



JOURNAL OF SOCIAL AND HUMANITIES SCIENCES RESEARCH

Uluslararası Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Araştırma Dergisi

Open Access Refereed e-Journal & Refereed & Indexed

Article Type	Research Article	Accepted / Makale Kabul	30.09.2019
Received / Makale Geliş	29.07.2019	Published / Yayınlanma	30.09.2019

THE SECOND MIGRATION OF POVERTY: FIKIRTEPE, ISTANBUL TÜRKİYE'DE YOKSULLUĞUN İKİNCİ GÖÇÜ: FIKIRTEPE, İSTANBUL

Dr. İlkin MARKOÇ

Yıldız Technical University, Faculty of Architecture, Department of Architecture, ISTANBUL
/ TURKEY, ORCID: 0000-0002-7805-1153



Doi Number: <http://dx.doi.org/10.26450/jshsr.1422>

Reference: Markoç, İ. (2019). The Second Migration of Poverty: Fikirtepe, Istanbul. *Journal of Social and Humanities Sciences Research*, 6(42): 2858-2868.

ABSTRACT

As of the 1950s, with the industrialization in agriculture, a surplus of labor force emerged in rural areas. Those living in their hometown have made the first migration to be employed in industrial facilities in the city. Migrants first settled their housing needs in gecekondu built with light tools on the periphery of the city around the industrial areas. Later, with the humility of the state, they transformed the first gecekondu units into reinforced concrete structures and apartment buildings. In the 2000s, the reproduction of the urban area came to the agenda and construction activities started to be presented to the upper-income group in the high rent areas of the city with neoliberal policies. The gecekondu settlements supported by the state reconstruction amnesty, are defined as the ruined areas of the city. The lower-income group residing in these areas is seen as crime-prone communities. This study aims to reveal the second migration of displaced gecekondu settlers due to urban transformation activities. The scope of this study was limited to Fikirtepe Neighborhood, where the transformation started in 2011, but the demolition and construction activities still continue today. Qualitative data collected through in-depth interviews conducted in the field were processed and presented through content analysis. It was revealed that many people who migrated from rural areas to settle in Fikirtepe in the 1950s were forced to perform the second migration due to poverty.

Keywords: Poverty, Migration, Urban Redevelopment, Fikirtepe

ÖZET

1950'li yıllar itibariyle tarımda sanayileşme ile birlikte kırsal alanda iş gücü fazlası ortaya çıkmıştır. Memleketlerinde geçim zorluğu çekmekte olanlar, kentteki sanayi tesislerinde istihdam edilmek üzere ilk göçü gerçekleştirmişlerdir. İlk olarak sanayi alanlarının çeperinde hafif gereçlerle inşa edilen gecekondu barınma ihtiyaçlarını giderme yoluna giden göçmenler, daha sonra devletin tevazu göstermesiyle birlikte ilkel gecekondu birimlerini zamanla betonarme yapılara ve apartmanlara dönüştürmüşlerdir. 2000'li yıllara gelindiğinde kentsel alanın yeniden üretimi gündeme gelmiş ve neoliberal politikalarla kentin rantı yüksek alanlarında üst gelir grubuna sunulmak üzere yıkıp-yeniden yapma faaliyetleri başlamıştır. O güne kadar devletin imar aflarıyla desteklediği gecekondu yerleşimleri artık kentin hastalıklı alanları olarak tanımlanmakta ve bu alanlarda ikamet eden alt-orta gelir grubu suç meyilli topluluklar olarak görülmektedir.

Bu çalışmanın amacı 2000'li yıllardan itibaren gerçekleşen kentsel dönüşüm faaliyetleri sebebiyle yerlerinden edilen gecekonducuların ikinci göçünü ortaya koymaktır. Çalışmanın kapsamı 2011 yılında dönüşümün başladığı ancak hala yıkım ve inşaa faaliyetlerinin devam ettiği Fikirtepe Mahallesi ile sınırlanmıştır. Alanda yapılan derinlemesine görüşmeler ile toplanan nitel veri içerik analizi ile işlenerek sunulmuştur. 1950'li yıllarda kırsal alandan göç ederek Fikirtepe'ye yerleşen pek çok kişinin yine yoksulluk sebebiyle dönüşüm sürecinde yaşam alanlarından ikinci göçü gerçekleştirmek zorunda kaldıkları bu çalışma ile ortaya konulmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yoksulluk, Göç, Kentsel Dönüşüm, Fikirtepe

1. INTRODUCTION

1950 is a significant turning point in Turkish political and social life. In the 1950 general elections, the period of single-party power came to an end, and the opposition party came into power by high level of participation. Industrial investments made in the city in the early years of the Republic continued in this

period, and the most significant support to the rural area was Marshall Aid made by the United States. With the help of Marshall Aid, a rapid mechanization effect in the agricultural sector resulted in a surplus labor force in rural areas. It has become difficult for many to live in rural areas due to the division of land through inheritance, the lack of inclusive agricultural policies, and the feud that accompanies the surplus of the labor force. On the other hand, components such as industrial investments in the city, encouraging urban life in the media and cinema can be expressed as attractive factors of living in the city.

