



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Gendered nature and urban culture: The dialectics of gated developments in Izmir, Turkey*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/83077/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Datta, A (2014) Gendered nature and urban culture: The dialectics of gated developments in Izmir, Turkey. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 38 (4). 1363 - 1383. ISSN 0309-1317

<https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12081>

Reuse

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

**GENDERED NATURE AND URBAN CULTURE:
THE DIALECTICS OF GATED DEVELOPMENTS IN IZMIR, TURKEY¹**

Abstract: This paper adds to recent debates on the emergence of new forms of private gated developments in Turkey that are targeted specifically to upper middle-classes. In particular, it focusses on the rise of residential gated developments along the Izmir-Ceşme expressway to highlight how the dialectics between gender, nature and culture are reinforced in these places. Using the case study of three gated developments in this region, this paper suggests that their production is made possible through a series of dualisms between nature and culture, mobility and fixity, urban public life and gendered domesticity, urban modernity and rural parochialism, polluted city and healthy town. Through interviews with architects, developers, residents and with local authority officials in Urla town who sanction these developments, this paper argues that contradictions between different sets of dualisms form a central aspect of the processes through which these developments were designed, produced, marketed and inhabited. Taken collectively, these contradictions point broadly to the limits of gated communities in creating stable, adaptable and sustainable patterns of development in Turkey and the global south.

Introduction

Research and scholarship on gated communities in the Anglo-American context, have largely examined gated communities with respect to aestheticization, neoliberal urbanism, urban policy, belonging and citizenship (Atkinson and Flint 2004, Atkinson and Blandy 2005, Coy and Pohler 2002, Grant and Mittelsteadt 2004, Jurgens and Gnad 2002). Much of this research is specific to the Anglo-American and Latin American contexts, where the focus

¹ © All Rights Reserved. Datta, A (2013, in press) Gendered Nature and Urban Culture: The dialectics of gated developments in Izmir, Turkey, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*.

has been on the fear of urban crime (Low 2001, Caldiera 2000), exclusionary planning practices (Mycoo 2006), and social segregation (Alvarez-Rivadulla 2007, Roitman and Phelps 2011). More recently since King's (2004) suggestion that gated developments as a built form moves along with globalisation, there has been an increased interest in the ways that such developments are manifesting across Asia (Breitung 2012, Falzon 2004, Pow 2007, Pow 2009, Pow and Kong 2007, Wu and Webber 2004), Africa (Durington 2006, Grant 2005, Hook and Vrdoljak 2002, Jurgens and Gnad 2002, Landman 2007), Latin America (Alvarez-Rivadulla 2007, Coy 2006, Coy and Pohler 2002, De Duren 2006, Roitman and Phelps 2011) and the Middle-East (Coy 2008, Glasze and Alkhayyal 2002, Kuppinger 2004, Rosen and Razin 2009). Yet in this renewed interest in gated communities, the Turkish case has been understudied. Further, while these studies in the global south focus on neoliberal urbanisation (Rosen and Razin 2009), marketing of transnational lifestyles (Grant 2005), moral ordering of space (Pow 2007), and a localisation of the global (Kuppinger 2004), the Izmir case brings us to a previously understudied notion of the dualisms around 'gendered nature' in conceptualising, marketing and consuming gated developments. While it is emerging that unlike Anglo-American and Latin American cases, fear of crime does not feature centrally in the production of gated developments in Turkey (Genis 2007) the emergence of a range of dualisms around nature/culture, women/modernity, elite/parochial, town/city makes the Turkish case a significant topic of interest in this area.

In this paper, I explore these dualisms through a focus on the notion of 'gendered nature' in Turkish gated communities, which are located close to Urla along the Izmir-Ceşme expressway. I follow the definition of gated communities as 'walled or fenced housing developments, to which public access is restricted, characterised by legal agreements which tie the residents to a common code of conduct and (usually) collective responsibility for management' (Atkinson and Blandy 2005: 178). Turkey is one of the significant sites where

gated communities have become a ‘key sign of economic and political power and a symbol for states making claims to modernity’ (King 2004). Although gated communities have existed in Turkey since the 1970s, they have mainly taken the form of apartment blocks, generally gated, each with their own administration responsible for the maintenance of its amenities, like gardens, parking lots, and sports facilities. Since the 1990s however, there has been a sharp transformation in the residential housing market in Turkey with the rise of suburban detached villas within gated communities, which earlier used to be within small-scale plotted developments (Cinar et. al. 2006). The built form of the villa introduced in late nineteenth century as an European model, have now come to be associated with ‘the new republican elites – bureaucrats, professionals and the elites’ (King 2004: 113) leading to a ‘villafication’ of the countryside in Turkey. While these villas were earlier referred to as ‘country homes’ with Turkish-English composite names (such as Kemer-Country near Istanbul), the new villas since 1990s have gained the ‘site’ (Turkish for gated community) denomination in general usage. In this paper, I refer to this more recent typology as gated development.

