nor Gypsy. Besides, he claimed that Sulukule's Romani identity was fake; naming Sulukule as a Romani neighborhood was a policy that served the intentions of the government. He continued his argument by mentioning that because of nomadic Gypsy groups, Sulukule was stigmatized

22 *Beya* and *mare* are famous phonation words in the Romani dialect in Turkey (w.n).

as a Romani neighborhood. He was the owner of a car park. From the manner of others towards him, it was understood that he was respected in his community. What can be inferred from his position against "Gypsiness" is that he strongly rejected being a "Gypsy" or Romani as the mainstream value system hold them. Gypsy refers to an impure, polluted identity in his identification schema. In other words, he does not accept the stigmatized identity as a strategy to eliminate the underclass position of "Gypsiness."

Before the urban renewal, most of the Sulukule residents' occupations were not in the formal sector. Almost no other common businesses such as peddling, carriage driving, playing instruments or piece working were in the formal sector. As mentioned, the most significant indicator that the people of Sulukule were unable to integrate into the mainstream class structure was their professions. Formal sector workers that received a regular income tend to refuse their ethnic origin, defining in-line with the rest of the society. Such a tendency is seen reasonable among members of a community that has experienced ethnic stigmatization. The interesting point in Sulukule was that although members did not break off social and emotional ties to the community, they still rejected their ethnicity. In other words, those people who rejected or externalize their ethnic origins did not attempt to leave Sulukule before or after the urban renewal project. Still there was a strong correlation between how they name their ethnic identity and their economic status.

3.6.1 *The Role of Gentrification in the Identification Process of the Sulukule Community*

The generation of self-identification among those in the Sulukule community before gentrification is a dilemma. The only significant inference to be made is that the correlation between the ethnic origin and one's social stratum became more visible after the gentrification process because members' social status as well as their financial gains from the renewal process were discernable. Title owners in the former Sulukule did not have to leave the neighborhood; they were able to survive as landlords in the neighborhood. They were able to set up formal businesses or maintain their occupations from before the gentrification. However, renters in the former Sulukule had to leave the neighbor-

hood and move to the fringes of the city.[23] They could not live there and returned to areas around their older neighborhood. However, the rents had doubled or trebled, and this increase worsened their quality of life. The degradation made visible differences that had been concealed by the day-to-day lifestyle, inherent to Sulukule community.

§ 3.7 Conclusion

In this chapter, the first argument concerns the undersclass position of the people of Sulukule, which was analyzed through the findings of the fieldwork. It was showed that there is a correlation between one's economic status and their way of self-identification of ethnicity.

Findings show that the Romani community in Sulukule was aware of their ethnic stigma. According to respondents, the self-identification of ethnicity is a major determinant on one's economic status. Policies such as the prohibition of their businesses or their displacement from the neighborhood were caused due to ethnic identity. One of the important emphases concerned how the mainstream society stigmatized the Romani way of living. Interviewees stressed that displacement of former Roma from Sulukule was a last step in the elimination of the Romani way of living. Although representations of ethnic identities are specified by economic capital, members who espoused either Romani or Gypsy identities, as well as ones who rejected both, were strongly aware pejorative connotations of the word "Gypsy" among members of the mainstream society. The rejection of "Gypsiness" was due to an objection to its enduring meanings. However, in the end it resulted in the total rejection of ethnic identity. In this sense, both the espousers and refusers of being Romani or Gypsy react categorically when identifying their ethnic origins.

This chapter presented stigmatized position of the people of Sulukule, which strongly affected their practices of self-identification with respect to ethnicity. These practices strongly correlate with one's economic capital. When the economic capital of the people of Sulukule is taken into account as a determining parameter of ethnicity, rejection of ethnic identity increases in

23 Most residents moved to a distinct called Taşoluk, which was located on the border of Arnavutköy, 40 kilometers from the city center (w.n)..

parallel to increased economic capital. In other words, when one's economic conditions were better than others in the community, both the Romani and Gypsy identities were rejected; in fact, the whole neighborhood's ethnic identity was refused. On the other hand, lower economic capital eliminates the differences between being a "Gypsy" or "Romani;" – they are seen as the same. Interviewees emphasize that wealthier community members tend to deny their "Gypsiness." As expected, the wealthier members of the community reacts angrily to the "Gypsy" identification, but were satisfied identifying themselves as Romani.

In addition to their peculiar self-identification of ethnicity, the people of Sulukule constructed a closed community with it's original, everyday codes. The whole structure changed after the destruction experience because of gentrification. The following chapter analyzes the renewal project's impact on everyday life and presents further empirical evidence about this subject.

4

Destruction Through Law

Through the Sulukule case, Chapter 3 analyzed that because they were positioned as underclass, the Romani society of Sulukule tend to generate a peculiar discourse on self-identification of ethnicity that puts defining ethnic origin according to one's economic capital at the center. Apparently, the most ostensible class differences among Sulukule residents become visible through the naming one's ethnic identity, as well as their sense of belonging to different types of the Roma identity such as Gypsiness or Romani. In other words, individuals' definition of their ethnic identity as Romani or Gypsy or an absolute rejection of the phenomena was strongly correlated with their economic status. The relatively concealed differences within the community have become much more significant after renewal project in accordance with the rights to claim rents in the renewed area.

In this chapter, I will focus on the issue from another perspective. The main goal is to explain what underwent to change after the destruction policy – referring to gentrification in this case – within the Sulukule Romani community. In other words, it will be discovered how the transformation was experienced by Romani people of Sulukule. To accomplish this, I will point to both the concealed and explicit aims of the project and try to figure out the outcomes of these aims. In this context, my argument is that the indigenized lifestyle of the Sulukule Romani Community was harmonious with the pre-gentrified neighborhood structure. I will highlight the importance of the neighborhood structure for the sake of the survival of the codes embedded in

their way of living. I attributed certain predominant particularities that became visible during the field work to the Sulukule community, such as the lack of regular income, day labor, and the match of housing arrays and lifestyles. at a higher level of abstraction, my argument is that in closed-community neighborhoods that attained their close-knit features from social stigmas and accordingly establish an original social structure, a destruction phenomenon such as urban renewal affects the community so dramatically that the unique social codes of the community cannot be sustained or reconfigured, even if the residents remains the same location. In other words, the strong structural relationship between the neighborhood and the way of life will be stressed in this chapter.

The outline of the chapter is as follows: First, I will present the urban renewal project that targeted Sulukule and started in 2005. Then, I will introduce the peculiar lifestyle that was constructed by Sulukule community members. Lastly, I will focus on the transformation of the way of life by comparing its features before and after the urban renewal to see its impact.

In addition to the previous sample, findings from an interview with a broker will also be presented.

§ 4.1 Urban Renewal or Gentrification

To understand the aims of the urban renewal, it is necessary to grasp Sulukule's unique location. The land value of the region is precious. Sulukule is a historical neighborhood between the Neslişah and Hatice Sultan quarters,[1] located in the district of Fatih. It takes its name from a street in the location. It is said there was once a cistern at the start of the street. The location in İstanbul is important: it is almost impossible to find a land to establish new housing projects in the center of the city. If it was possible, the price of the apartments would be astronomical. Because Sulukule is located near Edirnekapı and within walking distance to important centers such as Sultanahmet or Vefa, its land values are high. It is also easy to reach to major centers such as Taksim or Bakirkoy. Due to its location and authentic features, it is a precious land.

1 These two quarters have been joined into a single quarter called Karagümrük (w.n.).

The year 2005 was a milestone in the history of Sulukule. In this year, Sulukule was designated as an "Urban Renewal Area," and after a while, the project was carried into effect in cooperation with the Housing Development Administration. Interestingly, among academic studies about this project, there was almost nothing favorable –neither about the project nor its projected economic, social, and cultural outcomes. There was considerable demolition in Sulukule in 2005 because of the project.[2] Today, there almost nothing remains of the former residential area. When the project was declared in 2005, the aim was urban renewal; in other words, to replace the dilapidated residences with better and more modern ones, with a hotel, and with a shopping mall.[3] According to the project, 480 Ottoman style houses were going to be constructed. The critical point here is that the project cannot be understood in the context of "urban renewal" because it also led a radical social transformation along with its physical manifestation. Residents of the former Sulukule mentioned that the only thing they heard from authorities during the renewal project was "a better life for your children." However, at the end of the process, renewal of Sulukule turned into an assimilation project from above that first appropriated the space of the community, and then managed the desolated and expensive land in the middle of İstanbul.[4]

Most studies, especially those carried out by non-governmental organizations showed that people with that level of income could not survive in the renewed neighborhood, meaning that they would be compelled to detach from the community that had survived as a close community for centuries. Romani residents of Sulukule had established a neighborhood where the borders of public and private places were interlaced.[5] The public and private spaces according to the project would be sharply separated. In addition, the

2 Elif Ince, "Çöpe Atılan Sulukule," Radikal, June 14, 2012 accessed June 14 2016, http://www.radikal.com.tr/turkiye/cope-atilan-sulukule-1091069/.

3 For more information, visit rromani.org.

4 "Sınır Tanımayan Otonom Plancılar "Başka Bir Sulukule Mümkün" diyerek Alternatif Projelerini Basına Açıkladılar," last modified September 23, 2008, Sulukule Günlüğü, accessed June 14, 2016, http://sulukulegunlugu.blogspot.com.tr/2008/09/snr-tanmayan-otonom-planclar-baka-bir.html.

5 Ozan Karaman and Tolga İslam, "On the Dual Nature of Intra-Urban Borders: The Case of a Romani Neighborhood in İstanbul," *Cities* 29 (2012): 236.

street as a public space, which was the main place to socialize, was permanently taken away from the people of Sulukule. According to the explanations of the people of Sulukule, there was an important and strong solidarity network on the streets among residents. The essences of the "day-to-day" lifestyle, which will be explained in detail later on, were developed through the solidarity culture, and both were generated in the street. However, this solidarity culture irreparably damaged after gentrification. Revisiting Barth, this solidarity culture could be seen as a natural outcome of the boundary-making procedure, which was also an outcome of community-based identities and a distinctive social order. Moreover, the solidarity culture was usually realized through ignoring individuals' capacity to survive. After all, it was uncertain who among Sulukule community would become in need, when and what for they would become deprived. In other words, because almost all members of the community had the potential to be in-need, solidarity culture disregarded class-based differences within the neighborhood.

There were several reasons for the deterioration. First, the street lost its homogeneity. Secondly, after the renewal project, former residents were confronted with worse poverty than their living conditions before the project, which means that the people of Sulukule were no longer able to sustain the codes of street solidarity. This damaged the day-to-day lifestyle that was crucial to Romani identity before gentrification. In this context, it is necessary to revisit Bauman's observation that excluded communities are able to endure deprivation, but immediate changes have a subversive impact on their way of living. Most probably, a difficulty such as an economic crisis could be more easily surmounted by the people of Sulukule; however, an immediate change like displacement has a troubling impact on the everyday life of the neighborhood.

§ 4.2 Day-to-day Lifestyle as Romani Way of Life

Because Romanis survive as day labors with daily works to "round off the day," the nearest signifier for their lifestyle is 'day-to-day'. Most respondents claimed that before the urban renewal, most people in Sulukule earned their livelihood through day labor. Revisiting Özateşler's explanations presented in

the second chapter, Gypsy communities internalize objective socio-economic conditions in a subjective manner. Because they have limited access to the Gadjo-dominated formal labor market, their lines of employment are limited by their cultural background and the stigma of being Romani. In addition to entertainment business, people of Sulukule were selling daily-need items. The products varied from vegetables and fruits to underwear and socks. Some residents had been preparing foods in their own houses to be sold to the clients of the taverns before they were closed down. Again, there were people who transported inebriated clients from the taverns to their homes.

Another important occupation attached especially to the Sulukule community was "*unkacılık*." "*Unkacılık*" is a kind of subcontracting system. The possessor of certain counterfeit goods such as perfume, watches, cloth, and accessories sells the products with a limited profit to "employees." The employee then sells the products to the end users with extra profit. The unsold goods are returned to the initial possessor. One of my respondents explained the system as follows:

> *Suppose that we have perfume, watches, and pullovers. How much are they? Let's assume that they are 10 Turkish lira. M came, paid 10 and bought them [from the initial possessor] and then sold them [to the end users] for 25-30 liras. Then, he returned the money of the sold ones, and the unsold goods [to the initial possessor]. Both he and I [the initial possessor] were winners. [If I got 10 products in the initial step] I returned for 5 goods, and the price of 5 goods. The qualified, good sellers were transferred from one store to another. For example, [they say] give me 3 billion liras [3000 liras], and I am going to sell your stuff. But, he got the price of the stuff that he sold his own. For example, [suppose that] I bought a product for 7 liras, put 3 liras as profit, and sold to M for 10 liras. And M sold this product for 15 liras. In this case, I earned 3 liras, and M earned 5 liras… [In other words] We sell the local products as European goods, we used to sell the imitation goods as European manufacture. But it was the way of our survival.*

"Unkacılık" is an informal line of business, indeed, it was illegal because of the counterfeiting. Nevertheless, it was regarded as legitimate among the Sulukule community. When I asked the current situation of the business, they replied:

Now, it is over. Anyone who continues to sell gets arrested because selling counterfeit goods is forbidden.