Poverty is one of the oldest areas of development economics as well as the history of humanity. Poverty is the inability to meet the needs to achieve a minimum level of life. Poverty is one of the most critical problems of today, although there has been a significant income increase in the world for the last 50 years. Poverty is also an issue that is discussed and expected to be solved intensively in Turkey. Unfair distribution of income, inequality in the distribution of national income, economic crises, unsuccessful social policies have caused the impact of poverty to go deeper and increase (Sen, 1990).

The phenomenon of rural to urban migration, which started in the 1940s and accelerated in the 1950s, is a multidimensional issue that has been addressed by many disciplines for many years. In this study, migration from rural to urban areas is discussed in the cross-section of architecture and sociology. The problem of social and economic exclusion of the group who migrated from rural areas to Fikirtepe, in the 1950s and was forced into a migration movement again during the redevelopment process was put forward with this study.

This study aims to (1) relate rural to urban migration with poverty and gecekondu settlements, (2) to link first migration process to the urban redevelopment process, which is a popular activity of today, and (3) to present the migration problem of today that comes to the agenda with the redevelopment projects again.

This study consists of literature and a case study. First, the conceptual framework obtained from the existing literature is presented, and then the case study is presented. In the literature research, firstly, the phenomenon of poverty is discussed, and social reflections of poverty are revealed. Then the social aspects of migration, which is a reflection of the poverty in Turkey is handled.

With the effect of neoliberal policies, it is aimed to reconstruct the urban area to the upper-income group. The reproduction of areas with high rents in the center of the city makes the remaining activities in Turkey has gained momentum with the 2000s. After the earthquake in 1999, it was essential to construct the buildings with earthquake safety and to bring the existing building stock to earthquake-resistant. In particular, the ruling party, which established the government in 2003, enacted laws that pave the way for urban redevelopment activities to make the economic structure based on the construction sector and to make the existing building stock resistant to earthquakes.

Urban redevelopment generally targets the gecekondu areas. The redevelopment of the gecekondu settlements, which started to emerge in the 1950s, came to the agenda. In this process, the model of demolition and reconstruction was adopted for the redevelopment of gecekondu areas. The most common type of redevelopment is the destruction of relatively low-rise illegal gecekondu and the construction of gated communities of high-rise blocks. In this process, the squatter residents, who are generally low income, have begun to leave the area because they cannot afford to buy a new flat in the newly constructed gated communities. Another reason for the displacement of squatters in the process of transformation is the non-inclusive design approach. The squatters had to abandon their habitats in the 1950s because they had to adopt a lifestyle they were not used to, and they were not economically prepared for it. In this study, this process is defined as the second migration of poverty.

Istanbul is the city where this process, from 1950 to 2010, is seen most prominently. For this purpose, Fikirtepe, which was the first illegal settlements in the Anatolian side of Istanbul in the 1950s and experienced the demolition of gecekondu and the construction of gated communities consisting of high-rise blocks in 2010, was handled as a case study. Fikirtepe was deemed suitable for the case study in 2019, because of being observable in every stage of the redevelopment process. The construction process has been completed on some building blocks, and life has begun, while others have not demolished, yet. However, on the construction islands that have not been demolished, people continue to live in gecekondu, while the construction process continues on the side parcels. This situation causes chaos

throughout the settlement and decreases the quality of life of the people, and the process continues completely uncertain. Fikirtepe is regarded as valuable for this research in terms of the existence of gecekondus, some residents settled in new high-rise blocks and trying to live here; whose houses have not yet been demolished and are in an uncertain expectation.

In the case study part of this article, a field study was designed to reveal the second migration of poverty in Fikirtepe Urban Redevelopment Project. This field research was conducted on 28 April 2018 within the scope of the Fikirtepe Workshop. During the transformation process in Fikirtepe, semi-structured in-depth interviews were conducted with the sample ($n=16$) that lived in the gecekondus in the area (not yet been demolished). In the case study part, the rhetoric of the gecekondu settlers in Fikirtepe, the themes, and codes obtained from the field were presented. In conclusion, the reasons for the second migration are revealed.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Poverty

Poverty is the inability to meet the needs to achieve a minimum level of life. However, poverty is not only the inability to meet basic needs; in a broader sense, including deprivations in areas such as education, health, and life expectancy (Sanchez-Martinez & Davis, 2014). Poverty is not only a matter of concern to the individual or the family but also a mass problem of including the whole society. It is possible to see the traces of mass poverty in history. While poverty in the rural areas before the industrial revolution was bearable, modern poverty emerged after the industrial revolution, and a high proportion of poverty and hunger were observed. Today, poverty can emerge because of (1) limited access to income and employment, (2) insufficient and insecure living conditions, (3) poor infrastructure and services, (4) natural disasters, environmental hazards and similar risks, particularly health risks associated with living in gecekondus, (5) exclusion and (6) problems of inequality (Dodge et al., 1994; Gedbery et al., 2007).