The villa has now come to dominate the aesthetics of gated developments in Turkey and is following similar characteristics of middle-class privilege, securitisation and exclusion as the Anglo-American gated communities (King 2004). Unlike much of the literature on Anglo-American and Latin American gated developments however, the Turkish counterpart is seen to be produced less from an ‘architecture of fear’ (Ellin 1997) and more from the new cultures of consumption facing upper middle-classes in Turkey (Cinar et. al. 2006). They have been shaped recently in a very different context of globalisation and transnationalism in its three largest cities – Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir (Ayata 2002, Datta and Yucel Young 2007, Oncu 1997, Sonmez 2009). Istanbul and to a lesser extent Ankara as cities intimately linked to global connections, have been studied extensively for the rise of suburban gated

communities, yet the suburbanization of Izmir since the early 1990s has gone largely unnoticed. The Izmir gated developments are different from their counterparts in the global south not just because of their typology as villas and their connection to the inherent consumerism of middle-classes, but because they reflect much of the contradictions in Turkish society around the position of middle-class women and their connections to nature and culture. They therefore allow us to examine the dualisms of class itself ‘as a moral signifier’ (Sayer 2005) of gendered nature and urban culture. Through interviews with architects, developers and realtors who produce and sell these private residential neighbourhoods, with residents who inhabit its spaces, and with local authority officials in Urla who sanction these developments, this paper suggests that the production of Izmir’s suburban gated developments is made possible through this series of constructed dualisms that highlight its limits in achieving long-term sustainable and equitable patterns of residential life in Turkey and in the global south.

In the first section of this paper, I elaborate on two related sets of constructed dualisms – first between ‘modern’ Turkish women and rural landscapes and the resultant notion of gendered nature in these gated developments; and second between the ‘polluted’ city of Izmir and the ‘healthy’ town of Urla leading to the location of ‘culture’ within these gated developments. In the second section, I then argue that these dualisms form a central aspect of the processes through which gated developments in the Izmir region were designed, produced, sold and inhabited.

The dualisms of gated communities

The now prolific scholarship on gated communities in Anglo-American contexts has focussed on the discourse of fear, violence and crime in the city (Atkinson and Flint 2004, Atkinson and Blandy 2005, Low 2001) which produce middle-class segregation and spatial defence against unwanted encounters. However, emerging literature on gated developments

across the global south highlight a much more complex process of its production and consumption and should not therefore be seen only as an Anglo-American import (Goix and Webster 2008, Webster et. al. 2006). King (2004) calls these ‘spaces of global cultures’ where particular social, political, economic and cultural forces shape the built forms of contemporary gated developments in the global south and reflect the dualisms inherent in their production and consumption in particular local contexts. In the case of Cairo for example, Kuppinger (2004) notes how they present many moments of ambivalence between policing people and controlling spaces. Pow (2007) notes how Chinese gated communities use the logics of moral order to organise space and territorial exclusion through the discourses of ‘civilised lifestyles’. In Riyadh, while gated communities incorporate traditional architectural patterns, they offer spaces for the practice of western lifestyles (Glasze and Alkhayyal 2002). In South Africa on the other hand, Hook and Vrdoljak (2002) use the label ‘juxtaposed incompatibilities’ in presenting the dualisms between the ‘bucolic pastiche’ of architectural styles and the ‘rights’ to privilege associated with this. Genis (2007) highlights the most significant dualisms of the Turkish gated communities in that they propagate ‘anti-city’ but not necessarily ‘anti-urban’ lifestyles. Taken together these examples reflect the dualisms inherent in the recent trend of gated developments spreading across the global south.

Bourdieu’s (1984) work on the notion of taste and distinction is a useful theoretical tool to understand these dualisms since it provides us with the analytics to make sense of how women become the site of binary classifications through which spatial exclusivity, nature and culture are associated with gated developments in Turkey. Bourdieu notes that taste can constitute a form of cultural capital for the protection of identities, distinctions and exclusions. In the case of the Izmir gated communities, cultural capital relates to particular forms of aestheticized ‘nature’ framed by the houses. The relative location of the cultural

elites in positions of power is what Bourdieu notes as determining the distinction and value associated with their social and cultural capital. For him, the powers of the elite are vested in forms of capital – economic, social, cultural and symbolic, the relative weightage given to each form of capital in different spaces and the specific combination of economic, social cultural and symbolic capital which allows the elites and middle-classes to accumulate and legitimise their power within these spaces. Bourdieu calls this the ‘habitus’ – ‘a system of schemes of production of practices and a system of perception and appreciation of practices’ (1989: 19). Habitus produces the ‘practices and representations which are available for classification, which are objectively differentiated’ (1989: 19) but in order to understand their social significance, one needs to know the codes to these classificatory systems. In other words, Bourdieu suggests that while taste is highly subjective and constructed, they are represented and perceived as if they were based on a system of objective criteria. Put this way, taste and ‘culture’ can be seen to overlap as discursive constructs and it is on this basis that the power and cultural distinction of the middle-classes are maintained in the gated communities.