According to the respondents, surviving without encroachment is more important than obsessing about the legality of the business. In other words, one's business is legitimate if she or he earns a living without resorting to stealing. There was no concern about protecting indirect rights of other citizens like copyrights or tax payments. Therefore, *unkacılık* was legitimate among Sulukule members. Yet, no one in Sulukule became rich from these jobs, nor did they experience upward mobility within their social class. They merely survived without the need of help from others.

"Unkacılık" was not the only informal sector business pushing the line of illegality. A similar perception prevails for the drug trade and unlicensed taxis:

We had also "pirate" taxis; we were able to earn money with them."

In the past, the area of drug dealing was known. If one of the children of our neighborhood was trying to buy drugs from them, the dealer prevented. In fact, the dealer would let the family know about their child. But now, it's not like that. Who does what and where is not known.

Are those in the Romani community forced to hold illegal and informal occupations, or is it their choice? Özateşler mentioned that it is not easy to answer such a question. "Gypsy" individuals start to operate according to the "nature" attached to them; they make decisions or become successful within this frame. However, there were also registered businesses that were the source of living for a lot of people. The most important was taverns, which were also identified with the historical identity of Sulukule. I presented taverns in the previous chapter, but I think it will be beneficial to mention their importance.

Even though some sources claim that taverns were permanently stigmatized as illegal establishments, most respondents mentioned that they were active until the late 1990s.[6] According to respondents, the owners of the tav-

6 For more information, see The Barlett Development Planning Unit 2007 'Placing Sulukule' report in the following link: https://www.scribd.com/fullscreen/59533208?access_key=key-2aruex8hjvme1myboxy

erns were taxpayers, and taverns were registered businesses –i.e. formal enterprises. Karaman and İslam explain the essence of the taverns in detail and their relation to being from Sulukule:

> In the urban imaginary of Istanbulites, the name Sulukule connotes "entertainment houses" – houses composed of rooms, where groups of customers are served food and drinks as they are entertained by young girls dancing to the tunes of Romani music bands. Prototypes of these houses were established in the early 1940s. They remained popular among both tourists and locals alike, providing a vital source of livelihood for the neighborhood until the late 1980s. Today, many Sulukuleans, particularly those who worked in the entertainment industry, still reminisce in the prosperity of those years. As an old resident explained, Sulukule was a major point through which large slums of money entered Fatih [the large district], everyone prospered from the entertainment houses.[7]

The respondents support Karaman and İslam's argument that taverns were the most important source of income in Sulukule. Mentioning that they made a lot of money from these houses, respondents claimed that the entire community earned their livelihood due to taverns one way or another. According to them, the people of Sulukule earned their livelihood as registered or illicit laborers – through formal or informal means. Most community members remember those days with nostalgic sentiment, but there are people who underscore the dangers and risks of the informality of the system. The comment of C is a good example:

> *The previous stage [just before the urban renewal project] was very damaging. There were taverns [near the city walls]. It offended us. Especially after my daughters were born, I felt pained. Our 12- and 13 year-old girls were dancing modestly, but when things started to change, it also was reflected to our girls. The dancers in the taverns dressed well. Family girls wanted to be like them. So, the girls of Sultan [a quarter] started to dance, too. Then, things became worse. We heard that adultery became*

7 Karaman and İslam," On the Dual Nature," 235.

common. The degeneration reflected badly on the neighborhood, and we started to fight within our own community. I was saying to myself that this world would have survived, if only drug trafficking was eliminated… In the past, it was nice… only families were coming. After a while, things went south. Strange girls came to our neighborhood and it became degenerated. The form started to change, adultery started. Therefore, we said that the renewal [of the neighborhood] would be beneficial. But in the end, there are benefits as well as harms.

Incidentally, C was the only respondent that implied there was prostitution in the taverns. All others claimed that prostitution allegations were an organized, nonsensical lie, fueled the "Gypsy stigma." In line with Perez's argumentation introduced in the second chapter, the stigmatization of taverns was because of mainstream society's natural tendency to reject segregated places via categorical biases. The chief inspector, whose nickname was "Hose Suleyman," was a traumatic figure in Sulukule, as mentioned in the previous chapter. According to the claims of respondents who denied the prostitution, authorities similar to "Hose Suleyman" believed in the shamelessness of the Gypsies and made a plot with the "Haber Ozel" team to present a fake news report about prostitution in Sulukule. They claimed that the team bribed a Romani woman who lived near the walls to pretend like she was a prostitude. The team revealed the bargain and the collapse of the taverns accelerated as negative stigmas against the Romani people were quickly activated. This case indicates the dual dimension of stigma. In line with Wacquant's explanation of the general perspective of mainstream society, the report reinforced the criminalized image of Sulukule because stigmatized spaces are anyway perceived as "lawless zone." Secondly, the report activated exclusionary violence against the Sulukule community. Özateşler underscores that whenever a conflict is experienced between the Gypsy community and the rest of society, exclusionary violence is activated through "labeled interaction." This activation results in the confinement to limited interaction. Taverns were important in the history of Sulukule because they were a main source of income for the people of Sulukule. They were vital in the sense that Sulkuleans' embraced their day-to-day lifestyle had the opportunity to survive on account of the taverns. Although important among the Sulukule community, Gypsy stigma was extended to this line of

business. It was not clear who would round off the day through selling which product on which night. In fact, those were places where the people of Sulukule were able to perform their natural talents for music and dance, with which they thought they were endowed by birth. The people of Sulukule are aware of the fact that they have a peculiar lifestyle and maintain their lives closed off from the rest of the society. Likewise, they are aware that because they were positioned as underclass within the society that they live in. They maintain occupations that the rest of the society does not want. However, it is misleading to claim that they feel guilty in this situation. On the contrary, they considered being fond of music or dancing and, living a day-to-day lifestyle as positive features of their community. The identification of favored occupations with their ethnic identity offered them a more relaxed living space. At a more abstract level, Bauman infers that a stigmatized community tends to make their stigmatized features invisible within their own segregated living space so that it feels indistinguishable in contrast with external public space. P's observations about the community are meaningful:

> *I make music or dance until the morning [as a daily routine]. Sometimes, I earn money through dancing and music. They [Gadjos] come here because of the cheap rents; then, they complain "You are making too much noise!" I have lived like this for centuries, like everyone else here. I know how to get pleasure from life. They cannot get used to the life of Sulukule, and after a while, they leave.*

Romani people think the most significant sign of being Romani is fondness for dancing and music. G summarized being Romani as "having fun." Hence, for a community that adopted a day-to-day lifestyle and keen on music and dance, taverns were important. Karaman and Islam link the degeneration of taverns to Romani and non-Romani migration waves in the mid 1980s. According to their findings, longtime residents of Sulukule mention that petty crimes and prostitution started after these migration waves. Because of that, even some owners of taverns supported their closure:

> By the end of the 1990s, all the entertainment houses were shut down by the authorities on the grounds that they became centers of prostitution and drug trafficking. Since the live entertainment industry was

> the neighborhood's major source of income, its abolition ushered in a period of rapid economic decline and boosted drug trade as an alternative source of informal livelihood. The neighborhood also suffered physically; houses fell into disrepair as the residents lacked the economic resources to invest in and maintain their homes. Day after day walls of stigma rose around the neighborhood. Despite its very central location and its close proximity to main transportation axes and to the central tourist and hotel zones, Sulukule remained a no-go zone for the great majority of the Istanbulites.[8]

The solidarity network embodied in the neighborhood was an important survival strategy because of the hardships of the day-to-day lifestyle If we consider the group that migrated to Sulukule and maintained their lives in hovels near the city walls, were excluded from the solidarity network, they were in dire straits due to a marginalized status in an already excluded community. The solidarity network within the neighborhood was undeniably important. There was a precondition to become part of this network , which is that one should live on Sulukule Street. Before I asked, C explained the importance of the Street as follows: *"In the past, our women were sitting in front of their doors. All of us were in a hail-fellow-well-met situation. Poor ones used to help each other."* P and G also help to understand the importance of the street: "*Even our weddings were held in the street. People were having their meals in the street and invited people walking down the street."*

The solidarity network that included everyone living in Sulukule was damaged in parallel with the destruction of street culture. In addition, there were peculiar systems that supported and made it easier to struggle with the uncertainties of the way of life of the people of Sulukule. My interviews reveal that the operation of groceries was the most and important detail to round off the day. Residents were able to shop in the groceries of neighborhood according to their means. For example, they could buy just half a pack of margarine, or liquid oil, or detergent and so on, and thus meet their daily needs. There were still such groceries, but respondents mentioned that shopping was not done as it was in the past. While they can still buy certain products by the gram such

8 Ibid., 235-6.

as cheese or olives, they have difficulties with packaged products such as detergent or margarine. Furthermore, these kinds of groceries are not as prevalent as they were in the past. The people of Sulukule were not wealthy before the urban renewal; however, they had more available strategies to survive. Moreover, the people that left Sulukule and moved to Taşoluk during the urban renewal project returned to Sulukule even poorer. The absence of peddlers and corner groceries is a significant setback for them.

§ 4.3 Courtyard Houses vs. TOKİ[9]

The most important reason that subsistence conditions became worse is rent hikes. The most important reason for the increases is the collapse of the courtyard house typology, as well as lack of space to re-build them. These houses, which had been the most common housing style in Sulukule, usually had a gate. Between the gate and the house was a court in which there was a bathroom and, in some cases, a kitchen for common usage. When individuals from the family unit needed privacy due to a change in their marital status, a new "room" was constructed for them in the yard. Sometimes, these rooms were let out in return for a low rent. According to respondents, the rates ranged from 80 to 150 liras in today's currency. Additionally, renters had the opportunity to pay the rent late when they were unable to earn enough money. Usually, there was a kinship tie between the landlord and the renter. Renters comprised the group that left Sulukule to move to the newly established TOKİ houses in Taşoluk. They were by far the poorest segment of Sulukule community. I was not able to obtain clear information about how many families moved to Taşoluk. The respondent I interviewed in Sulukule claimed that around 600 families moved there. They also mentioned that only around fifty have not yet sold their share; they underscored that none of those is of Romani ethnicity. Most who left for Taşoluk returned to the nearby Karagümrük neighborhood. Because of the absence of creative living strategies, which had allowed for survival in the form of a day-to-day lifestyle –corner groceries, courtyard houses, and peddlers- they have become poorer than before. The

9 Abbreviation of the Housing Development Administration of Turkey. In Daily Turkish, TOKİ also refers to the apartment buildings constructed under the coordination of TOKİ (w.n.).

rent of a house in which a Romani family willconsent to live starts at 500 Turkish lira – approximately five times higher than before. The experience of P, who left for Taşoluk but returned to Sulukule, makes it easier to understand the situation. P's family has been living in Sulukule since 1480, and he claimed he possessed Ottoman property deeds. Because he could not live together with six families as in the past, he had to become a renter. In other words, he was formerly a landlord, but now a renter now like the rest of his extended family.

An explanation of the policy with regard to renters will be on point. Previous homeowners in the renewed area had the right to join the project as title holders for newly constructed TOKİ houses. The Fatih Municipality dedicated TOKİ houses in Taşoluk, located 40 kilometers away from Sulukule, to occupants and renters of the courtyard houses and rooms. Although to become a homeowner of the TOKİ houses in Taşoluk required certain preconditions – applicants also had to participate in a drawing- renters in old Sulukule were exempted from the process. However, they had to pay eighteen-month installment in return. The installment rates were manageable for a family with a regular income but it was hard to pay the installment (whatever the amount) for ones that obtained their livelihood from a day-to-day lifestyle. In other words, when irregularities in the way of life was confronted with even a tiny regularity, subjects suffered from the transformation. The installment rates were fixed to wholesale and consumer price indices; therefore, they increased annually.[10] When the renters were in Sulukule, they were doing daily jobs or piecework and earning their livelihood one way or another; however, they did not have opportunities to maintain these routine businesses in the new region of Taşoluk.[11] Therefore, the installment rates became unmanagable. P shared his own experience emphasizing the lack of spaces for peddling or musical performance, such that the routine occupations of the Romani community could not be undertaken:

> *I am a musician; I am a master of percussion. I had a private car in those days and a coffee house down the street. [Sometimes] I had a phone call*

10 Elif İnce, "Sulukule Evleri Duble Borca Battı," *Radikal*, November 12, 2012, accessed June 14, 2016, http://www.radikal.com.tr/turkiye/sulukule-evleri-duble-borca-batti-1107479/.

11 Ali Dağlar, "Rak Rak Raki, Yaktın Bizi TOKI," *Hürriyet*, March 25, 2009, accessed June 14, 2016, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/rak-rak-raki-yaktin-bizi-toki-11282561.

> *like "P, we have a program in Taksim at x." Ok. I was going 45 km to and from my home, taking my instrument, dressing up well, and coming back [to Sulukule to meet friends] to go to Taksim. I was meeting with my friends and going to Taksim. I was finishing my work at Taksim around 3 a.m. I was going back home in one hour. And the clock was read 4 a.m. I went to Taşoluk to see if I could succeed, but it was really hard.*

A similar experience was mentioned by M. One of M's friends was Romani, working in Sulukule, but living in Taşoluk. He was around twenty-five, and had just married when he moved there. Because he could not find proper work around Taşoluk, he was going to Sulukule every morning with the Taşoluk-Edirnekapı service. However, his job usually was not finished by 8 p.m., which was the time the service returned-, so he had to go to Taşoluk with public transportation. He explained that his reason to move back to Sulukule was "I even cannot touch my wife's hand."