With the Industrial Revolution, the unattractive factors of the rural areas and the attractive factors of the urban areas became more evident, and those living in rural areas migrated to the cities, which were the center of the capital, for working. This working class is the first generation of poverty in cities due to their low-income. In the current literature, the so-called "working poor" groups started to emerge at that time (Sinding, 2009). Adverse situations such as long working hours, low wages, and child labor brought about unfavorable circumstances such as family fragmentation, alcohol dependence, suicide, and social exclusion (Pompili et al., 2010). As Fuchs (2005) noted, even the language used to express the poverty in the 19th century has changed, and this change in language has been the first step in social discrimination and marginalization.

Social dimensions of poverty are seen as; (1) discrimination and social exclusion, (2) gecekondus, (3) crime, (4) domestic violence and (5) poverty culture (Godoy, 2004).

Discrimination and *social exclusion* emphasize that poverty leads to deprivation not only of financial means but also of participation in social life (Offer, 2012; Dieckhoff & Gash, 2015). Social exclusion, in general, means that individuals or households; it is a term that meets the process of being deprived of either resources or social ties with the broader community or society (Marshall, 1999).

The most prominent feature of *social exclusion* is the loss or detachment of the individual's or a particular group's relationship with society or ties to different welfare institutions. The disconnection of the individual from society indicates that the idea of solidarity in society is weakened (Sapancali, 2005). The fact that the poor are excluded from society in which they exist is one of the critical reasons for the deepening of poverty and its transfer from the older generation to the young one (Erdem, 2006). Poverty has recently been seen as a problem of marginalization and exclusion, along with a lack of income. The feeling of exclusion, accompanied by poverty, breaks the hopes of the poor and makes them more deprived in many ways (Hartley, 2016).

Gecekondus are the structures observed, especially in metropolitan cities, where poverty is deeply experienced, and exclusion, separation, and incontinence are extremely rare.

Crime is a practical and widespread consequence of poverty (Webster, 2014). The poor are people who are often exposed to social exclusion and feel out of society. Therefore, they can behave more freely than others in terms of non-compliance. The reasons for poor people committing crimes may be more than others. However, as already mentioned, the severe implication of crime is to marginalize the poor. In this context, one aim should be to combat poverty culture in the studies to be conducted for the poor (Sallan Gül, S., 2002).

Domestic violence is a social problem that starts in the home, but its effects are seen throughout society. Women and children are the leading victims of domestic violence. Violence in low-income families is a common phenomenon. In particular, the household man who has a lack of self-confidence in terms of socio-economic and cultural aspects can be explained with the view that he has put pressure on his wife or children in order to overcome this deficiency. As a result, the man has a relatively emotional satisfaction; on the other hand, women and children are in psychologically intense depression. Some poor women accept this thread and see it as a regular thing. When we look at the reasons for this, we can see factors such as low level of consciousness, learned helplessness, lack of support, and lack of education. Although the phenomenon of violence is seen in educated people, the researches show that the rate of violence among the uneducated is higher (Marium, 2014). In this case, it can be said that poverty has outcomes such as violence as well as triggering factors such as lack of education and unemployment. Also, poverty increases the trend of the prevalence of violence in families with low levels of education. All of these have a direct connection to the rights of women and children.

Poverty culture, as a theoretical perspective, has an essential place in most of the academic and applied studies in the poverty literature. In general, 'poverty culture,' which describes a cultural environment characterized by fatalism, trust, and idleness, is the opposite of success, hard work, and self-confidence (Marshall, 1999). Poverty culture defines a series of behaviors and attitudes affected by the conditions experienced in poverty. For those who adopt this approach, the reason is psychological rather than economic. With the chronicity of poverty, one feels trapped in this wheel. When he realizes that he cannot survive, he embraces the lifestyle he has built upon someone helping him (O'Brian, 2006). According to Lewis (1965), a culture is caused by poverty over time. (1) Low-wage employment, (2) long-term unemployment, (3) the inability to provide social, (4) political and economic organization for the low-income strata, and (5) the existence of a judgment of value that tends to accumulate wealth in the dominant class and connects the lower strata to personal inability are the root causes of the poverty culture. These reasons and poverty are two paradigms that feed and sustain each other (Lewis, 1965).