Yet as Sayer (2005) notes, Bourdieu does not explain why and how class positioning might become both a matter of pride and embarrassment. In other words, Sayer notes that class itself might become a form of ‘moral signifier’, which people use to distinguish themselves from other social groups. Sayer notes that class goes beyond its positioning through structural conditions and consumer practices. Class is also related to sentiments that are constructed through how people position themselves against what they value – which is critical to arguing for a moral hierarchy of class itself. Conceptualising class as a moral signifier alongside more structural notions of access to forms of capital through which the middle-classes distinguish themselves means that class can be seen in this case as constructed through a contradictory process of ‘lay morality’. Thus middle-classes might argue that their

class signifier is related to the concern for nature yet their privileged access to economic and social capital leads to a consumerist consumption of this very nature. In this case a combination of structural and moral signifiers of class produces a further dualism – a false morality of gendered empowerment and ‘bourgeois environmentalism’.

There are two distinct but related dualisms that I focus on in this paper – first is the dualisms between nature and culture and the role of women within this; and second is the dualisms between the modern city and parochial town and the role of middle-classes in shaping them. Using Bourdieu’s (1989) words, I argue that these dualisms ‘function as distinct signs’. This means that social worlds of those living in these developments can be presented as a logical system of binaries which can then operate as signs of distinction. But they also relate to the dualisms of middle-class morality in the ways that differentiated but universalised middle-class values relate to the positions of women, nature, culture and the modern city. In these developments thus binaries of working/middle-class, town/city, nature/culture and so on differentiate social groups ‘by the distinctions they make, between the beautiful and the ugly, the distinguished and the vulgar, in which their position in the objective classifications is expressed’ (Bourdieu 1984: 6). Taking women as a site of construction of these binaries means gendering this system of classifications and binaries to make masculine/feminine binaries fall roughly in line with modern/parochial, city/town, nature/culture and so on. However, as I suggest in this paper, the Turkish case complicates the presentation of these binaries as simple masculine-culture/feminine-nature dualisms.

Gendered constructions of nature/culture dualisms in suburban gated developments.

It is now widely accepted among feminist scholars that nature/culture dualisms lay at the heart of Western society’s advances in areas of technology, modernity and rationality (Haraway 1990, Merchant 1989). This dualism served a number of purposes: first, it presumed nature as wild and uncontrolled which could only be tamed through the rationality of culture; second, this implied an inherent exploitation of nature which could be justified as

a consequence of culture, rationality and modernity; and finally, this dualism was gendered in that it tied women to a 'natural' order of things presumed to be related to their reproductive and domestic roles and therefore at a lower level to 'culture' (which was presumed to be masculine). Merchant (1989) goes further to argue that this nature/culture dualism served to simultaneously justify the control of both women and environment since the dawn of modernity. The gendered effects of the nature/culture dualisms manifested particularly strongly in the rise and growth of Anglo-American suburbia since the 19th century. Keulartz (1995) notes that this began with approaches to early town planning by figures like Patrick Geddes who proposed that the urbanisation of the countryside was at the cost of disturbing the 'natural order' between rural and urban and by extension between masculine and feminine roles. Subsequent conceptualisations of the 'garden city' by Geddes' protégé Lewis Mumford was then presented as establishing and reinforcing the balance between 'tamed' nature and 'modern' culture. In the most compelling feminist critique of this dualism so far, Hayden (2002) argues how American suburban housing perpetuate Victorian stereotypes of the home as 'woman's place' and the city as 'man's world'. While these critiques are useful in examining much of the Anglo-American scholarship on gated developments, the Turkish gated developments suggest a more contradictory conceptualisation of gendered nature which is related to the social, political and historical links between the specificities of Turkish women and nature.

The making of the Turkish Republic is intimately linked to the empowerment of its women, which has particular consequences in gendering the nature/culture dualisms. During the making of the Turkish Republic under Ataturk in the 1930s, a radical restructuring of the legal system took place which changed earlier Sharia laws to a secular civil code – monogamy, equal rights under divorce, ownership of property, custody of children and full political representation (Kagitcibasi 1986). The aim of these reforms was to 'modernize'

Turkish society, with the role and position of women seen as central to this modernization. Modern Turkish women were expected to shed their veil, be educated, and be equal participants in the public sphere. This Republican discourse on women in Turkey had a prominent spatial and architectural component, in which modern architecture was associated with the image of the newly ‘liberated’ women both symbolically and literally (Bozdogan 2001). Analysing the architecture of the new Turkish republic, Baydar (2002) notes that ‘modern Turkish women’ and the ‘modern Turkish home’ both became part of the ‘complicated and contradictory ways that constitute the seemingly coherent narratives of architectural and cultural modernisation in Turkey’. On the one hand, modern Turkish women were valorised as an antipode to the veiled Islamic women from the Ottoman Period. On the other hand, this image simultaneously served the mechanisms of paternalism which located modern Turkish women as nurturing domestic subjects whose rightful place was in the home. Baydar (2002) notes that structural, legal and institutional reforms brought a number of women into the public sphere but it did not fundamentally reorder the structures of power within the home and family. As Baydar concludes, the new Turkish Republic removed Islam but not paternalism from the public lives of women – as a consequence the modern Turkish home was simply reimagined as serving the new consumerist practices of modern Turkish women.