When the conventional lifestyle of Sulukle and people's working and living conditions are considered, community members cannot pay regular installments however small. Particularly, once lines of business that the Romani community had dominated –such as carriage driving and entertainment – started to be limited by legal regulations, the community became even poorer. The courtyard house system was the only thing that remained from the past, and it was lost due to the urban renewal project. In the end, they had to sell their living spaces, too. The main reason for this unwritten obligation was the enactment of a law on "Renovating, Conserving and Actively Using Dilapidated Historical and Cultural Immovable Assets" numbered 5366 and dated 16.06.2005. In the third article of the law, "Implementation", the method of the renewal was outlined:

> In the areas designated as renovation areas, special provincial administrations and municipalities shall implement or cause public entities or natural or legal persons to implement the renovation projects which special provincial administrations and municipalities have prepared or caused to prepare. In such areas, it shall be possible to implement the projects jointly with the Housing Development Administration or cause the same to implement them.

> In metropolises, district and first-tier municipalities shall alone or jointly implement or cause to implement the projects not initiated by metropolitan municipalities.

District municipalities were given full authorization in the implementation of renewal, renovation, or gentrification projects. In the forth article of the same law, "Restrictions on Property Rights and Expropriation," the situation of immovable properties was designated:

> The special provincial administration or the municipality may impose temporary restrictions of construction, utilization or operation on the existing immovable properties in the areas declared as renovation areas until the project is completed.
>
> Mutual agreement shall be the fundamental rule in dealing with the evacuation, demolition and expropriation of buildings located in the renovation areas. Where an agreement is not reached, special provincial administrations and municipalities may expropriate the immovable property owned by natural persons or private law legal persons… Special provincial administrations and municipalities may, if they deem suitable, instead of expropriating the immovable property, purchase the property, exchange it on the basis of land for flat, or establish limited property rights through usufruct rights or right of construction as regulated in the relevant Articles of the Turkish Civil Code No. 4721.

How the articles included in the law were practiced and became reality can be clearly observed in the Sulukule project. The legal entity that dealt with Sulukule residents in the purchase and expropriation of the immovable properties was Fatih Municipality. During the process, the municipality used its full authority, given by the Law 5366. I focus on the statements of former residents whose immovable properties were expropriated or bought by the municipality. At the initial stages of the project, the market value of the old Sulukule houses was set at 500 Turkish lira per square meter. If we assume that the houses were approximately 100 square meters, then the title owner would get 50 thousand Turkish lira from the municipality. In case owners were un-

willing to sell, they were reminded of the expropriation rights of the municipality. In other words, former residents were obliged to sell their houses. Title owners were given the right to participate in the housing project to be built in the renewal area, but the minimum market value of a house in the project was set at 109 thousand Turkish lira. In short, the title owners had the right to participate on the condition that they paid the set market value (a minimum of 109 thousand Turkish Lira) over 180 months (15 years). The monthly installments would be indexed to changes in the Wholesale Price Index and Consumer Price Index, which meant that payments would increase annually even if there was no meaningful change in the monthly income of the participants.[12] Families which did not have a regular income could not cooperate with such a project. They explain the reason simply as "It was not a loan we could dare to risk." People who participated in the project regret because of the never-ending, ever-growing loan. When I asked how they consented to a project in which their housing rights were obviously violated, they usually replied:

> *They told us they would not be unfair against any of us; the houses would be very nice. We were fooled… I regret it for all the people I convinced to participate in the project."*
>
> *Around the spring of 2005, they told us about urban renewal. It was a weird term to us, we did not know what was happening. It was said that the neighborhood was going to be renovated. Of course we all want our children to grow up in a better area. People coming from the municipality said that they were going to tear down our houses and build new ones. Mustafa Demir [the mayor at the time] told us that they would even pay for our trees… They paid for even the planted trees and disintegrated all of us.*

The same person mentioned that he did not understand how he had become burdened with a debt above the market value of his old house.

12 Elif İnce, "Sulukule: Bir Dokun Bin Ah İşit," *Radikal*, August 2, 2013, accessed June 14, 2016, http://www.radikal.com.tr/turkiye/sulukule-bir-dokun-bin-ah-isit-1144770/.

They set the market value as 500 TL per square meter. If you had a 100 square meter house, then its return was 50 thousand TL. But if you participated in the project, then you had to pay 150 thousand TL. It is impossible for our people to pay this price. There is no regular income. As a matter of fact, after the taverns were shut down, peddling was prohibited, and carriage driving was prohibited, we become insolvent over night. If you buy my house for 50 thousand, why would I become indebted for 150 thousand TL [for the same number of square meters]?.. It [the municipality] says that you either have to sell your house to me or I pay the money to the bank and I expropriate it. Strangers [most of the time brokers or contractors] offered higher than the municipality. [They asked] how much does the municipality pay? [We answered] 50 thousand TL. [They said,] I am ready to pay 60 thousand; sell your house to me. Because kids did not have the means, they could not participate in the project. On the other hand, if one cannot pay the installments for three years, they [the authorities] sequester your share. How could the people pay 750 TL, 1000 TL? Because rates were indexed to TEFE and TÜFE [Wholesale Price Index and Consumer Price Index], people who used to pay 750 TL now pay 1250 TL. It feels like I am a renter in my own house. Besides, there are also security and landscaping dues because of the gated system. And 15 years…

As mentioned, Sulukule is a precious land. If market value rents in the center of places in İstanbul are considered, brokers would obviously not miss the chance to own a house in return for such a small fee on such precious land. The market value of a 100 square meter house in Bakırköy was estimated between 210 to 660 thousand TL in 2015. The price was between 310 to 1.7 milllion TL in Beşiktaş, and 220 to 560 thousand TL in Kadıköy.[13] The average

13 The given prices referred to the lowest and highest values in the given districts. The lowest value for Bakırköy is in the Sakızağacı neighborhood (210.000 TL), whereas the highest rate is in Ataköy 2- 5-6 (660.000 TL.). The neighborhoods in Beşiktaş are Türkali (310.000 TL) and Bebek neighborhoods (1.700.000 TL), and in Kadıköy Rasimpaşa (220.000 TL) and Fenerbahçe (560.000 TL). Usually, the lowest prices belong to neighborhoods with not only old-fashioned style of settlement, but also poor living conditions; the highest ones are rich neighborhoods (w.n.).

market value of a 100 square meter house in Karagümrük is 376 thousand TL. These districts are the most central in İstanbul. Sulukule is already very central geographically. After the urban renewal, it become not only central, but included modern housing. When I conducted my research in Sulukule, I had the opportunity to talk with one of these brokers, a contractor. As mentioned by a respondent, he paid 60 thousand TL (instead of municipality's 50 thousand offer) to buyan old house in Sulukule as soon as the project was announced. In doing so, he owned the title and therefore had the right to participate in the housing project. He bought a two-bedroom house, the value of which was set 125 thousand TL on a 180-month installment plan. The day I talked with him, he put the house up for sale. The estimated market value and his expected profit were colossal. He put the house on sale for a n asking price of 600 thousand TL.

The people of Sulukule were aware of these kinds of profiteers;[14] but, preferred to sell their houses to whomever offered the highest price rather than incurring a debt that they could not be pay. They claimed that some municipal employees also benefited from their vulnerable position. When I claimed that there were legal limitations for municipal employees, P explained it as follows:

> *[Assume] you are the municipality officer, and I am the title owner. And this [M] is my man. This man [M] comes and buys the right to participate in the project from me. Then, he sells his house for 600-700 thousand TL and gives money to you.*

Only a few former residents became home-owners by the end of the project. All of these people were middle class or rich within their close community. In the initial phase of the project, 120 houses were constructed. Due to courtyard house typology, more than 120 families were displaced. However, only 120 families had the right to participate in the project as shareholders.

As I mentioned in the Chapter 3, some respondents strongly rejected the "Gypsy" identity and claimed that the Gypsies of Sulukule were those 12-13

14 "Sulukule'de Dudak Uçuklatan Rant," *Radikal*, October 9, 2011, accessed June 14, 2016, http://www.radikal.com.tr/turkiye/sulukulede-dudak-ucuklatan-rant-1065796/.
"Sulukule'nin Rantsal Dönüşümü," *Radikal*, March 18, 2009, accessed June 14, 2016, http://www.radikal.com.tr/turkiye/sulukulenin-rantsal-donusumu-926779/.

families living near the walls. On the other hand, some highlighted their pride in being" Romani." It cannot be ignored that the exclusionary, marginalizing tendency within the community was related to the unfavorable stigma of the word "Gypsy." In other words, some Romanis refused to identify themselves as Gypsy because they equate being a Gypsy to inferior stigmas in de facto social codes. On the other hand, they define their ethnic identity as Romani due to the authenticity of the word as a concept. This tendency can be seen as a normal reflex when the pejorative attributions of the word "Gypsy" are considered. Nevertheless, the relation of such a segregationist practice and the urban renewal project becomes understandable in the respondents' answers:

> *As a first step, the ones that supported the project established an association when the project was announced. Then, title owners established another association. Neither of them is still in effect. The ones living near the walls were against the urban renewal project. Thus, in order to discredit them, they practiced a separate-disintegrate-eradicate strategy. The ones who supported the project claimed "They are not one of us, they are making bad businesses." Otherwise, none of the people in Sulukule can dare to claim "I have never gained money around the walls [referring taverns]." There were people from here [Sulukule] and outsiders; but all were Romanis. Additionally, there were not twelve or thirteen but thirty-three enterprises there before they collapsed, of which 70 % were from Sulukule.*

I will later focus on how the neighborhood transformed after the urban renewal. However, at this point, I touch upon how the stigmatization and separationist practices within the community –as an offshoot of the project- were perceived. I explained in detail the exclusion and stigmatization practices against Gypsy society in the previous chapter. In this part, I will analyze the findings to show how learned attitudes during this process of stigmatization were activated – by members of the stigmatized community, within the community, and against community members-when personal interests were issue.

§ 4.4 The Collapse

Respondents, who claimed that "Gypsy" and "Romani" refer to the same thing were aware of their stigmas. When I asked their reaction to their stigmas, the extortion of their rights, and the destruction of their original way of life, P explained:

> *In the Taksim-Gezi Park protests, the whole country rebelled because of trees. We did not participate. Why? Because it was Taksim. They called themselves leftists, but I do not believe that. They were not real leftists; the real left would not act as they did. There were a lot of historical artifacts [discovered] during the demolition of the neighborhood. They built a swimming pool over the historical water cistern. The walls and the area around the walls had witnessed the history. Byzantine, Roman, Ottoman history… History was engraved the here. All of it world heritage, but no one made a sound.*

P's manner was confident. He explained his opinion on the issue; so, it is not possible to quote him directly. However, from his opinions and his manner it can be said that he thought people did not interfere in the renewal project because of the stigmas and exclusion of the "Gypsiness;" they preferred to keep silent. Moreover, he linked the attitude of the rest of society to the reality he described: "…because the Romani community is the weakest link of the Republic." He thinks the reason lying behind the underdeveloped position of his community is the low level of education among its members:

> *We did not obtain an education. We remained ignorant.*

E further explained the ruse of the municipality on the implementing of a renewal project that so drastically and visibly violated rights of the community:

> *They think "We even hit their heads, afterward we give them candy and fool them…" While our houses were being demolished in Sulukule, we did not even throw a pebble to the police. We protested with our music and dance. We taught the meaning of democracy to the wise people.*

Fraser argues that the excluded groups are confronted with exclusionary practices due to their incompatibility with the institutionalized patterns of mainstream systems of value. In the mainstream class structure, upwardly mobility is possible for ones who obtain higher education. The lack of education among an excluded part of society again prevents their upwardly mobility in their given society. On the other hand, lack of education did not cause undemocratic protests against the urban renewal project. Certainly, the people of Sulukule used music and dance in their protest during the renewal. A rap band named Tahribad-ı İsyan, all of the members of which are Romani, emerged in reaction. Tahribad-ı İsyan place their videos in the renewed area. The audience usually thinks the band was an answer.[15] In a documentary called "World Music" produced by BBC World – currently in post-production – the band found its place.

Although the protests were held democratically –and in fact, as the people of Sulukule mentioned, the Romani society never objected to the state's policies[16]– there were many smear campaigns against the Sulukule community during the pre-project period. I mentioned the collapse of taverns due to a false report by "Haber Özel" about prostitution in Sulukule. Such false news were strategies to accelerate the legitimation of the demolition policy. The people of Sulukule are also aware that the location of the neighborhood is valuable. But they sometimes claimed that the neighborhood was destroyed not only for its material value, but because the society was against their lifestyle. The respondents exemplified that community members were aware of the process of criminalization of their neighborhood. P's treatment of the issue summarizes the situation:

> *They did it because they are against our way of life. It should be called assimilation. We experienced here a neighborhood culture perish; a family was dispatched from its own place. We witnessed how our solidarity was annihilated… In such cases, a divide and conquer strategy is implemented. If I want to erase you, I smear you… How could they accomplish*

15 Pınar Öğünç, "Biz Onlara Göre Kirliyiz!," *Radikal*, May 16, 2012, accessed June 1, 2016, http://www.radikal.com.tr/hayat/biz-onlara-gore-kirliyiz-1088121/.