2.2. Migration, Slum Housing and Poverty in Turkey

-Poverty in Turkey

With accelerating industrialization in Turkey in the 1950s, there has been migration from rural to urban. This situation has created new urban problems such as crooked urbanization, slum housing, and infrastructure problems. However, due to the protection of spiritual values, poverty did not make itself felt much in this period; especially after 1980, social discrimination and inequality began to be seen frequently (Wodtke, 2016).

According to Kalaycioglu and Tilic (2002), the following factors affect the increase and visibility of poverty after 1980;

- Change in understanding and approaches in economic policies; for example, the joint effects of globalization and financial knowledge that emphasize neoliberal and individual entrepreneurship.
- In particular, the change in the conditions of immigrants after 1985. The new immigrants had less chance in every sense than the old ones.
- A reduction in real wages and income distribution in metropolitan cities. The former middle class lost its socio-economic status, and new immigrants (after 1985) could not use the opportunities in the city as much as the old immigrants.
- The flexibility of production in the industrial sector, such as flexibility and irregularity in the labor market and wages, unemployment caused by the shift from labor-intensive to machine-intensive.

- Increasing the use of homework, piece work, and especially female and child labor in the form of informal production.

In Turkey, not only economic opportunities for the poor but also be deprived of a team of social interests and benefits can be explained with global impact. The gap between the social classes getting more substantial because of the reasons; (1) the only criterion of participation in social life is money, (2) fluctuations in money markets, (3) the emphasis on wealth in the media, (4) the absence of any limit in property acquisition, and (5) the fact that the criterion for using legitimate or illegitimate opportunities is at the forefront of raising or developing property increases. This gap leads to the erosion of both value and character in both wealth and poverty (Isik & Pinarcioglu, 2003).

Several social problems arise as a result of economic and political factors emerge due to the poverty both in the world and Turkey. Also, it is necessary to take micro factors into account, such as cultural elements and individual characteristics as well as macro factors in the emergence of poverty (Christiaensen, Demery & Paternostro, 2003). In international comparisons, not in very bright conditions concerning poverty indicators, Turkey is among the countries where the income distributed as extremely unjust. Poverty today has become one of the most critical issues in a developing country such as Turkey. On the one hand, unfair income distribution, on the other hand, low share of national income, economic crises in recent years are factors that increase poverty throughout the country (Arpacioglu & Yildirim, 2011).

The poverty research in Turkey finds a strong relationship with poverty and social ties. Kinship, friendship, or citizenship among the poor were found to be quite strong. The real problem here is the attitude and behavior of institutions or wealthy citizens towards the poor. In Turkish culture, while it is assumed that the rich people care for the poor and are closer to them, even today, there is a disconnect between the rich and poor brothers. The main problem that causes social exclusion to accelerate and push the poor out of society in the future is individualism, selfishness, and not thinking about others and not being able to empathize. The fact that the social segments move away from each other is seen as a more dangerous situation than problems such as poverty and unemployment (Fleche & Layard, 2017).

-Migration

Turkey's agricultural modernization movement began in the 1950s. The increase in the use of machine power in agriculture with the help of Marshall Aid resulted in the emergence of labor surplus in the agricultural sector. As the republic period, the state focused on industrial investments in the cities and encouraged the private sector to industrialize. Labor surplus in rural and labor demand in urban areas has caused migration from rural to urban areas. However, this has brought many social and cultural problems. The state didn't provide social housing for the laborers who work for the industry while investing in the industrial facilities at urban sites. These people were forced to solve their housing problems by building illegal houses on public state-owned land. The zoning amnesties supported the redistribution of urban areas (Ataov & Osmay, 2007).

For the immigrants who came to the cities since the 1950s, housing was the main problem. Immigrants who had a job in the city could not find accommodation suitable for their economic conditions. In the 1940s, immigrants built shelters in the periphery of the city on their own and light tools. The state did not prevent these persons who met their housing needs illegally. Also, the population of squatter houses was considered to be a positive contribution to the economy, starting from the 1950s (Erman & Eken, 2004). In that sense, it can be said that in the 1970s, there was a co-operation between the state and illegal housing producers. This co-operation can be read from providing services such as electricity, water, infrastructure, and transportation to the squatter houses by the government.

In the 1980s, zoning amnesties came to the agenda to gain political support from the shanty houses. The slums, which were first built illegally with light tools with the zoning amnesty given by the governments of the period before the election, gradually evolved into the reinforced concrete and multi-storey structure. In the 1990s, slum settlements became the areas with the highest building density in the cities. However, over the years, slum areas have become the first stopping point of the migrants from rural to urban areas. This production of space, which has been emerged in non-commodified areas into the property market, has brought about new forms of inequality rather than diminishing them (Cavusoglu, 2014). The 1980s became dominant, and income inequality became more visible. With the growth of

cities, gecekondu areas remained in the central regions instead of the periphery of the cities. So the growing rent came into the agenda in these areas. Urban redevelopment, which adopted the model of the production of multi-storey luxury houses to demolish the gecekondu settlements, offer them to the upper-income groups, came into the agenda with the 2000s. The main objective of urban transformation in Turkey, especially the 1999 Marmara Earthquake action is not on the program with the rehabilitation of earthquake risk areas. Today, Turkey has become the most significant property owner mode of production volume of urban redevelopment.