This active participation of the Turkish home in the production of a new gendered realm in Turkey was related to the contradictory relationships between women and nature in Turkish society. If the modern Turkish woman was meant to be rational, secular, professional, educated and an equal participant in the public sphere, they were therefore perceived as disconnected from their ‘natural instincts’. In other words, if women entered the ‘masculinist’ realm of the public sphere, they were seen to have become disconnected from their ‘natural’ qualities of nurturance and reproduction. This had important consequences for

the highly urbanised upper- and middle-class women who gained the most from the Kemalist structural reforms and became increasingly visible in the public realm, but were perceived as those with little understanding or desire for 'nature'. As I will argue in this paper, this perception led to particular marketing strategies directed at these women, in order to cultivate amongst them this desire for 'nature' associated with gated developments. This did not necessarily mean that the women who moved to these gated developments shared this perception. Rather, the notion of 'gendered nature' as constructed by the architects and developers stood in a fundamental contradiction with that constructed by the women themselves, in ways that reflected the gender contradictions prevalent in wider Turkish society.

'Culture' and Distinction of Middle-classes

The second set of dualisms that I address in this paper is around the class-based moral distinctions made between nature/culture and town/city. Social and cultural histories of the city shows that much before the rise of suburbia, there were particular imagined geographies that had to do with 'nature' and 'countryside,' which were tied to urban elite/aristocrat's perceptions of the city as a place of dirt, pollution and crime. This class-bias in suburban gated developments is widely recognised among scholars, particularly around how contradictory constructions of nature and culture are inherent in elite flights from the city and in subsequent consolidation of spatial exclusion and privilege in suburban gated communities. Indeed, Duncan and Duncan (2004) note from their research in an elite New York suburb, how a landscape aesthetic of a pastoral rural village served to reinforce, justify and naturalise social distinctions on the basis of race and class. Similarly research in post-socialist contexts shows how the lifestyles, values and consumption patterns in new gated developments are justified on aesthetic and environmental grounds, even when it induces wider environmental harm (Blinnikov et. al. 2006, Polanska 2010). This means that while the middle-classes might see the city as the site of crime, pollution, dirt and all sorts of social

evils, their move to the countryside is justified as being closer to 'nature' even though this move in itself is sustained through the depletion of natural resources (as a result of increased transport connections and the construction of gated developments). More recent studies of suburbia and gated communities also acknowledge the increased reliance and availability of private mobilities of the middle-classes that although environmentally harmful, nevertheless produce exclusionary private gated developments. Crucially they also refer to how access to the car has transformed contemporary urban and suburban spaces in a fundamental way, since it is now possible to cultivate and maintain urban lifestyles without necessarily living in the city. The car provides symbols of social status, freedom, modernity and so on, while it is also the single-most important cause of what Shiva (1997) would call the 'plunder of nature' and therefore contributes to the contradictions inherent in the production of contemporary gated developments.

The recent academic interest and scholarship on the rise of new gated communities particularly in countries like India and China, is largely focussed on their relationship to middle-classes (King 2004). In India, middle-classes have been labelled as 'omnivores' (Gadgil and Guha 1995) whose consumerist and globalised lifestyles as well as western architectural references have led to the proliferation of exclusionary urban and suburban landscapes across the global south. It is only recently that scholars are raising questions about the conceptual limitations of seeing middle-classes as a homogeneous group associated with power and consumerism (Gupta 2000, Pandey 2009). Particularly with reference to India, where the middle-classes have risen to increased prominence since neoliberalisation on 1991, scholars ask how middle-class identity is intersected by other categories of gender, religion, ethnicity and so on, and whether focussing only upon middle-class consumerism might silence other more complex and paradoxical processes through which they relate to nature, culture and (sub)urbanisation. Thinking through middle-class identity as shaped by both

structural and moral processes (Sayer 2005) however allows us to better understand the ambiguities of class and the dualisms in its value systems.

Although the recent call to explore the ambiguities of middle-class positioning is only just emerging, the literature on Turkish gated communities and the associated architectural form of a single-family home in cities like Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir is still very much embedded in the notion of a homogenous middle-class engaged in globalised consumerism (Candan and Kolluoglu 2008). Commenting on the suburban developments in Ankara, Turkey after 1990, Ayata describes the middle-classes as a ‘community of select and civilized people’ defined by what it excludes: ‘city life and its vulgar mix of the lower classes, the new rich and the Islamists.’ (2000: 30). Candan and Kolluoglu call this a ‘gating of the city’ through which places like Istanbul has experienced increasing pockets of new wealth located in exclusionary spaces of gated communities. The re-emergence of suburbia around Izmir in particular is said to have used the ‘Anglo-Saxon’ home as its central theme because of its reliance on ‘transnational economic relations, formation of new upper income groups, social polarization and changing consumption habits.’ (Sonmez 2009: 741).