16 "Romanların Yaşadıkları Hep Aynı", *Evrensel*, January 18, 2010, accessed June 14, 2016, http://www.evrensel.net/haber/193095/romanlarin-yasadiklari-hep-ayni.

it without smearing?... Again, it was not urban renewal, it was the transformation of rents. In alternative projects, both owners and renters were able to get a house, but the municipality rejected them. It was a dispatch project. They wanted to dispatch… People moved out of the neighborhood, but they did so because they were forced to.

Yet, it cannot be claimed that the Sulukule renewal project was entirely an assimilation and dispatch project. It is remarkable that in a city like İstanbul, which has completed its globalization process, finding places for mass housing projects is almost impossible without a destruction or displacement project, Sulukule's location is strategically important and valuable. The community's close feature, and its members' distanced from state authorities made them vulnerable. They were an easy target for displacement. As expected, its strategic position led to a hike in rents after the urban renewal project.[17] Still, it is beneficial to revisit Byrne's argument in this context. He emphasizes that the construction of a new cultural order in a segregated place results in an increase in the social gap between the excluded community and the rest of the society.

Another important point is that in the renewed area, the ones that belong to middle class – at least in Turkish social system – had the opportunity to acquire a house, if not the Romani residents of Sulukule. Although not a direct or intentional intervention into an original lifestyle, Law 5366 – enacted in 2005 concurrent with the begin of the renewal project–indeed refers to obtaining maximal profit from this valuable location. The people of Sulukule used to be homeowners, living in courtyard houses together with five or six families. Whatever the physical conditions of the houses, they were destroyed by the end of the project. Although former old residents were satisfied with their "getting by" conditions, they were aware that the renewal policies were easily enacted in Sulukule because of the residents' Romani identity. It was a continuation of exclusionary, destructive, and devastating policies against Romani society. P's opinion about the real aims of the project may be taken as a summary of their muted position with respect to these kinds of policies:

17 Nuriye Doğu, "Ganimet Toplama Zamanı!," *Radikal*, January 1, 2012, accessed June 14, 2016, http://www.radikal.com.tr/ekonomi/ganimet-toplama-zamani-1074199/.

We are one of the main components of the Republic of Turkey. We are not minorities. I mean, my ancestors migrated to İstanbul in 1480 and settled around the walls… However, we are vagrants. Think about Jewish society. There is too much talk about the Holocaust, right? Worse than that was carried out against Romanis; but we can't prove it because we are vagrants. There is no record of those slaughters, performed against nomadic societies like Romanis. It is not talked about. Why they are executed? Because they [Romanis] are seen a kind of evil.

In this sense, the Roma in Sulukule are aware that the urban renewal policy is a practice of the elimination of the "impure."

I mentioned before, the state gave right to the former renters in Sulukule to become shareholders of housing project in Taşoluk in return for a 180 months' installment plan. Almost all of the Romanis ended up selling their shares in Taşoluk petty prices and return to the area around Sulukule. Some of preferred to live in peripheral districts such as Beylikdüzü due to the relatively lower rents compared to the central neighborhoods of İstanbul. I could not find definite information about how many still lived in Taşoluk, but these limitations aside, according to information I collected during the fieldwork, it seems that about forty of the initial 350 families still live in Taşoluk. Respondents claimed that none of those remaining were Romani. For example, M moved to Taşoluk after the project and still lives there. He was born in Sulukule. He was from Erzurum and had no kinship connection to the Romani community. In addition, M had had a regular income from an insured job even before the project. He was able to establish a social network due to his work for a political party in his new neighborhood. Moreover, he claimed he had no difficulties adapting to his new neighborhood, as well as finding a job. He related his experience as follows:

We get accustomed to Taşoluk. The opportunity [to leave Sulukule to become a shareholder in Taşoluk's housing project] took place at a terrible moment. Our financial situation was very bad. I am speaking of myself. We endured and now I am at ease. Of course, sometimes I think of returning [to Sulukule] – in the end, we are from Sulukule – but when I consider my children, I do not return. The neighborhood is worse now. It was not like that before. We have gotten accustomed to Taşoluk. We did

> *not experience any exclusion there. Only the ones whose jobs were in Sulukule had difficulties. 95 percent of those who moved here returned. When rents of the houses in Taşoluk increased, everyone sold their homes. There are factories in Taşoluk; if someone wants to work, there are opportunities here. As I mentioned, when we moved, I was not initially confronted with any difficulty. Neither did [the people already living in Taşoluk] discriminate against us. There was also a cohesive aura. For example, I recently needed some money to change out my car, and I received the needed amount from new friends in Taşoluk.*

Some people in Sulukule, who had had a regular income due from regular jobs before the project were not confronted with discrimination due to their ethnicity. They did not experience an adaptation problem and regularized their lives in Taşoluk. In fact, they have been able to generate social and their human relations improved so much that they can ask for loans from their new friends. On the other hand, the process was not so for the Romani movers. They conceded to sell their houses due to a strange and unusual social system that they had not experienced during their lives in Sulukule. The tragic dimension of the incident is that they cannot justify the necessity of selling their shares in Taşoluk. As mentioned, the Neslişah and Hatice Sultan neighborhoods are separate, but together the Sultan neighborhood, comprised mostly of a Romani population. Both neighborhoods were united into the Karagümrük neighborhood before the last elections. I interviewed Karagümrük chief official (*muhtar*) during my fieldwork, he mentioned that he was born and raised in Karagümrük, but strongly differentiated himself from the Roma. He used pejorative statements about the Romani community referring their impurity. Yet, he underscored the necessity of former renters who had moved to Taşoluk to sell their shares:

> *The renters were determined [before the project]. They became house owners with 300 TL installments. We followed the process in Taşoluk from the start to the completion of the roofs of the houses. These ignorant people sold their shares with return of 5 thousand, 7 thousand or 10 thousand TL at this time. The ones who waited for a while sold for 30 or 40 thousand TL. For example, there was Mehmet, who was stealing, robbing. Mehmet says, "I cannot live here [in Taşoluk]; I am going to starve."*

Mehmet has not actively worked for forty years, will he do so in Taşoluk?!... Romanis were not appreciative…

The chief official obviously did not approve of the process by which shares were sold out. Likewise, he did not endorse the Romani way of life. He was familiar with the Romani lifestyle, but although he was raised confronting the Romani way of life, he attributed their dispossession after the project to their own "ignorance." When we consider such an exclusionary attitude that habituated to the Roma, it is clear that waiting for protective action from state authorities is useless. As Bourdieu mentions, residents of a stigmatized place are perceived as "demeaned" subjects, just because of their living spaces. The reasons behind their attempts to sell their shares are not questioned: "They sold their shares because they are Gypsies". A dialogue with P is conclusive:

M.S.: Suppose that I had gone to municipal officials and claimed that there were x *number of houses, you made* y *number of people house owners, but* z *number of people became dispossessed and were mistreated. What would their answer be?*
P: [Laughing] They would say; "We gave houses to all of them, but they sold the houses because they are Gypsies."

In summary, after a renewal project in a region where former residents' way of life was ignored, many people were confronted with dispossession. Almost none of the people of Sulukule benefit from currently increased rents as title owners. Moreover, almost all of the families that participated in the housing project in Sulukule struggled with ever-growing installment rates. After the renewal project, the people of Sulukule had to deal with the state much more than before. It was an extraordinary experience for them: they had been able to stand outside of bureaucratic processes or connect only at minimum level due to their lifestyle. The neighborhood system paralleled this lifestyle. By the time of the renewal project, most of the lines of employments they had taken up over time were prohibited; however, they were able to find solutions to survive without sacrificing their way of living. At that time the threat was larger: they would lose their housing rights because they could not complete their payment… that is how bureaucracy is organized and ordered. Unsurprisingly, they could not regularly continue to pay the installments, and had to sell their

shares for nothing. They became even poorer due to the increased rental rates when they returned to their old neighborhood. Unfortunately, it was impossible to reestablish the old neighborhood system due to the transformations of the location and system of settlement.

In the following section, I try to analyze the current condition of reunited residents and the situation of Sulukule after its renewal.

§ 4.5 Gentrification or Destruction

Most families in Taşoluk returned to the neighborhood formerly named Sultan Mahallesi. I did not get exact information about the number who returned. The claims range from 335 to 600. According to one respondent, 337 Romani families moved to Taşoluk, of which 332 returned to Sulukule after selling their shares. News reports boister this claim.[18] When they return, they were poorer. The main reason for their impoverishment was the disproportionate increase in their rents. Before they left Sulukule, the market value of rents was around 100-150 TL; five years later, they were to a minimum of 500 TL. When the legal rates of rental increases in Turkey are considered, the current value of which is 10 percent per year, the highest end rate, should be about 243 TL at the end of 5 years. 600 TL is almost three times larger. Also, renters in Sulukule used to live with relatives. In this context, it is likely that rents would would have increased than the legal rate; moreover, they had an option to delay payment until they had enough money. G explained this situation as follows:

> *Because renters and landlords knew each other closely, renters could insist on paying "not today, but tomorrow." Because there is no such opportunity in the current situation, they pay their rents by borrowing from another person.*

In suppert, P, who was a homeowner in the former Sulukule but a renter after the renewal project, mentioned that he was able to pay the rent regularly, but his electricity bill had accured to about 6500 TL.

18 Reyhan Gül, "334 Aile Sulukule'ye Döndü," *Haber 7,* September 11, 2011, accessed September 17, 2015, http://m.haber7.com/haberDetay.php?id=783287#

Another reason for impoverishment was restrictions or the extinction of different businesses. People, who used to earn their daily keep through petty jobs, struggle to create new employment opportunities. Almost all of the occupations that they were accustomed to –such as peddling, carriage driving or *unkacilik* – are now prohibited. In addition, the newcomers handle almost all of the new businesses that appeared in the renewed area, such as groceries and bakeries. It will be beneficial to introduce the general profile of the newcomers through my own field experience would be beneficial.

The first three persons I met in my first field visit to the renewed area and asked for directions knew neither English nor Turkish. When I walked down the streets of the renewed area, I realized the signboards of the shops were written in Arabic. After a long search, I found an estate agent run by a former resident of Sulukule. She claimed that almost all of the new residents were Syrian refugees, mentioning that these refugees were wealthy ones with professions. The number of the refugees was so high that some opened small enterprises like groceries or bakery stores, sustained by through Arabic-speaking customers. Luxury cars with Syrian license on the streets of the renewed area attracted. According to news reports in the local dailies, the villa type houses built during the renewal project in Sulukule had become the new living space of the "white Syrians." [19] This fact, of upper-middle class Syrians settling down to live in Sulukule is as a radical level of transformation. The newcomers were not only upper-class foreigners, but war-weary ones. They led change around the neighborhood both with respect to on the class relations and ethnic differentiation, simultaneously. At the neighborhood level, Sultan Mahallesi, which was formerly identified as Romani, is now home to Syrians, a transformation even reflected to the signboards of the shops in the neighborhood. Furthermore, a strange cohesion problem arose due to the transformation. A mass who cannot communicate due to language and cultural barriers mushroomed in the middle of the neighborhood. There were also houses open to Syrian refugees or students where the rent share is calculated per bed. In these cases, many people live together in two or three-bedroom apartments.

19 "Beyaz Suriyeliler Burada Yaşıyor," *Milliyet*, January 1, 2015, accessed September 17, 2016 http://www.milliyet.com.tr/beyaz-suriyeliler-burada-yasiyor-gundem-2000265/

After the settlement of Syrians, those returning from Taşoluk started to live at the margins of their old neighborhood. Because of the authentic aspects of their shops, they became competitors to the older shopkeepers of Sulukule. Needless to say, the future of business life in Sulukule is unknown.

As a result of the newcomers who established a particular life inside their community, there was no connection to the Romani community. It was strange to the Roma, who have become accustomed to socializing and conducting their everyday routines on the streets –even weddings and fights. During the fieldwork, all of the respondents mentioned that there was no cohesion between Syrians and Roma. They did not visit each other's houses on special days such as holidays or for wedding ceremonies.

The physical appearance of the neighborhood transformed along with the social structure. The neighborhood that formerly called Sultan Mahallesi was connected to Karagümrük in the 2014 local election. It was composed of old buildings, but only a few were designated as historical. Formerly, the housing typologies were not uniform, which means that the houses were not a single style. However, the new houses were built all the same style are jarring in between these old buildings. Moreover, the green spaces mentioned in the land project has not built. The lack of green place was realized by the former he residents of Sulukule. A former resident of whom I asked an opinion about the renewed area answered:

> *The houses are now very brown: It's too bad. Formerly, they were purple, blue, green, yellow, and red… very beautiful.*

I have not any evidence in the fieldwork or in the literature review that the project was approved in the sense of aesthetics or social concerns. It is impossible not notice the absence of an aesthetic in the renewed area.