In the urban redevelopment process, the low-income groups move to the peripheral zones of the city under the effect of exclusionary economic conditions. Meanwhile, the high-income groups move towards redeveloped, gated communities that are designed with high security and social facilities. High-income groups live together with the people who belong to the same social class. This situation means that people are evicted from the areas where they feel a sense of belonging- ing by forced displacement (Sen, 2008; Turkun, 2014).

In this context, the process in which the gecekondu settlers see themselves as a part of the urban life with the support of the state ended with the redevelopment process. The gecekondu settlers reversed to undesirable actors in the field. Effective neoliberal policies play a significant role in the process. With the effects of globalization, the tendency of national economies. Urban redevelopment projects gained momentum (Yalcintan et al., 2014; Sen, 2008).

In the process of regenerating the urban space, which is the surplus of the capitalist system, social class differences became more apparent. The lower-income group, generally resident in gecekondu areas, had to leave the field due to the lack of inclusive economic policies in the economic and social context. A group that migrated from rural areas in the 1950s and met their housing needs illegally in slum areas was forced to migrate again in the 2000s when the transformation process started in the slum area. However, as in the 1950s, this migration is not declared and compelling. As in the 1950s, this migration is primarily caused by economic and then social factors.

Firstly, during the urban transformation process, the selling and service costs of newly built houses are very high. Since it is not possible for the lower-income group living in the slums to adapt to these new economic conditions, a significant mass of people left the process by selling their rights. Besides, the concept of design in residential buildings that will be built as multi-storey indoor sites in the urban transformation area does not fit the lifestyles of the people living in the slums. The next wave of migration occurred because the new settlement did not match the lifestyle of the gecekondu settlers. The next wave of immigration is realized by those who have settled in new housing but have experienced economic and social problems even though they have tried (Markoc, 2019).

3. CASE STUDY

3.1. Method

In the field study of the Fikirtepe Workshop held on April 28, 2018, semi-structured in-depth interviews were conducted with the people whose housing has not yet been demolished. The content analysis of the discourses obtained and the data of the field study were compiled. The universe of the field research consists of 60 building islands within the scope of transformation in Fikirtepe, Dumlupınar, Eğitim, and Merdivenköy neighborhoods. On April 28, 2018, the sample group consisted of 16 randomly selected people in Fikirtepe's unspoiled garden. People were asked questions about the transformation, and their discourses were recorded with a voice recorder with their permission. Then, the interviews were deciphered, and content analysis revealed the speech of the indigenous people on the migration of poverty.

3.2. Fikirtepe District

The first settlements in Fikirtepe started in the 1950s with rural migrations to Istanbul. Those who came to Istanbul to work in industrial facilities first built illegal houses with light tools on the treasury lands of the state. With the zoning amnesties over time, the slums became multi-storey and dense and created an inadequate quality building stock. First, the eastern part of Fikirtepe developed rapidly. In the aerial photographs in 1966, it is seen that approximately 40% of the area has been built and the agricultural

areas have started to turn into slum areas. (1/1000 Scale Fikirtepe and Surrounding Implementation Development Plan Report, 2013).

In 1965, Fikirtepe was appointed as a neighborhood and overgrew in 1975 and was divided into three districts: Fikirtepe, Dumlupınar, and Egitim. Among these neighborhoods, the Education District in the south has shown a more planned development compared to the other neighborhoods. Dumlupınar and Fikirtepe Neighborhoods continued their growth in an unplanned way with the irregular construction consisting of multi-storey shanty houses (Haksever & Cinar, 2018).

In the 1980s, due to the immigration population, slum movements in the big cities gained momentum, and in Fikirtepe, the building density started to increase. The booming auto industry and carpenter workshops in the region have caused new workers to shelter in the area. In 1973, with the opening of the Bosphorus Bridge and the D100 motorway, Fikirtepe became an urban center. Within the scope of Law No. 2981, which was enacted in 1984, the shanty houses in Fikirtepe were legalized, and the owners of the shanty houses became owners of the land. In 1991, with the Improvement Development Plan, the title deeds were distributed to the slum owners. In the 2000s, Fikirtepe and its environs gained their present appearance in terms of structuring. Since the existing building stock of the Fikirtepe region is irregular and earthquake-resistant due to unplanned development, the region was declared as a Special Project Area in the Master Plan in 2005. With the amendment of the Master Plan of Kadıköy Central and D-100 Highway Interim Zone approved by 22.03.2007, the term Urban Transformation Area was added to the "Special Project Area" legend. Since the implementation zoning plan was not made in line with this plan, legal procedures related to planning and zoning were interrupted, and the people of the region experienced socio-economic problems. 1/1000 scale Fikirtepe and Surrounding Area Implementation Plan Istanbul was approved in 2011 by the Mayor of the Metropolitan Municipality. Objectives of the plan; (1) Strengthening the building stock against all disaster damages, especially earthquakes, (2) Increasing reinforcement areas in the planning area, (3) Ensuring the integration of the planning area with the city in terms of economic and social aspects, (4) Developing transformation strategies specific to the region.