However, unlike Indian or Chinese middle-classes whose globalised consumerism have emerged largely during the states’ alignment with neoliberalism, Turkish middle-classes (particularly in Izmir) relate to globalisation through the radical moment of the making of the Turkish Republic in October 1923, when nearly 400,000 (Muslim) Turks from the Balkans and Aegean Islands moved into Anatolia and a majority settled in the Izmir region (in nearby villages and towns like Urla) (Arkon 1989, Karadag 2000). They thus identify themselves with a more complex geo-political history of Turkey seeing their personal identities as a combination of Greek, Balkan and Turkish heritage and their largely urbanised ‘culture’ as the rejection of conservative Islamic traditions embodied by the rural countryside. Izmir’s middle-classes also arose from a social and economic need for such a group as a result of the

emigration of earlier Ottoman middle-class minorities from the region (Cagaptay 2004). In Izmir, these ‘emergent Turks acquired businesses and distribution and licensing rights that foreign companies had previously granted to minorities’ (Karasapan 1986: 30) thus becoming one of the most educated and powerful social groups in the city. The 1927 Law for the Encouragement of Industry in Turkey was a major stepping stone for this emerging class of industrialists in Izmir, who also began to see themselves as culturally elite. They frequented Izmir’s theatres, art scenes, cafes and participated in promoting cultural events in the city. Crucially they were largely a secular population, who in their construction of identity, belonging and citizenship aligned themselves more with Europe than with the Islamic world.

These specific historical, cultural and political contexts of the making of Izmir’s middle-classes shows a greater need to understand the moral significance of middle-class positioning in the production of gated developments. This is in line with recent calls to ‘tease out the local specificities of gated communities’ (Pow 2009) beyond its physical form and middle-class bias in order to understand better the combination of forces which produce and sustain its social and cultural landscapes. This concern is relevant in a Turkish context where its new middle-classes have aligned themselves with the state’s ongoing aspirations for European Union (EU) membership, yet seen a flattening of these aspirations by the rise of Islamist and Kurdish movements since the 1990s. Thus despite their move to the countryside, the middle-classes continue to identify themselves culturally as ‘urban’, since the town/village continues to be linked to parochialism and Islamist practices. Gender occupies a central role in these imaginations in terms of distancing themselves away from Islamist practices particularly those that are seen to imply control over women’s bodies. The Turkish middle classes in Izmir are well educated and secular; they see themselves as modern, cosmopolitan and hence highly ‘cultured’ – clearly a positionality from which they argue for women’s freedom and participation in the public realm, alongside a perception that this also

entails women's disengagement from their 'naturally ordained' gender roles. Izmir's middle-classes therefore present a number of inherently contradictory positions to produce what many scholars call a 'vernacularisation of class' (Gupta 2000) in gated developments. It is from their contradictory moral positioning against gender, culture and nature that the production, consumption and marketing of Urla's gated communities should be understood.

Researching Izmir's gated communities

This research was part of a wider study into the emergence of new types of gated communities along the Izmir- Çeşme expressway since its construction in 1993. We were interested in questions of how the increased mobility made possible by the expressway reinforced privileges of class and transnational status in the making of the material, cultural, and symbolic geographies of these developments. They consisted of single-family, two-storey houses with a swimming pool, which were built as gated communities housing upper middle-class families. We choose three of these gated developments for our study.

Development A was a relatively small-scale gated community, designed, built and marketed by the architect who also lived there but had his office in Izmir. Most of the villas there were sold to his social contacts from Izmir. Each villa was of a different design, on very large plots (15 percent built-up area), had unrestricted view of the Aegean Sea, and was often built in consultation with potential owners. This development was also the closest to the expressway. Development B was a medium-scale gated community of 30 single family houses (in the first of two phases) whose architect was located in Izmir and whose developer was a well-known construction company based in Ankara. Development C was designed by a well-known Izmir architect and built by a housing association based in Izmir. This comprised 217 identical single-family homes constructed on subdivisions (with 30 percent built-up area). Owners of these homes were members of the housing association. Many of them lived in Izmir and rented these out to NATO officials working in the nearby base in Izmir. This

development was also the furthest from the expressway (seven kilometres through uneven roads before reaching the expressway). All three of these developments were within the jurisdiction of Urla Municipality.

The research method involved semi-structured interviews with the architects and developers who built these developments, the Urla municipality officials and the residents of these gated communities. The participants (architects and residents) were recruited through the social networks of the author's Turkish friends and contacts and then snowballed to recruit new participants within these developments. The interviews were conducted mainly in Turkish, although the architects were all able to answer questions in English, frequently falling back on Turkish if they wanted to articulate more complex issues. The developers, realtors, Urla municipality officials and residents of the gated communities all spoke in Turkish. The host academic partner was able to provide on-site translations for the author and also conduct these interviews in the presence of the author, who often prompted for follow-up questions and clarifications. The interviews were translated and transcribed professionally at the end of the fieldwork.

The production of Urla's gated communities

In the late 1980s there emerged an economic imperative to connect Izmir, the third largest city in Turkey to Çeşme, a historic port town at the end of the Izmir peninsula in the West through a high-speed auto expressway. Çeşme was important to Izmir's middle- and upper-classes since many of them owned summer cottages there and would live there for a few months each year. These two cities were already connected by the existing national highway, but journey along the highway was slow. The high-speed expressway was meant to improve the economy of the region since Çeşme was an important tourist destination. The new expressway bypassed many of the small towns and villages which the national highway passed through but included Urla as one of the major towns along its route. Soon after the

expressway was completed in 1993 a large number of high-end gated developments or gated communities began to emerge around Urla. These immediately became desirable to Izmir's middle-and upper-classes, many of who moved there soon afterwards.



Figure 1: Hill slopes around Urla dotted with gated communities. Photo: Author.