My argument in this chapter is to indicate the relationship of the lifestyle and the formulation of living space. I showed that human elements and the characteristics of a location are not enough to sustain or rebuild a peculiar lifestyle. Although most former residents return to their old neighborhood of Sulukule, they were unable to return to their former lifestyle, as they had hoped. The reason for this was the absolute departure of the current living space a form that of a close community's living space. This situation of the

neighborhood prevents a return to the customary human, social, and economic solidarity. In other words, in the former neighborhood everyone knew other residents' professions whether legal or illegal. This awareness increased the recognition of safe and unsafe regions in the neighborhood. When people came back, they settled in dispersed houses found at the margins of the neighborhood. Furthermore, there was a significant increase drug dealing in the temporary absence of the former residents. Among the people I interviewed, the principle complaint was the dispersion illegal dealings and thus threatening the safety of the neighborhood as a whole. C, who distinguished the Romani community living near the walls that were against the renewal project, thus positing himself with a better social status, mentioned this safety problem:

> *Formerly, the people near the city walls did not walk the streets, but when the neighborhood dissolved, everyone came here. It is worse than in the pre-renewal period.*

Romani community was able to construct a safer neighborhood in accordance with the certain lines of business, as the common explanations of P and C show:

> *Formerly, drug dealers were very known well. Think about it: There was a drug dealer on this corner, there were taverns on that corner; there were porters at this corner, there were craftsmen at this corner, there was a mosque and religious folk at this corner, etc., etc. … Everyone belonged to their own circle. For example, suppose that I need some drugs; then, I can get it at this corner. Suppose that I want to go to a tavern; and then I would go to that corner. Do I need to pray? Then, I go to that corner. I used to know exactly what was where. What happened now? The craftsmen sell drugs, the thieves sell drugs, and the religious people sell drugs… Everything is a mess… Besides, there are new [drug] dealers that we have not seen before. They fight with each other, and I pay the price for their fights.*

Similar responses by M who moved to Taşoluk and stayed there, and E, who stayed in Sulukule during and after the renewal, explain the chaotic situation. I mentioned that M does not have Romani origins; yet, he was not excluded from the solidarity network of Sulukule where he was born and grew up:

> *Formerly, everyone knew each other. Suppose that I had dared to buy drugs as a Sulukule boy. The dealer would not sell to me because I was from the neighborhood. Not only that, he would complain about me to my family. That is to say, everyone used to protect each other and their children in the neighborhood. Now, they intercept me and ask for money even when I walk on the street.*

Similarly, E complained about the unsafe environment of the neighborhood:

> *They also intercept me. I endured during the project and did not move elsewhere, but I cannot stand it anymore. I think about moving. We grew up playing in the streets, but I do not let my own children play in the same streets anymore. There is no business around here. Now, I am working on it, ... If I can set it up, I am going to move to Denizli.*

Although I cannot compare the former or latter safety situation of the neighborhood, the frequent warnings of former residents with whom I came face-to-face during the fieldwork – especially while making interviews alone – suggest that residents feel more unsafe compared to the pre-renewal period. They repeatedly reminded me I should drop their names in case someone intercepted me to ask for money. The demolition of the neighborhood's physical structure has an impact on the safety criteria of the people of Sulukule. In this respect, Bauman's argument that residents of a ghetto feel secure on the condition that others obey the constructed social order in everyday life has been actualized in the case of Sulukule.

Obviously, safe and unsafe areas of the former neighborhood were set in accordance with the businesses that they conducted. Even though the borders of these zones were not perceptibly drawn, residents knew them from daily practice. In fact, residents who crossed the borders and wandered around unsafe areas knew that their families would be informed. Moreover, almost all respondents expressed without hesitation that Roma are easily prone to start quarrelling. The intensity of the quarrels was not felt so much due to the dispersion of coffee houses before the renewal. Incidentally, it should be emphasized that reports of Romani society's tendency to quarrel does not have scientific, anthropological backing; however, Romani individuals interviewed in

the field stressed this characteristic peculiarity of their community. I underscore this because the peculiarity is not a stigma attributed to the community, but a feature that members were at peace with. When the people of Sulukule talked about their relations in the neighborhood, they mentioned that there were daily quarrels over petty problems, but resolution come as easily as the fights. Fortunately, quarrels were kept in check due to the dispersion of coffee houses, most of which were– since closed. Each coffee house had its own regular patrons; thus, people argued in zones. Coffee houses were also an important venue for the socialization of male day laborers. As mentioned before, former residents are unaccustomed to the living spaces in the neighborhood after the renewal project, which limits the space for living and for socializing. This resulted in the decrease of coffee houses to only one, while there were six or seven in the former neighborhood. Therefore, Romani men that socialized in the coffee houses are now limited to only one place. Indeed, whenever I visited this coffee house, I saw that it was crowded and had more patrons than its capacity allowed. This also means that quarrels between individuals are handled and resolved just in one private place. In other words, the people of Sulukule experience the hardship of being constrained in a confined space. This was also reflected in their daily quarrels. C explains:

> *Although we feel more comfortable at night due to the absence of music and entertainment, and although our neighborhood is more silent than before, as soon as we arrived at the coffee hose, there is always a quarrel. There is always a quarrel for petty reasons. Formerly, the quarrels between individuals were dispersed. Now, they are confined because they confined us. Formerly, there were 5-10 coffee houses, now there are not. Besides, police are not here anymore. When a quarrel occurs, policemen say "First, Romanis should take care of this, then we will arrive."*

P mentioned the hands-off tendency of the police force:

> *For example, I call 155, give the address, and explain that there is a quarrel in* x *street. They ask me whether there is a fatality or not. When I say "no," they say "well then, we'll come." But there no police come in the end.*

The neighborhood system of the former Sulukule was structured by determining zones according to lines of business to increase the safety of living spaces. Moreover, the structure was established according to the socialization places somewhat to eliminate the start of quarrels. Such a harmony currently cannot be established because of impoverishment, the higher degree of heterogeneity, and the confined living space.

Lastly, the solidarity system of the neighborhood was incapacitated as an indirect result of the renewal project. It was mentioned before that some systems catalyzed the hardships of the day-to-day lifestyle such as courtyard housing system or groceries that sold products piecemeal. Due also to the *unkacıs* or peddlers, most people of Sulukule were able to provide for their daily needs at rock-bottom prices. If all else failed, people compensated for each other when was necessary. To illustrate, P once supplied domestic water to one of his neighbors that was unable to pay the bill for fifteen days and therefore lacked water himself. Unfortunately, in the current situation of the neighborhood, such compensative acts are almost impossible. The most significant reason is the impoverishment of people; they are only able to supply their own needs. Furthermore, they cannot appreciate their reunion due to the hardships of being cramped. The only place left to reunite is a coffee house, but they underscored how hard it is to gather in such a limited space such as one small coffee house. We do not exactly know whether the authorities' implementation of the renewal project was aimed to eradicate the Romani way of life, but it should be mentioned that Romanis reunited in their old space, try to maintain the way of living to which they are accustomed, but under unfamiliar living conditions. On one hand, implicit classes within the community are much more visible, and this has led to a tendency to exclude the lower ones. On the other, the system and survival facilities that eased the plight of the lower class has faded away. Nowadays, around fifty people make do as solid waste collectors. A similar group started to work at İstanbul Municipality's parking lot company (İSPARK) stations as ushers. The rest earn money only when they can find a labor, and all are befuddled. This is not their neighborhood anymore, a neighborhood once harmonized with their way of life. They become attuned to their new location and its system of order instead of reconfiguring the new neighborhood system to their customary lifestyle. Most Romani now send their children to institutions of higher education; the fortune of their

musical "talent," which was claimed as "given," is uncertain. All in all, boundary-making procedures are maintained unless the built social system is recognized both by the insiders and outsiders of the Sulukule community, as Barth claims.

§ 4.6 Conclusion

This chapter showed the extent of the transformation due to urban renewal of everyday life in Sulukule. Mainly, this chapter showed that the former neighborhood structure was based on a delicate balance. This to show, I stressed the relationship between the neighborhood structure and the Romani way of living.

As explored through findings in the fieldwork, the neighborhood was organized according to the priorities of the Sulukule community. Because the people of Sulukule were surviving with day labor and uncertain incomes, the neighborhood structure was convenient for maintaining their occupations. Likewise, the courtyard house system was ideal for fulfilling their housing needs.

Another important dimension of the neighborhood was its congruity with the Sulukule community's day-to-day lifestyle. Because the daily income was uncertain, trading practices in shops were designed accordingly. Due to such facilities, residents were able to round off the day meeting their daily needs with whatever money they had.

Although the people of Sulukule were accustomed to the structure of their former neighborhood and were able to manage possible dangers, the neighborhood was vulnerable to crime. In that context, they established a system where safe and unsafe zones were clearly determined; thus, residents did not experience safety problems. Currently, residents feel unsafe in their neighborhood because drug dealers have moved in after the urban renewal. The mainstream society started to criminalize the neighborhood before the renewal project. However, interviewees strongly argue that the neighborhood became criminalized after the project because of the detrimental impacts of gentrification. They mentioned that the homogeneity of the neighborhood was irrep-

arably damaged, and that criminals came to the neighborhood after the project. Moreover, an in-group solidarity network was vital for the day-to-day lifestyle for immediate compensations when it was needed. However, it was also damaged after the project.

All in all, this chapter presented several important dimensions of the demolishing effects of gentrification for the lives of the former residents of Sulukule. When the project started, authorities promised shareholders a better life in better conditions. However, they became poorer and were forced to live in a less safe neighborhood. Before the subversion, Sulukule was identified with authentic Romani identity. This fame allowed them to maintain lives according to the community's cultural codes, but also offered a more decent image. After the project, the "Gypsy" stigma became more prominent, even within the community. Separations and groupings occurred, impairing the solidarity network.

5

Conclusion

In this thesis, I tried to discover the impacts of exclusion on the social structure of Sulukule. On the other hand, the impacts of the urban renewal project on this social structure was analyzed. To this end, I stressed the theoretical explanations of Douglas' study of pure and impure spaces and Bauman's enquiry into how groups are transformed into closed communities and how they construct their in-community value systems. These are the best theories for understanding both the exclusion of Sulukule as well as the reasons why Sulukule's community structure perished after the subversion of the living space.

The framework of pure and impure spaces is constructed in an unknown time. Social agents attach to norms as they are given. The pure and polluted spaces and social agents are detected according to the construction of social codes. The pure takes on protective operations. The polluted, on the other hand, is exposed to exclusionary practices. The stigma of contamination is arbitrary; the start, reasons, and way to eliminate it are unknown. All we know is that the agent or space is stigmatized as impure and becomes excluded due to its incompatibility with the existing social schemes. The excluded experiences the process more than those doing the excluding: The excluded space is marginalized due to the way of life there. The excluded are exposed to discrimination in different areas of life, such as the labor market or health services. On the other hand, exclusionary practices can be implicit in everyday practices. The space of the excluded, which is at the margins of a given society,

is deemed impure space. Those within of excluded groups are recognized as impure in context of the attached stigma. Those doing the excluding operate in a manner to avoid the impure in their everyday practices.

While social interaction is needed among stigmatized people, the mainstream society tends to treat to the inhabitants of excluded spaces as social pariahs. In other words, the means of interaction is established by the exctern al society. In the end, the ambiguity of the stigma becomes rationalized by making the stigmatized dependent on the norms and value structure of mainstream society. As a result of their pariah position, an illusion that those in the mainstream society seems are masters is generated. This illusion increases discrimination against the marginalized; they become vulnerable to multiple dimensions of exploitation: the lines of employment characteristic of impure spaces can be prohibited anytime, and their living spaces can be demolished by state policies. Even the citizenship rights can be revoked. Mead explains:

> …[I]n those social situations in which the individual self feels dependent for his continuation or continued existence upon the rest of the members of the given social group to which he belongs, it is true that no feeling of superiority on his part toward those other members of that group is necessary to his continuation or continued existence. But in those social situations in which he cannot, for the time being, integrate his social relations with other individual selves into a common, unitary pattern …, there ensues, temporarily …, an attitude of hostility, of "latent opposition," on his part toward the organized society or social community of which he is a member; and during that time the given individual self must "call in" or rely upon the feeling of superiority toward that society or social community, or toward its other individual members, in order to buoy himself up and "keep himself going" as such.[1]

The reason for their dependent and excluded position is attributed to the community structure to which they belong. Thus, individuals may assimilate themselves to organize their interactions in line with the mainstream society.

1 George Herbert Mead, *Mind, Self, and Society* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2015), 305-6.

The stigma or excluded position can be eliminated at an individualistic level. However, the stigma is stable when the group to which they belong is considered. In the cases where the stigma is rigid and cannot be escaped under any circumstances, the stigmatized group constructs a sui generis social structure inside of their group. Through that social structure the community sets itself apart from the external (i.e. modern) society, on the one hand. On the other, they become homogenized. Consequently, members become familiarize with both the internal and external systems of values.

The Roma have experienced extreme exclusion procedures in every society in which they have lived. Their segregated living spaces are determined impure, unsafe or criminal. This is precisely because the stigmas attached to them are ethnic; however, it is impossible to make precise conclusions about the roots of their ethnic stigma. All can be said is that they have a unique way of living, and most of the time this uniqueness ended in an extreme process of marginalization. If they are not confronted by exclusionary practices, it is probably because their peculiar community features are romanticized by a given host society. Thus, they either become animalized or fantasized, but their internal reality is never contended with. They become excluded or romanticized tautologically as categorical stereotypes.[2] For this reason, Kligman criticizes the general handling of Roma society:

> Prejudice against Romani is customarily predicated on racialized, social-cultural "features" attributed to them by others and by which they are, tautologically, identified and essentialized… Among "racially" dictated practices and characteristics customarily assigned by non-Romani to Romani are that they are "dirty," "uncivilized," "not to be trusted," "immoral," "thieves." They are poor and will always remain so because they do not engage in "honest work" for a living; they live off of others, whether through begging, theft, or social assistance. They

2 Gail Kligman, "On the Social construction of Otherness: Identifying the Romani in Post-Socialist Communities," *Review of Sociology* 7/ 2 (2007): 62.