In line with these objectives, it is aimed to solve the problems in the region and to create a structure that is resistant to all disaster damages, especially earthquakes. The state decided to transform the existing small-scale houses in Fikirtepe region into large-scale gated communities. Fikirtepe redevelopment area is divided into 60 building islands with the master plan. According to the master plan, as the parcel areas merged and grown, a structural transformation has been realized.

3.3. Presentation of Field Data

The prominent discourses obtained from the semi-structured in-depth interviews conducted in the field study are as follows:

"Once you have gone, you can't return. Foreigners will come, Arabs will come. Football players will come here, to live. Local people are conservative, here. They don't use swimming pools. They don't need swimming pools."

"People did not want to leave Fikirtepe. But nobody asked them their opinion; they were offered a project they can not refuse."

"Fikirtepe is no longer left to live. It would be better if there were no urban transformation."

"With the new law, the system started to work. No living space has been created for us. There are buildings that they cannot bring electricity, water. People cannot live in the area during the reconstruction process."

"The houses around were destroyed, our building island remained in the middle, our neighbors are trying to live in the construction dust."

"First, we were surprised, everybody was discussing different issues, we made the agreement, we have been here for many years, we don't want to be displaced, but now it happens."

"I don't know how to read or write. They took our houses from us. We're victims. Some parcels have been partially evacuated. Some islands have reached a deal. There is severe chaos in the neighborhood."

"Our tenants went, too. We were living with rental income."

"I was a tenant when my shop was demolished; I had to move to Umraniye (a settlement away from here), I lost my job."

"Due to the prolonged process, most people were forced to sell their land rights."

"My compensation for land is not enough to buy a flat, I have to sell our stock, or I can't pay the difference."

"In Fikirtepe, there is no old neighborhood relationship; everyone is alone."

"The neighborhood demolished. We can't sit here. I will go to a place with a garden where I can shout and call again, where I can barbecue."

"Here is both my town and my city. I can't go back to the rural anymore, and I can't stay here either."

"Transformation is a complete displacement, forced internal migration. I don't think we can have a neighbor relationship with the people who will come to live in Fikirtepe."

"It is best to go elsewhere."

"If we take our rights, we will go."

"We'd be comfortable now if we took the money and left. We waited for it to gain value. We were regretting that we didn't go on time."

"It's not easy to go, but I want to leave here because it's tough to live here."

"There is no realistic planned project. It is not clear how we will be our flat when the project is finished. Maybe it won't be a suitable flat may be very problematic. Perhaps we can't live in it."

"We continue to live in uncertainty. It's not clear either we stay or leave."

"The demands of the people here were not taken into consideration during the planning process. The state offered us if you like to stay in your neighborhood or you can go."

"We want to be a part of a more humane project where so many people can live. But they did it according to the rich ones' lifestyles."

"I want the state to be the guarantor. I don't trust the contractor."

"The state left us with the contractors. The contractor firm determines our destiny."

"We lost many spiritual emotions and entered into monetary relations between neighbors. There is no neighborhood relationship now. Fikirtepe has changed a lot."

"Every day I'm spending more money for transportation, as I'm changing four different vehicles to get to my home. I'd better get out of here."

"Where we just moved, our costs increased. I'm thinking of renting this house and moving to a more liveable neighborhood."

"They cut the rent allowance. We get along hard. I lost my kids, looking after my orphan grandchildren. We used to get together somehow. I can't live in new homes."

"The contract should be explained before we sign. The state should protect the public. They said to take care of ourselves."

"Due to the pressure on the neighborhood created by the expropriation and the media, we could not resist anymore and signed the contract. Unfortunately, the officials of the ministry told us that the state couldn't act as an arbitrator. We expected that the state would

mediate between our demands and our counterpart's offer, but unfortunately, it was not as we thought and hoped."

The themes and codes obtained from prevalent discourses are given in Figure 1 and Figure 2.