Brunn and Frantz (2005) note the importance of studying gated communities beyond their urban form and residential group to focus on the role of wider regulatory frameworks in producing and shaping their development particularly in understudied cities of Asia. Indeed differentiated local governance in India and China has seen the rise of ‘enclave urbanism’ (Breitung 2012, 278) in particular cities and urban peripheries. De Duren (2006) in particular explains in the case of Buenos Aires how the upgrade of the northern highway tripled the number of gated communities along its route. Significant is his observation that their distribution was uneven, with the largest number concentrated in poorer municipalities who modified planning codes to lure developers.

Using this rationale, one can see why Urla as a relatively ‘poorer’ municipality in the Izmir region became a ‘hotspot’ for the development of gated communities. In 1992, Urla municipality made a few amendments to their planning guidelines to capitalise on the development potential presented by the expressway. The Urla masterplan (put in effect in 1995) permitted certain agricultural lands to have up to seven percent construction for a small

building, which was expected to house the necessary equipment and a small family who would work in the fields. Unlike other masterplans in Turkey, there were no plan notes to limit or govern anything else with respect to these constructions. Similar agricultural lands elsewhere were generally given only five percent permit, with plan notes that specified the minimum parcel size (in the case of the division of the land), maximum square meters and maximum height for a house within one parcel. In the revised Urla plan (set in action in 1995) only the minimum parcel size was given (3000sqm), which made it easier to build gated developments. These revisions facilitated architects to design houses much larger than the prescribed limits. As the architect of development C explained,

The problem with the [development] was there were too many people so they had to design or build too many houses but status of the, well the [master] plan didn't suit with the population that wanted to come there. But the Board of Governors had been engaged to the people so they were forced the law in a way. So this is why the roofs are tilted like this. Because according to the codes of the Mayorship in Urla, what you call it the place in the roof, the angle [pitch] of the roof, yeah at some places, the angle gets, you know, the roof gets very low, so these areas are not counted as the building area. So we had such roofs, I mean otherwise they couldn't build the houses. [Architect, Development C, interviewed in English]

Within Urla's municipality borders, there are now 163 housing cooperatives that have constructed 5667 units (Sonmez 2009). While many of the housing cooperatives started their constructions in the 1980s in the peripheries of Urla, the number increased phenomenally from 1986 to 1995. The masterplan amendments facilitated these constructions since these were located within the Urla municipality. These gated developments were largely populated by Izmir's urban middle-classes, who moved out of the city in search of 'natural and healthier' lifestyles.

Polluted Izmir and Healthy Urla

The geographic and class-based seclusions of Izmir's middle-classes are not new. In the 1950s, Izmir's middle-classes lived largely in its upmarket areas in the highly desirable four-storey high-rise apartment buildings with views to the Izmir bay, while a majority of the low-income groups were located in Konak and its environs on the hills. Since the 1960s however the rise of gecekondus (squatter settlements) across the city has led to a perception of crime, dirt and pollution in the city. Along with rapid urbanisation in the 1960s and revisions in the 1972 masterplan which saw the increase in industrial developments in and around the city, Izmir with its squatter settlements, automobile traffic; the pollution of Izmir bay with ferries, industries and NATO airbase began to be seen increasingly by its middle-classes as 'dirty'.

Izmir was also seen as dangerous with its frequent earthquakes and clayey soil on which the four-storey apartments of the middle-classes were built. There was a general fear that with their poor quality construction, these apartments would not survive another major earthquake. 'Safer' and healthier environments therefore became an important aspect of the generation of desire among the middle- and upper-classes to move outside Izmir. Many of them had owned summer homes in Çeşme, but this could not be a long-term arrangement because of the time it took to cover the distance between Izmir and Çeşme even along the expressway. The mushrooming of gated developments around Urla, which now took only 45 minutes to reach from Izmir, made it possible for them to consider a more long-term move to a number of high-end gated communities around Urla.

However, unlike most gated communities in Istanbul which are supported by social and cultural infrastructure (Candan and Kolluoglu 2008), these Urla developments were primarily residential, which meant that residents continued to maintain their social, cultural and economic ties with the city even after they left. This also meant demographic homogeneity – residents mainly relocated from upmarket areas in Izmir, their familial status

as ‘empty-nesters’ (those who did not have children, or those whose children had left home) and their economic profile (belonging to business or managerial professions) were the determining factor in being able to live in the developments around Urla.

The attraction for Urla as a place to move to outside and away from Izmir was related to a number of binary dualisms. In comparison to Izmir, Urla was perceived as a healthy town, providing much needed respite from its pollution. This was based on a number of ‘facts’. Urla was the first region in Turkey to develop a Local Agenda 21, in compliance with the agreements at the 1992 Rio Summit to promote sustainable development. Second, Urla was also the location of a number of ‘clean’ industries – grapes, raisins and a high olive oil and soap production. More recently, the greenhouses in Izmir had relocated to Urla, which increased the perception of Urla as the centre of agriculture and hence of bucolic and pastoral ‘nature’.