> dress differently and unconventionally. In short… the Romani are a race born "other," a different people.[3]

Ethnic categories like Turkish or Romani are not given but they are social constructions that strongly affect social relations and fuel discrimination. They are not frozen, but change over time.[4] The Roma people who involved in performances and entertainment are relatively more respected than other Romani individuals in the community. Scholars claim that the main reason for this is talent. In the historic Sulukule, most residents used to earn their livelihood through entertainment services, which means that they had a more prestigious position compared to other Romani communities. However, their relatively better position among other communities was not enough to integrate into the mainstream class structure in Turkish society. In other words, they still experienced social dilemmas due to underclass position. Their neighborhood was also stigmatized as "unsafe and impure" because of the residents' ethnic origins. Despite that, they were proud of being identified with their musical talent. In other words, they were at peace with their lifestyle.

When Akkan and her team were studying Romani neighborhoods in İzmit, the typical warning they heard was "Do not go to those Gypsy neighborhoods, because they are unsafe places. Do not even get close to those places!" Moreover, public officials that Akkan et al. interviewed mentioned that the Romani neighborhoods should be cleansed because of crime and deviant activities, but without mentioning any specific type of crime.[5] This means Romani neighborhoods experience criminalization due to the stigma without their characteristics or identification. In contrast with İzmit case, the justification of the community in Sulukule was made through identification of the neighborhood with entertainment facilities. Thanks to this identification, the neighborhood had been deemed authentic for decades. However, after the banning of this aspect of the neighborhood, even residents claimed that the neighborhood became unsafe for their children. In other words, the authentic features of Sulukule were ignored, and it was obliged to experience a criminalized stigma.

---

3 Ibid, 62-3.

4 Özateşler, *The Gypsy Stigma*, 13.

5 Akkan and others, "Sosyal Dışlanmanın Roman Halleri," 34-8.

The myths about Gypsy stigma significantly hinders the elimination of their impurity in the mainstream society. Even Roma reproduce the myths by describing themselves in the frame stigmatizing myths. When I asked the roots of "Gypsy" stigma, one interviewee explained one of the famous legend according to which the fire to burn Prophet Abraham was activated due to the fornication of Cin and Gan siblings in public. The interviewee based the Romani exclusion to notorious legend and emphasized that the stigma started thousands of years ago; it was not possible to avoid exclusion if one belonged to the Gypsy community.

Most of the time, people categorically refuse to include Gypsies in their social relations. As mentioned before, the attitude towards Gypsies is the fruit of an ahistorical stigmatizing process. According to Özateşler, the perception of local "Gypsiness" was affected by perceptions, stereotypes, stigmas, and discrimination at the national level. She continues that because there is little social interaction between Gypsies and the rest of the society, there is a gap between Gypsies and other people; therefore, the tools of stereotyping survive and are recreated. Gypsies obtain usually dirty jobs that mainstream society want to do. Thus, most of the time their social status belongs to the lowest step. Moreover, as mentioned, some Gypsies think that Gypiness just means poor.[6]

Some argue that the most significant problem in the Romani community is unemployment.[7] However, this conceal the roots of concrete problems. In their study, Akkan and others found that this claim not only hides their main problems in the job market, but leads to underestimation of their survival strategies.[8] The main problem they confront in the job market is the quality of employment. Akkan et al. claim that because Romani communities survive at the lowest layer of social stratification, they are obliged to work in unskilled, uncertain, and unsafe jobs in the labor market. Furthermore, prohibition of the lines of work that Romani had historically carried out for centuries from generation to generation such as hawking, bohçacılık,[9] or carriage driving –

6 Ibid., 52.

7 Ibid., 49.

8 Ibid., 49.

9 *Bohçacılık* refers to the informal profession of selling certain kinds of products door to door. These products usually consist of dowry materials, fabric, and ornaments. The job was usually held by Romani women.

negatively affected the employment status and economic conditions in Romani communities.

The experience of exclusion of Roma did not stem from their ethnicity, but instead, from their incompatiblity within the host population's framework of pure and impure. Due to archaic and lasting, exclusionary, and discriminatory social reflexes, they became a stigmatized community. As a result, they became a close community.

The archaic stigmatization process strongly affected their defining practice about ethnic origin. This practice has a correlative link with the economic capital. If one's economic condition was less strong, then there was no problem to consent the Gypsy or Romani identity. However, the better one's social status gets, the more they tend to reject the "Gypsyness." In fact, they tend to reject the whole community's Gypsy or Romani identity. The gentrification process made the different perceptions on their ethnic identity much more visible. At the end of the process, which refers to the completing of the pay up, it seems as only the members who were "Romani" and absolute decliner of being "Romani" or "Gypsiness" will be remained; and the neighborhood will be cleaned up from the "Gypsy" members.

Without exception, the people of Sulukule claimed that the renewal project was a great failure. Fieldwork was conducted to see how the project transformed the neighborhood. Between March and June 2015, Sulukule was visited five times. In these field visits, six former Sulukule residents were adopted as respondents, using a snow ball technique. Two respondents were women. Most of the interviews were made in a coffee house, the clients of which were mainly former Romani residents of Sulukule. Though the entire questionnaire was not asked of others, some questions were directed to people other than the six main respondents. The responses were satisfactory by the end of the sixth interview. The questionnaire was designed around three main themes – identity, urban renewal, and neighborhood solidarity – to reveal the class dynamics in the Sulukule community as well as the transformation of in-community social order.

Even chief official of Karagümrük that openly mentioned he was against the Romani way of life underscored that an alternative renewal project coherent with the Romani lifestyle would have been beneficial; the one that was implemented resulted in the impoverishment of Romani residents. Likewise,

Romani respondents expressed alternatives, all of which emphasized the aspect of continuity. G stressed "We have played and danced since the beginning. They presented us as different and cold, and they demolished our living spaces as well as our authentic features." She tried to explain the mismatch between the project and the actual residents of the renewed area. Similarly, P asked, "First, they acknowledged our way of living as authentic, then they destroyed it. Why did they create a project which resulted great increases in the rental rates instead of our authentic features, inasmuch as our way of living really is authentic?" He stressed the direct intervention into the lifestyle with which Sulukule is identified. To illustrate, before the renewal project the people of Sulukule used to organize the International Gypsy Festival as well as the famous *hidirellez* festivals, whereas they could only celebrate *hidirellez* inside the community after the project.

Considered that the renewal project aimed for the assimilation of the Romani way of life –directly or indirectly – it should be underscored that the renewal project is just the latest attempt to banish Romani society to the margins of the social system through the legal destruction of their lifestyle. Undoubtedly, the legal prohibition of the taverns was the first in the chain. In between, the prohibition of common lines of business such as peddling, carriage driving, unkacilik resulted in the impoverishment of the people of Sulukule, and accordingly, there further marginalization. Nevertheless, their solidarity network helped them to fight worsening conditions. The street as a social space made personal struggles more visible, allowing them to be quickly resolved. In addition, safe zones within social space were clearly determined as a result of daily routines. In short, living spaces were in a harmony with the lifestyle. However, as a result of the demolishing of the living spaces, an abyss occurred in this balance. Still, the transformation of the Romani life style could not be accomplished at the end of the project. It is beneficial to emphasize that there was no transformation of the lives of the displaced people. Displaced people's only concern is how to survive in yet more impoverished conditions. According to their opinions, the neighborhood is less safe than before because it has become the haunt of people with illegal dealings, who took the advantage of the instability of the transformation as an opportunity. Despite unsafe conditions respondents state that the police are less willing to interfere

in the problems of Sulukule due to its Romani identity. In short, it is difficult to claim there has been a social renewal or assimilation.

On the other hand, considering that the renewal project did not aim at assimilation or social transformation, but was only dedicated to city planning policies such as gentrification or renewal, it still cannot be considered a successful project. Most Romani residents think there is an anti-aesthetic approach to the renewed area because of the mass housing that replaced houses mostly built in an irregular style. There was symmetry between the asymmetrical positions of the different types of houses. However, the renewed area sharply divides the harmony of the disharmony. When the unjust treatments mentioned in this chapter are considered, it is obvious that the project ignored the social dimension. When the social dimension of the renewal project is presented, the main goal is to improve the quality of life for former residents. However, by the end of the Sulukule renewal project, former residents became more impoverished. Therefore, the social dimension of the project also failed.

There is a strong relation between the location and sustainability of the Romani way of life formed as a result of social codes transferred down through the centuries. The people of Sulukule were able to establish a social order in harmony with the lifestyle of their close community. The fine detail of the organization lay behind a solidarity network and commercial facilities that were coherent with the lifestyle. According to the simplest economic principle, every supply occasioned its own demand. The practical vision of this principle took place in Sulukule due to groceries selling piecemeal products and courtyard housing typology. People who needed to shop according to their daily earnings to round off the day demanded groceries that would sell products piecemeal, resulting in commercial enterprises coherent with their economic activities. Likewise, they demanded for houses that functioned for their particular housing needs, which included communal elements such as shared bathrooms. Consequently, courtyard housing typologies emerged which provided private places for petty prices. The living spaces that sustained their lives were convenient to these demands. For instance, almost all of the houses had already had gated courtyards. It was not hard to build extra rooms in the yards. In addition, it is expected that in a neighborhood in which many residents survived through day labor, some will be involved in illegal work such as drug dealing. However, due to street socialization, people knew each other well; due

to the solidarity network within the community, even the dealers protected that solidarity and the safety zones. Before the renewal, Sulukule was safer and less poor. However, when the location that cohered with their lifestyle collapsed, the unwritten social system with its codes and rules was also lost. Almost all who moved away returned to their neighborhood, and none is as giving up their accustomed way of living. However, they are unable to establish the former social structure. They live in an unsafe neighborhood, under poorer conditions. The only thing that has changed socially in their Roman way of life after the project is the increase in their tendency to marginalize each other.

Appendix A – Fieldwork Questionnaire

IDENTITY

1 How do you define yourself?

- Can you please share all the identities you belong to?
- Which of these identities is the most important for you? (Why)

2 What kind of unfortunate events did you witness for people who have been living in Sulukule?

- Did you witness such an event yourself?
- How did you act against such events?
- In general, how do you react to such problems?

3 What are the differences between being a Romani and being a Gypsy?

- Is it a bad thing to be a Gypsy?
- How does the society evaluate being a Gypsy? Can you please tell according to your observations?
- What are the reasons for the negative attitude towards Gypsies?
- Why are Gypsies poor in general?
- Why are Gypsies being excluded?
- You have lived with Gypsies for a long while. Did you experience any problem? (If yes, what are some of the problems?)
- As a Romani, do people show similar negative reactions towards you as well?

4 What does it mean to be a Romani?

- What do you think the society thinks about this issue?
- What are the reasons for negative or positive attitude?

5 There are numerous projects towards the Roma in the Republican history. The latest being the 2006 Romani opening. Can you please evaluate such policies in general?

- Which policies do you know? (Which ones did you witness and which ones did you hear?)

- As a Romani, what are the positive and negative aspects of such policies?

6 In your opinion, what are the biggest problems facing Romani people?

7 Can you please explain differences you have people who are working in taverns?

8 This place is known as a Romani neighborhood. What does it mean to be a resident of Sulukule? Please share your opinions by comparing pre and post urban renewal periods.

- Do you feel special in your neighborhood?
- What is the place you feel safest outside your household?
- What are the common values residents share in this neighborhood?
- Do you like to be from Sulukule?
- How well do people know Sulukule? (What are some things they do not know?)

URBAN RENEWAL

1 For how long have you been living in this neighborhood?
2 What changed after urban renewal?

- What are the differences of new residents from old residents?
- How did the change in house prices reflect on the residents?

3 What changed in your own life?

- Compared to the past, what do you think became better and worse?

4 Do you still do your job you had before urban renewal?

- (If not, what are the reasons for changing your job?)

5 What are the things you miss most from the period before urban renewal in your neighborhood?
6 It is being said that a lot of families are victims after the closure of taverns. Do you have any information about this?

- What are the problems people faced because of this?
- In your opinion, was this closure a positive or a negative development? Can you please evaluate?

7 How did the urban renewal project affect your neighborhood?

- What are the positive consequences?
- What are the negative consequences?

8 Can you please talk about the people who moved into your neighborhood Sulukule after the urban renewal?

- What are the differences in everyday practices of the people who recently moved in?
- And what are the differences with people who moved out (Please think in tems of neighborhood and community values).

NEIGHBORHOOD COLLABORATION

1 Are you a member of an association?

- If yes, can you please tell me about this association and its activities?
- Why are you a member?
- What sort of activities do you conduct there?
- For what reasons do you meet with your friends in your daily life in this association?
- And are you a member of a political party? (You don't need to name the party)
- For what reasons are you a member? (Is there any relation between the party's approach to your neighborhood and your membership?)

2 Can you please tell me an ordinary day you spend in your neighborhood?

- For how long is this routine has been going on?
- When did it change?

3 Is your neighborhood safe?

- Do you trust people living in your neighborhood?
- Who do you trust the most?
- Compared to the period before urban renewal, is there a change in the number of people you trust?
- Do you ask for your help if you are in a dire situation for some reason?
- When do you ask for help? (For instance, do they take care of your child when you go to the hospital?)
- When do you not ask for their help? (For instance, when you need money urgently, do you not borrow from them? Is the amount important for your decision?)
- What do you think first when you experience a crime such as burglary or blackmailing?
- What is the first thing you do when you experience such a crime?