	THEMES	CODES
1	<i>Fikirtepe is no longer the usual old version.</i>	· LOSING NEIGHBORHOOD ROUTINS · ECONOMIC EXCLUSION
2	<i>The operating costs of new homes are very high.</i>	· ECONOMIC EXCLUSION
3	<i>For people whose neighbors have gone, living in Fikirtepe is meaningless.</i>	· ALIENATION · SOCIAL EXCLUSION
4	<i>Both economic and social-oriented exclusionary decisions have been made.</i>	· PARTICIPATION PROBLEMATICS · ECONOMIC EXCLUSION · SOCIAL EXCLUSION
5	<i>The low-income group was not considered at any stage of the transformation.</i>	· ECONOMIC EXCLUSION · SOCIAL EXCLUSION
6	<i>Decisions have been taken on the fact that the low-income group is leaving the area.</i>	· DISPLACEMENT
7	<i>Those who are waiting for the redevelopment of their home with profit expectations also want to go as soon as possible.</i>	· SOCIAL EXCLUSION
8	<i>Most people would have preferred to leave Fikirtepe from the beginning instead of going through this process.</i>	· PARTICIPATION PROBLEMATICS
9	<i>For people who have lived in Fikirtepe for many years, newly built sites are not suitable living spaces.</i>	· SOCIAL EXCLUSION · ECONOMIC EXCLUSION
10	<i>People who have lived in Fikirtepe for many years now want to leave.</i>	· DISPLACEMENT
11	<i>People who have lived in Fikirtepe for many years now have to leave because of changing conditions.</i>	· DISPLACEMENT

Figure 1. The Themes and Codes Obtained from Field Data



Figure 2. Codes of the Field Data

4. CONCLUSION

In the 1950s, those who had difficulty living in rural areas migrated from rural areas to cities to work in industrial facilities. In this study, this process was defined as *the first migration of poverty*. Blue-collar workers in industrial facilities in the city have solved their housing problem by building gecekondus. For these slums, areas on the periphery of the city were generally chosen near industrial facilities. However, with the growth of the city over time, these areas remained in the center of the city. Also, high rent value emerged in these areas.

After the 1999 Marmara earthquake resistance of housing stock to earthquakes in Turkey, has been questioned. In the 2000s, the reproduction of the existing housing stock due to earthquake risk was brought to the agenda. Fikirtepe, which was selected as a case study, is a residential area that has been transformed in this process. The rebuilding of low-rise gecekondus in Fikirtepe on an island basis model is aimed at reproduction. However, the rebuilt houses are not designed according to the lifestyle and needs of the gecekondu families living in Fikirtepe.

Due to the high rent value of the area, the newly produced houses (high-rise gated communities) are suitable for the demands of the upper-income group. Since both the selling costs and the operating costs of these dwellings are high, the gecekondus have become more inhabitable in Fikirtepe. Before the redevelopment process, most people living in the gecekondus in Fikirtepe had to leave the area. In this study, this displacement process is defined as *the second migration of poverty*. Themes and codes were obtained by processing semi-structured in-depth interviews conducted in the field with content analysis. The process described as *the second migration of poverty* is a significant social problem that should be considered together with the concepts of loss of neighborhood culture, alienation, social and economic exclusion, participation problem and displacement.

REFERENCES

- ARPACIOĞLU, Ö. & YILDIRIM, M. (2011). Dünyada ve Türkiye’de yoksulluğun analizi. *Niğde Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 4(2), 60–76.
- ATAÖV, A., OSMAY, S. (2007). Türkiye’de Kentsel Dönüşüme Yöntemsel Bir Yaklaşım. *METU JFA*, 2(24:2), 57-82.
- CHRISTIAENSEN, L., DEMERY, L., & STEFANO, P. (2003). Macro and Micro Perspectives of Growth and Poverty in Africa. *The World Bank Economic Review*, 17(3), 317-347. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3990244>
- DIECKHOFF, M. and GASH, V. (2015). Unemployed and alone? Unemployment and social participation in Europe. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 35, 67–90
- DODGE, K. A., PETTIT G. S., BATES J. E. (1994). Socialization mediators of the relation between socioeconomic status and child conduct problems. *Child Development*, 65(2), 649-665.
- ERDEM, T., (2006). Yoksulluk, Feodaliteden Küreselleşmeye emel Kavramlar ve Süreçler, Lotus Yayınevi, Ankara.
- ERMAN, T., EKEN, A. (2004). ‘The “Other of the Other” and “unregulated territories” in the urban periphery: Gecekondu violence in the 2000s with a focus on the Esenler case, İstanbul’, *Cities*, 21 (1), pp. 57-68.
- FLÈCHE, S., and LAYARD, R. (2017). Do More of Those in Misery Suffer from Poverty, Unemployment or Mental Illness?. *Kyklos*, 70: 27– 41.
- FUCHS, R., (2005) *Gender and Poverty in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, New York: Cambridge University Pres., s. 10.
- GERBERY, D., BODNÁROVÁ, B., FILADELFIOVÁ, J. (2007). Životné podmienky rodín v medzigeneračnej perspektíve. In *Rodina a práca*, 1, 52
- GODOY, L. (2004). ‘Understanding poverty from a gender perspective’, Women and Development Unit of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC),
- HARTLEY, D. (2016). Poverty and social exclusion. In: Platt, Lucinda and Dean, Hartley, (eds.) *Social Advantage and Disadvantage*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, pp. 3-24. ISBN 9780198737070
- IŞIK, O., PINARCIOĞLU, M. (2003). Nöbetleşe Yoksulluktan Kuralsız Yoksulluğa, *Görüş Dergisi*, S.51.