Recent scholarship on gated communities has suggested that we need to look beyond issues of urban segregation and middle-class lifestyles to the local politics of space and place that shape the exclusionary landscapes of gated developments (Falzon 2004, Pow 2007). Pow argues how ‘territoriality in Shanghai’s gated communities is invariably bound up in a moral distinction between the “urban(e)” and “rural” that revolves around the moral discourses on civilised modernity’ (2007, 1539). Similarly, the distinctions created between ‘polluted’ Izmir and ‘healthy’ Urla ‘reconfigured and depoliticised the defence of luxury and privileges’ (Pow 2007, 1539) to produce a social and material landscape of cultural and moral exclusivity within the gated developments.

Now I see that because it’s rather expensive in the transportation wise. You have to use your car every day. 45 minutes of driving. Only people of middle class prefer to live. It’s independent of profession I think, but people of some culture who care for

the nature [my emphasis] I should say. And who have above middle income tax, middle income, they prefer. [Architect, Development C, interviewed in English]

Thus the architect in Development C articulated a moral connection between ‘culture’ and ‘nature’, implying that appreciating or desiring to be close to ‘nature’ was a ‘cultured’ taste. ‘Nature’ was constructed through a reference to the more visual and aesthetic qualities of the landscape in which these gated communities were located. ‘Culture’ on the other hand referred to the capability to appreciate this aestheticized form of nature – something that was implied as vested within Izmir’s middle-classes, or those groups who could afford increased fuel costs incurred in relocating to Urla. This dualism between nature and culture was not mutually exclusive; rather was produced from a dialectics between aestheticized landscapes, private forms of mobility and middle-class values. These dialectics also connected a number of binary distinctions constructed between – the ‘polluted’ city of Izmir and the provincialism of Urla, apartment living in the city and large villas in the rural countryside, urban and ‘natural’ lifestyles.

These dialectics were also possible through the dualisms of car ownership, where the car was seen as a form of social capital, yet its very ownership was premised upon a reduction in participants’ physical proximity to Izmir. As Urry (2002, 265) notes, ‘car-driving and its resultant socialities have become central to sustaining social capital across most societies across the globe.’ Actual and potential socio-spatial mobility or ‘motility’ (Kaufmann et. al. 2004) produced the car as central to an urban cosmopolitan citizenship that was physically distanced from the city and yet socially/economically embedded in city life. Motility was also actively promoted in the publicity material of the gated developments. The actual and potential socio-spatial mobility afforded by the car emerged as a compelling motif for producing the desire for gated living among Izmir’s middle-classes. As well as being a sign of increased motility, statements like ‘Yesterday, we produced the living environments

for today. Do you ask about tomorrow?’ (Figure 2) in the publicity materials presented the car as a potential route to accessing and acquiring ‘natural’ capital by proximity to the bucolic and pastoral landscapes of Urla.



Figure 2: Marketing image in Development B that read: ‘Yesterday, we produced the living environments for today. Do you ask about tomorrow?’ Photo: Author.

The construction of binary dualisms was not just confined to those living in the gated developments. There was a discursive construction among Urla Municipality officers too about the moral geographies of urban/rural practices that largely excluded and bypassed Urla’s locals – both socially and economically. The construction of this binary moral order between urban middle-class / agricultural classes referred to the irony of locals losing their land and being socially excluded from the gated developments and yet being employed in service sector work in these gated developments as cleaners, gardeners and domestic help,.

The ones who are coming here are here for these reasons – Let me breathe the air of this place, drink its water, get my rest but via expressway let me be at my work place in 20 minutes. That is what he thinks and come here accordingly. There is no such thing as let me go to Urla, sit in one of the shops and talk with the people. You cannot enter into their gated communities. You cannot even pass through the land. I mean there is no dialogue with Urla. (Official, Urla Municipality)

Locals in Urla labelled the gated developments as *zengin geçekondulari* or rich squatter settlements, referring to the ambiguous legal codes through which they had been made materially possible. There emerged therefore a discourse of the ‘rich squatters’ who had come to enjoy ‘nature’ in Urla without giving anything back. The moral binaries between urban/rural, city/town, middle-/agricultural-classes were then recast as the binaries between polluting/sustainable – as the urban middle-classes being the ‘real’ source of environmental damage to the ‘natural’ environment of Urla.

What we are doing here – because, there is fertile land there. You are destroying that land and placing concrete over it. ... When they [residents of gated developments] are coming they are coming with everything – with their concrete, cement, asphalt, with the poisons from the products they are using. It is not only about their arrival. I mean, like an oil drop in the water it spreads in haste. It is affecting many environs in a negative way and then the situation turns insolvable like the [pollution problems of the] bay of Izmir. If it continues like this, we know where it is headed. (Official, Urla Municipality, interviewed in Turkish).

Thus while the dualisms of healthy and polluted, town and city, led to the rise of these gated developments, these were not simple labels, rather a much more complex process of negotiating between the real and imagined ‘dirt’ and dangers between city/countryside. Entangled within these dualisms were the contradictory constructions of ‘agricultural

buildings' in the Urla masterplan and actually existing material homes of Izmir's urban middle-classes as achieved through the manipulation of bureaucratic and legal definitions that guided development in the region.