4 What do you do for social activities?

- Is there a regular activity you do? (Extra-curricular classes or rotating microcredit meetings)

- Can you please inform me about people who participate in such events? For instance in what ways do they resemble you or not?
- For what reasons do you see these people outside times of the event?
- In which places do you meet people who are not from your neighborhood? (For instance do you go to mosque?)
- Do you have a friendship networks based on the relationships you have outside the neighborhood?

5 From whom do you seek support when you have a problem?

- Since when do you share your problems with this acquaintance?
- What do you do when you cannot reach to this person?
- Do you share a problem with a friend from your neighborhood?
- How would people around you act if they knew that you have a current problem? (Please compare with past times)..
- And how would you act if you knew they have a problem?
- If people moving into your neighborhood nowadays become unhappy, would this have an implication on your personal life? (If yes, what are such implications?)
- How about your previous neighbors? Especially think about those who work in taverns.

6 Now I would like you to compare the environment you grew up in with the environment your child grows up in. When you think about the features of the neighborhood, what are the differences?

7 What are the neighbors' relationships with each other in this neighborhood?

- Can you please tell me about your relationship with people who moved here after urban renewal in detail?
- Do you visit them in their houses?
- How often do you visit them?
- What are some interactions you have? (For instance, where do you see each other?)
- Do you invite them to events such as weddings? (Or do they invite you?)
- Can you please compare old residents with newcomers?
- What were the positive sides of old residents?

- Do you still see people who moved out of your neighborhood? (If yes, how often do you see them for what reasons? If not, why do you not see them anymore?)
- Can you please tell me about your neighborhood's history?
- Please answer my next question by making a comparison to the past. Is there a culture of solidarity in your neighborhood?
- Are there personal or communal problems you resolved all collaborating (such as imece and cooperation)?

Appendix B – Görüşme Formu

KİMLİK

1 Kendinizi ne olarak tanımlıyorsunuz?

- Ait olduğunuzu düşündüğünüz tüm kimliklerinizi benimle paylaşır mısınız?
- Bu kimliklerinizden hangisi daha önemli sizin için? (Neden?)

2 Sulukule'de eskiden beridir yasayan insanların kimliklerinden ötürü ne gibi şanssızlıklar yaşadıklarına şahit oldunuz?

- Siz bunlardan hiçbirini yaşadınız mi?
- Yaşadığınız şanssızlıklar karşısında nasıl davrandınız?
- Peki, genel olarak değerlendirdiğinizde bu durumu nasıl karşılıyorsunuz?

3 Sizce Roman olmakla Çingene olmak arasında nasıl bir farklılaşma var?

- Çingene olmak kotu bir şey mi?
- Toplum nasıl değerlendiriyor Çingene olmayı? Gözlemlediğiniz kadarıyla anlatır mısınız?
- Çingenelere karşı olan olumsuz algının altında ne gibi nedenler var sizce?
- Sizce neden çingeneler genelde yoksul?
- Sizce neden çingeneler genelde dışlanıyorlar?
- Siz bir grup çingeneyle uzun sure birlikte yaşadınız. Hiç sorun yaşadınız mı? (Evetse ne gibi sorunlar yaşadınız?)
- Bir Roman olarak insanlar benzer olumsuz tutumları size karşı da gösteriyor mu?

4 Sizce Roman olmak ne demektir?

- Sizce toplum bu konuda neler düşünüyor?
- Olumlu (ya da olumsuz algının altında neler yatıyor?)

5 Cumhuriyet tarihinde Romanlara yönelik geliştirilen birçok proje var. En son 2006'daki Roman açılımını hatırlıyoruz mesela. Bu politikaları genel olarak değerlendirir misiniz?

- Siz bunlardan hangilerini biliyorsunuz? (Hangilerine şahit oldunuz, hangilerini duydunuz?)
- Bir Roman olarak, bu politikaların olumlu (ve olumsuz) yönleri nelerdir sizce?

6 Sizce Romanların en büyük sorunları nelerdir?

7 Devriye evlerinde çalışanlarla aranızda ne gibi farklılıklar olduğunu detaylı olarak anlatır misiniz?

8 Burası bir Roman mahallesi olarak biliniyor. Sulukuleli olmak size neler ifade ediyor? Lütfen kentsel dönüşümü de göz önünde bulundurarak, öncesi ve sonrasıyla kıyaslayarak benimle düşüncelerinizi paylaşın.

- Kendinizi özel hissediyor musunuz mahallenizde?
- Eviniz dışında en güven duyduğunuz, kendinizi güvende hissettiğiniz yer neresi?
- Sizce bu mahalledeki insanlar ne gibi ortak değerleri paylaşıyorlar?
- Sulukuleli olmayı seviyor musunuz?
- Sizce insanlar Sulukule'yi ne kadar biliyorlar? (Onların bilmediği neler söyleyebilirsiniz?)

KENTSEL DÖNÜŞUM

1 Ne kadar zamandır bu mahallede yaşıyorsunuz?
2 Kentsel dönüşüm sonrası burada neler değişti?

- Yeni mahalle sakinlerinin eskilerden farklari neler?
- Mahalledeki ev fiyatlarındaki değişim buranın insanlarına nasıl yansıdı?

3 Peki, sizin hayatınızda neler değişti?

- Eskiyle kıyasladığınızda, hangi açılardan daha iyi (ya da daha kotu) olduğunu düşünüyorsunuz?

4 Kentsel dönüşümden önceki mesleğinizi devam ettiriyor musunuz?

- (Hayırsa) İşinizi değiştirmenizdeki sebepler nelerdir?

5 Mahallenizde kentsel dönüşüm öncesine dair en çok neleri özlüyorsunuz?
6 Devriye evlerinin kapanmasıyla birçok ailenin mağdur olduğu söyleniyor. Bu konuda bir bilginiz var mı?

- İnsanlar ne gibi mağduriyetler yaşadılar?
- Sizce devriye evlerinin kapatılması mahalleniz için olumlu mu, yoksa olumsuz bir gelişme mi oldu? Lütfen değerlendirir misiniz?

7 Sizce kentsel dönüşüm projesi mahallenizi nasıl etkiledi?

- Olumlu yönde ne gibi değişimler oldu?
- Olumsuz yönde ne gibi değişimler oldu?

8 Kentsel dönüşüm sonrasında mahallenize taşınanlar hakkında bilgi verir misiniz?

- Yeni gelenlerin rutin hayati sizinkinden ne gibi açılardan farklılaşıyor?
- Peki, gidenlerle aralarındaki farklar neler? (Lütfen özellikle komşuluk bağlamında düşünün.)

MAHALLE İÇİ DAYANIŞMA

1 Herhangi bir derneğe üye misiniz?

- (Evetse) Bu dernek ve faaliyetleriniz hakkında bilgi verir misiniz?
- Neden bu derneğe üyesiniz?
- Ne gibi faaliyetler yürütüyorsunuz?
- Bu dernekteki arkadaşlarınızla günlük hayatta ne gibi sebeplerle buluşuyorsunuz?
- Peki, bir siyasi partiye üye misiniz (adını söylemek zorunda değilsiniz)?
- Ne gibi sebeplerle üyesiniz (ya da, partinin mahallenize olan yaklaşımıyla üyeliğiniz arasında bir bağlantı var mı)?

2 Sıradan bir günde mahallede gecen bir gününüzü anlatır misiniz?

- Kaç yıldır bu rutininiz devam ediyor?
- Ne zaman değişti?

3 Mahalleniz güvenli bir mahalle midir?

- Mahallenizde yasayan insanlara güveniyor musunuz?
- En çok kime güveniyorsunuz?
- Kentsel dönüşüm öncesiyle kıyasladığınızda güvendiğiniz insan sayısında bir değişim oldu mu?
- Çeşitli sebeplerle zor durumda kaldığınızda komşularınızdan yardım istiyor musunuz?
- Hangi durumlarda yardım istiyorsunuz? (Mesela, hastaneye giderken çocuğunuzu emanet ediyor musunuz?)
- Hangi durumlarda yardım istemiyorsunuz? (i. Mesela, acil paraya ihtiyacınız olduğunda komşularınızdan borç para istiyor musunuz? ii. Miktar önemli oluyor mu?)
- Hırsızlık ya da şantaj gibi bir suca maruz kaldığınızda ilk ne düşünürsünüz?
- Böyle bir suçla karşılaştığınızda ilk yaptığınız şey ne olur?

4 Sosyal aktivite bağlamında ne gibi şeyler yapıyorsunuz?

- Düzeni yürüttüğünüz bir sosyal aktiviteniz var mı (kurs ya da altın günü vs.)?

- Bu faaliyetlerinize katılan diğer kişiler hakkında bilgi verir misiniz? Mesela, size hangi yönlerden benziyorlar (ya da benzemiyorlar)?
- Buradaki kişilerle faaliyet zamanı dışında ne sebeplerle görüşüyorsunuz?
- Mahalle dışındaki kişilerle hangi ortamlarda buluşuyorsunuz? (Mesela, camiye gidiyor musunuz?)
- Mahalle dışındaki ilişkileriniz üstünden sahip olduğunuz bir arkadaş çevreniz var mi?

5 Caninizi sikan durumlarla karşılaştığınızda kimden destek alırsınız?

- Ne zamandır bu yakınınızla dertleşiyorsunuz?
- Ona ulaşamadığınızda ne yapıyorsunuz?
- Mahallenizdeki bir dostunuzla sıkıntınızı paylaşıyor musunuz?
- Su anda etrafınızda olan insanlar zor durumda olduğunuzu bilseler nasıl davranırlardı? (Lütfen eskiyle kıyaslayarak anlatın.)
- Peki, siz onların zor durumda olduklarını bilseniz nasıl davranırdınız?
- Mahallenize yeni gelen insanlar mutsuz olsalar, bunun sizin hayatiniza bir yansıması olur mu? (evetse, ne gibi yansimalari olur?)
- Peki, eski mahalle sakinlerini düşündüğünüzde de ayni cevabi verebiliyor musunuz? Özellikle devriye evlerinde çalışanları düşünün lütfen.

6 Simdi sizden büyüdüğünüz ortamı çocuğunuzun büyüdüğü ortamla kıyaslamanızı rica edeceğim. Mahalle özelinde düşündüğünüzde, ne gibi farklılıklar var?

7 Bu mahallede komşuluk ilişkileri nasıldır?

- Kentsel dönüşüm sonrasında buraya yerleşen insanlarla ilişkilerinizi detaylı anlatır mısınız?
- Evlerine gidip geliyor musunuz?
- Ne sıklıkta ziyarete gidiyorsunuz?
- Ne gibi ortak paylaşımlarda bulunuyorsunuz? (Yani nerelerde görüşüyorsunuz?)
- Düğün gibi özel günlerinize davet ediyor musunuz? (ya da onlar size davet ediyor mu?)
- Eskilerle yeni gelenleri karşılaştırır mısınız?
- Eskilerin güzel yanları nelerdi?

- Mahallenizden taşınanlarla görüşüyor musunuz? (Evetse ne gibi sebeplerle, ne sıklıkta ve nasıl görüşüyorsunuz? Hayırsa, niçin görüşmüyorsunuz?)
- Eskiden nasıldı mahalleniz? Anlatır mısınız?
- Bu soruma lütfen eskiyle kıyaslayarak cevap verin. Mahallenizde bir dayanışma kültürü var mı?
- İmece usulü gibi, birkaç mahalleli bir araya gelerek çözdüğünüz mahalleye ait ya da kendinize ait sorunlarınız var mı?

Bibliography

Abrahams, Israel. *Jewish Life in the Middle Ages*. London: Macmillan Company, 1919.

Acton, Thomas. *Scholarship and the Gypsy Struggle*. Hertfordshire: University of the Hertfordshire Press, 2000.

Acton, Thomas and Gary Mundy. *Romani Culture and Gypsy Identity*. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press, 1999.

Akkan, Başak Ekim, Mehmet Baki Deniz, and Mehmet Ertan. *Sosyal Dışlanmanın Romanin Halleri*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Sosyal Politika Forumu – Anadolu Kültür Yayınları, 2011.

Aksu, Mustafa. *Türkiye'de Çingene Olmak*. İstanbul: Kesit Yayınları, 2006.

Barth, Fredrik, *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*, Little Brown and Company, Boston 1969.

Barth, Fredrik. "Introduction." In *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*, edited by Frederik Barth, 9-38. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969.

Barth, Frederik. "Enduring and Emerging Issues in the Analysis of Ethnicity." In *The Anthropology of Ethnicity: Beyond 'Ethnic Groups and Boundaries,* edited by Hans Vermeulen, and Cora Govers, 11-32. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis, 1994.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Community*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001.

"Beyaz Suriyeliler Burada Yaşıyor." *Milliyet*. January 1, 2015. Accessed September 17, 2016. http://www.milliyet.com.tr/beyaz-suriyeliler-burada-yasiyor-gundem-2000265/.

Beynon, Erdmann Doane. "The Gypsy in a Non- Gypsy Economy." *American Journal of Sociology* 42/3 (1936): 358-370.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Weight of the World*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999.

Bourdieu, Pierre. "The Forms Of Capital." In *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education,* edited by Alain Coulon and John G. Richardson, 241-258. New York: Greenwood, 1986.