- KALAYCIOGLU, S. ve RITTERSBERGER TILIC, H. (2002). "Yapısal Uyum Programlarıyla Ortaya Çıkan Yoksullukla Basetme Stratejileri", içinde Kentleşme, Göç ve Yoksulluk. 7. Ulusal Sosyal Bilimler Kongresi, İmaj Yayıncılık, Ankara, s.197-246.
- LEWIS, O. (1965) *İşte Hayat*, (Çev: Vahit Çelikbaş), E Yayınları, İstanbul.
- MARIUM S. (2014). Women level of education and its effect on domestic violence in Bangladesh. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 19:40-45.
- MARKOC, I. (2019). "Türkiye’de Cumhuriyet Döneminden İtibaren Uygulanan Konut Politikaları ve Bir Çözüm Önerisi Olarak Kentsel Dönüşüm". *International Social Sciences Studies Journal*, 5(39): 3598-3608.
- MARSHALL, G. (1999). *Sosyoloji Sözlüğü*, (Çev: Osman Akınhay, Derya Kömürçü). Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları, İstanbul.
- SANCHEZ-MARTÍNEZ, M. & DAVIS, P. (2014). "A review of the economic theories of poverty," National Institute of Economic and Social Research (NIESR) Discussion Papers 435, *National Institute of Economic and Social Research*.
- O’BRIAN, R. (2006). Culture Of Poverty, *Encyclopedia of World Poverty*, (Ed: Mehmet Odekon), Sage Publications, USA, s. 222-224.
- OFFER, S. (2012). The burden of reciprocity: Processes of exclusion and withdrawal from personal networks among lowincome families. *Current Sociology*, 60, 788–805.
- POMPILI M, et al. (2014). Suicidal Behavior and Alcohol Abuse. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 7:1392–1431
- SALLAN GÜL, S., (2002). Türkiye’de Yoksulluk ve Yoksullukla Mücadelenin Sosyolojik Boyutları: Göreliden Mutlak Yoksulluğa, Yoksulluk, Şiddet ve İnsan Hakları içinde, ed. Yasemin Özdek, TODAİE Yayınları, Ankara. S. 108.
- SAPANCALI, F. (2005). AB’nde Sosyal Dışlanma Sorunu ve Mücadele Yöntemler. *Çalışma ve Toplum*, s. 51-70.
- SARI HAKSEVER, T. and CİNAR, C. (2019). The Coordination of Actors in Urban Regeneration Projects: Fikirtepe, İstanbul, Turkey, *International Journal of Contemporary Urban Affairs*, no.2019, ss.114-123.
- SEN, A. (1990). "Gender and Cooperative Conflicts", (Ed.) I. Tinker, *Persistent Inequalities: Women and World Development*, New York: Oxford University.
- ŞEN, B. (2005). "Soylulaştırma: Kentsel Mekanda Yeni Bir Ayrışma Biçimi", İstanbul’da Kentsel Ayrışma Mekansal Dönüşümde Farklı Boyutlar içinde. Hazırlayan Hatice Kurtuluş, Bağlam Yayınları, İstanbul.
- T.A.K (2018). Fikirtepe Örneğinde Kentsel Dönüşüm Çalıştayı, Sarıoğlu Erdoğan, G.P. <http://takortak.org/etkinlik/kadikoy/fikirtepe-orneğinde-kentseldonusum-calistayi/> Erişim tarihi:10 Ağustos 2018
- TÜRKÜN, A. (2014). Mevcut "Dönüşüm ve Yenileme Politikaları" Dar Gelirli Toplumsal Kesimlerin Barınma Sorununu Çözebilir mi? A. Türkün, & A. Türkün (Dü.) içinde, Mülk, Mahal, İnsan: İstanbul’da Kentsel Dönüşüm (s. 391-436). İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- WEBSTER, C. (2014). Impact of Poverty on Crime. Project Report, York, Joseph Rowntree Foundation
- WODTKE G. T. (2016). Social Class and Income Inequality in the United States: Ownership, Authority, and Personal Income Distribution from 1980 to 2010. *AJS; American journal of sociology*, 121(5), 1375–1415.
- YALCINTAN, M., ÇALIŞKAN, O. Ç., ÇILGIN, K. ve DÜNDAR, U. (2014). *İstanbul Dönüşüm Coğrafyası*, Yeni İstanbul Çalışmaları, Metis Yayıncılık, İstanbul.