Byrne, David. *Social Exclusion*. New York: Open University Press, 2005.

Cloke, Paul, Terry Marsden, and Patrick Mooney. *Handbook of Rural Studies*. London: SAGE Publications, 2006.

Dağlar, Ali. "Rak Rak Raki, Yaktın Bizi TOKI." *Hürriyet*. March 25, 2009. Accessed June 14, 2016. http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/rak-rak-raki-yaktin-bizi-toki-11282561.

De Haan, Arjan. "Social Exclusion: Enriching the Understanding of Deprivation." *Studies in Social and Political Thought* 2 2 (2000): 22-40.

Dench, Geoff. *Minorities in the Open Society – Prisoners of Ambivalence*. London and New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986.

Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger – An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London & New York: Routledge, 2001.

Doğu, Nuriye. "Ganimet Toplama Zamanı!" *Radikal.* January 1, 2012. Accessed June 14, 2016. http://www.radikal.com.tr/ekonomi/ganimet-toplama-zamani-1074199/.

Durkheim, Emile. *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. Mineola-New York: Dover Publications, 2008.

Eidheim, Herald. "When Ethnic Identity is a Social Stigma." In *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*, edited by Frederik Barth, 39-57. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969.

Fraser, Angus. *Avrupa Halkları Çingeneler*. Istanbul: Homer Yayinlari, 2006.

Fraser, Nancy and Axel Honneth, *Redistribution or Recognition? – A Political-Philosophical Exchange*, Verso, New York 2003.

Fraser, Nancy. "Social Justice in the Age of Identity Politics: Redistribution, Recognition, and Participation." In *Redistribution or Recognition? – A Political-Philosophical Exchange*, edited by Nancy Fraser and Axel Honneth, 7-109. New York: Verso.

Freud, Sigmund. *The Future of an Illusion*. California: Stanford University Press, 1927.

Gençoğlu-Onbaşı, Funda. "The Romani Opening in Turkey: Antidiscrimination?" *Turkish Studies* 13/4 (2012): 599-613.

Giordano, Christian and Andrea Boscoboinik. "The "Romanié Problem: Ethnicisation or Social Marginalization." In *Social Inclusion and Cultural Identity of Romani Communities in South-Eastern Europe,* 11-18. Bern: Swisspeace, 2011.

Gough, Jamie, Aram Eisenschitz, and Andrew McCulloch. *Spaces of Social Exclusion.* New York: Routledge, 2006.

Gül, Reyhan. "334 Aile Sulukule'ye Döndü." *Haber 7.* September 11, 2011. Accessed September 17, 2015. http://m.haber7.com/haberDetay.php?id=783287#.

Hancock, Ian. "Duty and Beauty, Possession and Truth: Lexical Impoverishment as Control." In *Romani Culture and Gypsy Identity*, edited by Thomas Acton and Gary Mundy, 182-190. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press, 1999.

Hancock, Ian. "The Emergence of Romani as a Koïné outside of India." In *Scholarship and the Gypsy Struggle* edited by Tony Acton, 1 – 14. Hertfordshire: University of the Hertfordshire Press, 2000.

Ince, Elif. "Çöpe Atılan Sulukule." *Radikal*, June 14, 2012. Accessed June 14 2016. http://www.radikal.com.tr/turkiye/cope-atilan-sulukule-1091069/.

İnce, Elif. "Sulukule: Bir Dokun Bin Ah İşit." *Radikal*. August 2, 2013. Accessed June 14, 2016. http://www.radikal.com.tr/turkiye/sulukule-bir-dokun-bin-ah-isit-1144770/.

İnce, Elif. "Sulukule Evleri Duble Borca Battı." *Radikal*. November 12, 2012. Accessed June 14, 2016. http://www.radikal.com.tr/turkiye/sulukule-evleri-duble-borca-batti-1107479/.

Karaman, Ozan and Tolga İslam. "On the Dual Nature of Intra-Urban Borders: The Case of a Romani Neighborhood in İstanbul." *Cities* 29 (2012): 234-243.

Karpat, Kemal, H. *Osmanlı Nüfusu 1830-1914*. Istanbul: Timaş Yayınları 2010.

Kligman, Gail. "On the Social construction of Otherness: Identifying the Romani in Post-Socialist Communities." *Review of Sociology* 7/2 (2007): 61-78.

Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structures of Scientific Revolution*. Chicago: International Encyclopedia of Unified Science by University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Ladanyi, Janos and Ivan Szelenyi. *Patterns of Exclusion: Constructing Gypsy Ethnicity and the Making of an Underclass in Transitional Societies of Europe*. New York: Colombia University Press, 2006.

Laederich, Stephane. "Romani Cultural Identity." In *Social Inclusion and Cultural Identity of Romani Communities in South-Eastern Europe,* 19-28. Bern: Swisspeace, 2011.

Lennon, Jack J. *Pollution and Religion in Ancient Rome*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Marsh, Adrian and Elin Strand. *Gypsies and the Problem of Identities – Contextual, Constructed and Contested.* İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2006.

Marsh, Adrian and Elin Strand. Reaching the Romanlar: *A Report on the Feasibility Studies "Mapping" a Number of Romanin (Gypsy) Communities in Istanbul*. Istanbul: International Romani Studies Network, British Council, 2005.

Marsh, Adrian. "Ottoman Gypsies and Taxation A Comment on Cantemir's "…about the Gypsy People, who are numerous in the Turkish country." In *Gypsies and the Problem of Identities – Contextual, Constructed and Contested*, edited by Adrian Marsh and Elin Strand, 171-174. Istanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2006.

Marsh, Adrian. "Ethnicity and Identity: Who are the Gypsies." In *We are Here – Discriminatory Exclusion and Struggle for Rights of Romani in Turkey*, edited by Ebru Uzpeder, 21-31. Istanbul: European Romani Rights Center, 2008.

Marshall, Thomas Humphrey. *Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1950.

Marushiakova, Elena and Vesselin Popov. *Gypsies in the Ottoman Empire – A Contribution to the History of the Balkans*. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2001.

Marushiakova, Elena and Vesselin Popov. "Myth as Process." In *Scholarship and the Gypsy Struggle* edited by Tony Acton, 81 – 94. Hertfordshire: University of the Hertfordshire Press, 2000.

Mead, George Herbert. *Mind, Self, and Society*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 2015.

Mezarcıoğlu, Ali. *Çingenelerin Kitabı - Tarihi, Sosyolojik ve Antropolojik Bir Kaynak*. İstanbul: Cinius Yayınları, 2010.

Mingione, Enzo. *Urban Poverty and the Underclass – A Reader*. Massachusets: Blackwell Publishers, 1996.

Mingione, Enzo. "Urban Poverty in the Advanced Industrial World: Concepts, Analysis and Debates." In *Urban Poverty and the Underclass – A Reader,* edited by Enzo Mingione, 3-40. Massachusets: Blackwell Publishers, 1996.

Mirescu, Gabriela. *Social Inclusion and Cultural Identity of Romani Communities in South-Eastern Europe*. Bern: Swisspeace, 2011.

Mirescu, Gabriela. "Introduction." In *Social Inclusion and Cultural Identity of Romani Communities in South-Eastern Europe,* 5-10. Bern: Swisspeace, 2011.

Mischek, Udo. "Mahalle Identity – Romanin (Gypsy) Identity under Urban Conditions." In *Gypsies and the Problem of Identities – Contextual, Constructed and Contested*, edited by Adrian Marsh and Elin Strand, 157-162. Istanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2006.

Oakley, Judith. "Recycled (mis)representations: Gypsies, Travellers or Romani Treated as Objects, Rarely Subjects." *People, Place and Polic*y 8/1 (2014): 65-85.

Oprişan, Ana. "An Interview of the Romaninlar in Turkey," In *Gypsies and the Problem of Identities – Contextual, Constructed and Contested*, edited by Adrian Marsh and Elin Strand, 163-170. Istanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2006.

Öğünç, Pınar. "Biz Onlara Göre Kirliyiz!" *Radikal*. May 16, 2012. Accessed June 1, 2016. http://www.radikal.com.tr/hayat/biz-onlara-gore-kirliyiz-1088121/.

Önen, Selin. "Citizenship Rights of Gypsies in Turkey: Romani and Dom Communities." *Middle Eastern Studies* 49 / 4 (2013): 608-622.

Özateşler, Gül. "Gypsies in the Economy of Turkey: A Focus on Gypsy Flower Sellers in Two Central Districts of İstanbul." *New Perspectives on Turkey* 51 (2014): 123-146.

Özateşler, Gül. *Gypsy Stigma and Exclusion in Turkey, 1970 – The Social Dynamics of Exclusionary Violence*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Perez, Juan A. Serge Moscovici, and Berta Chulvi. "The Taboo Against Group Contact: Hypothesis of Gypsy Ontologization." *British Journal of Social Psychology* 46 (2007): 249-272.

Richardson, Joanna. "Talking about Gypsies: The Notion of Discourse as Control." *Housing Studies* 21 / 1 (2006): 77-96.

"Romanların Yaşadıkları Hep Aynı." *Evrensel*. January 18, 2010. Accessed June 14, 2016. http://www.evrensel.net/haber/193095/romanlarin-yasadiklari-hep-ayni.

Rosenberg, Göran. "The Squaring of the Warm Circle." Presentation in the conference Rethinking the Nation State, 1999.

Rroma. "Sulukule." Accessed August 20, 2015. http://rroma.org/reports/sulukule/.

Saunders, Peter. *Social Theory and the Urban Question – Second Edition*. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Sen, Amartya. "Social Exclusion: Concepts, Application and Scrutiny." *Asian Development Bank Social Development Papers* 1 (2000): 1-55.

Sennett, Richard. "Growth and Failure: The New Political Economy and its Culture." In *Spaces of Culture – City, Nation, World*, edited by Mike Featherstone and Scott Lash, 14 – 26. London: Sage Publications, 1999.

Sennett, Richard. *Kamusal Insanın Çöküşü*. Istanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları, 2010.

Silver, Hilary and S. M. Miller. "Social Exclusion: The European Approach to Social Disadvantage." *Indicators* 2 (2003): 5-21.

Silver, Hilary. "Culture, Politics, and National Discourses of the New Urban Poverty." In *Urban Poverty and the Underclass – A Reader,* edited by Enzo Mingione, 105-139. Massachusets: Blackwell Publishers, 1996.

Stewart, Michael. "Romani and Gypsy "Ethnicity" as a Subject of Anthropological Inquiry." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 42 (2013): 415-432.

Stewart, Michael. "The Puzzle of Romani Persistence: Group Identity without a Nation." In *Romani Culture and Gypsy Identity*, edited by Thomas Acton and Gary Mundy, 84-99. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press, 1999.

Stewart, Michael. "Deprivation, the Romani, and the Underclass." In *Postsocialism: Ideals, Ideologies and Practices in Eurasia*, edited by Christopher M. Hann, 133-155. London: Routledge, 2002.

Strand, Elin. "Romanlar and Ethno-Religious Identity in Turkey: A Comperative Perspective." In *Gypsies and the Problem of Identities – Contextual, Constructed and Contested*, edited by Adrian Marsh and Elin Strand, 97-104. Istanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2006.

"Sulukule'de Dudak Uçuklatan Rant." *Radikal*. October 9, 2011. Accessed June 14, 2016. http://www.radikal.com.tr/turkiye/sulukulede-dudak-ucuklatan-rant-1065796/.

Sulukule Günlüğü. "Sınır Tanımayan Otonom Plancılar "Başka Bir Sulukule Mümkün" diyerek Alternatif Projelerini Basına Açıkladılar." last modified September 23, 2008. Accessed June 14, 2016. http://sulukulegunlugu.blogspot.com.tr/2008/09/snr-tanmayan-otonom-planclar-baka-bir.html.

"Sulukule'nin Rantsal Dönüşümü." *Radikal*. March 18, 2009. Accessed June 14, 2016. http://www.radikal.com.tr/turkiye/sulukulenin-rantsal-donusumu-926779/.

The Barlett Development Planning Unit. "Placing Sulukule." 2007. Accessed October 29, 2015. https://www.scribd.com/fullscreen/59533208?access_key=key-2aruex8hjvme1myboxy.

United Nations, Commission of the European Communities. *Turkey 2009 Progress Report accompanying the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council – Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2009-2010.* Brussels, 2010.

Wacquant, Loïc. "A Black City within the White." *Black Renaissance* 2/1 (1998): 141.

Wacquant, Loïc. "Ghettos and Anti Ghettos – An Anatomy of the New Urban Poverty." *Thesis Eleven* 94/113 (2008): 113-118.

Wacquant, Loïc. "Territorial Stigmatization in the Age of Advanced Marginality." *Thesis Eleven* 91 (2007): 66-77.

Wacquant, Loïc. *Urban Outcasts – A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007.

Wacquant, Loïc. "Decivilizing and Demonizing: The Remaking the American Ghetto." In *The Sociology of Norbert Elias*, edited by Steven Loyal and Stephen Quilley, 94 – 123. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Weeks, Jeffrey. *Making Sexual History*. Massachusetts: Polity Press, 2000.

Wilson, William Julius. *The Truly Disadvantaged- The Inner City, the Underclass and Public Policy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Wimmer, Andreas. "Elementary Strategies of Ethnic Boundary Making." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 31/6, (2008): 1025 – 1055.