Generating gendered desires

Bourdieu (1984) notes that 'nothing is more distinctive, more distinguished, than the capacity to confer aesthetic status on objects that are banal or even 'common', or the ability to apply the principles of a 'pure' aesthetic to the most everyday choices of everyday life'. Architects, developers and realtors, all conferred heightened symbolic status to the villas in the gated communities. The houses, their proximity to the rural countryside and the financial capital invested in them, all symbolised 'taste' – this was a process of distinguishing the gated developments by conferring aesthetic and cultural capital to the most mundane of spaces in everyday life – the home.

Significantly, the dialectical relations between the series of binaries were gendered through parallel constructions of modern Turkish women and 'pastoral nature'. In our interviews with the architects, the recurrent discussion was how difficult it was to sell these villas to the target social group. This was particularly true of development A which was designed, built and marketed by the architect himself. This was because there was only a particular gendered stratum of Izmir society which could take the decision to move to these villas. As he elaborated,

First of all, they should be rich. Plus their wives should desire such a living there and they should have a license and a car. If somebody's wife doesn't drive a car forget it. Forget it actually. I mean wives are very dominant in the decision. They should live there; they should want to live there; they should desire to live there.

(Architect/developer/resident, Development A, interviewed in English)

Wu (2005) notes that research on gated communities should go beyond the narrow focus on its morphology and architectural form to understanding the wider cultural and socio-

political context of production. Certainly, moving beyond the immediate built form and middle-class consumerism of the villa in these gated communities we are then able to see how Turkish women become critical to the use and exchange value of these homes. The architect particularly targeted middle-aged women whose children had left home since there were no schools or childcare for children nearby. More specifically, it was gendered mobility that made the gated communities possible, since men were seen to go to work everyday, but it were the wives who were seen as the ‘real’ residents. It was important then that these women had access to private transport in order to enjoy the social and cultural infrastructure (seen as absent in Urla) in Izmir and maintain their ‘urban’ lifestyles. It was imperative therefore to first convince these women to move to the gated developments.

Although the husbands give them money, wives have say because they spend more time in the house and most of them are housewives. But also most of the time it’s the wives who resist coming to Urla. You know living in their comfortable apartment life in Izmir, where they can go to the barber shop, where they can go and visit their friends. It’s very difficult for them to come to suburbs. In Turkey, women are not very nature-oriented [my emphasis]. They much rather stay in the city where all their friends are. They prefer city life. (Architect/developer/resident, Development A, interviewed in English).

Here emerges then the fundamental contradiction in the construction of gated developments. The architect’s perception of Turkish women as highly urbanised, who ‘prefer city-life’ and hence reject living close to ‘nature’, distances them from their ‘natural’ qualities of nurturing and home-making, and hence paradoxically connects them intimately to the modern Turkish home. The architect in situating middle class women within apartment blocks in the city also locates them squarely within a consumerist cosmopolitan/secular

ideology – going to the hairdressers, cafes and meeting friend which he sees as a contradiction with their ‘natural’ roles as housewives.

This contradiction also challenges Sayer’s (2005) argument that class as a moral signifier is different from gender as identity. Sayer notes that it is possible to change one’s attitude towards gender equality but class works as a moral value system and hence harder to change. The narratives of the architects suggest class and gender are both intimately linked in the construction of middle-class Turkish women and their relationship to nature. This linkage is produced from the historical and structural advantages enjoyed by Izmir’s middle-classes and the resultant values which have become normalised and universalised as the basis of difference from those ‘other’ than themselves.

How then was it possible to convince such women to move to Urla despite their assumed love of urban life? The literature on gated communities often offers a discourse of marketing that is produced by developers and geared towards middle-classes. Pow and Kong (2007) for example, highlights how developers have become savvy at combining the symbolic values of house and home in producing desires for these neighbourhoods. While the attractiveness of exclusive landscapes and middle-class lifestyles is a continuous marketing strategy, the Turkish developers also use a gendered strategy in attracting the ‘right’ clientele. Given that they see women as resistant to relocating to Urla, and their relative significance in household decision-making was largely accepted, the architects and developers often organised cocktail parties exclusively for the benefit of elite social groups in Izmir, who were selected on the basis of their marital and family status (as elaborated earlier) with the women in possession of a car. The women who came to these parties were then given information about the developments and handed brochures explaining the benefits of a ‘natural’ lifestyle. These parties turned out to be a success since most of the villas were sold through such efforts.

These efforts echo the observation made in the case of Cairo's gated developments (Kuppinger 2004) where buyers were nowhere near as enthusiastic about moving as the developers were in promoting them. The efforts of the architect in development A to recruit through gendered strategies should also be understood in this context where women and their families were largely seen to resist relocating from the city and coming to Urla. In using this specific strategy, the architects in Bourdieu's words, attempted to target groups who would understand how to exchange their social and cultural capital in the city for a perceived higher value capital in Urla.

Nature and culture in Urla's gated developments

Bourdieu suggests that "taste classifies and it classifies the classifier" (1984: 6).

Indeed the kind of amenities present in the gated developments were similar to most others in Turkey, yet in their particular combination with the architectural styles of the villas and relative symbolic power of the residents who moved here, they provided a way of distinguishing their residents from the wider urban 'dirt' of Izmir and the 'provincialism' of Urla. These binary differentiations sought to construct the gated developments as a valuable symbolic and cultural good and therefore its residents as those with refined taste and culture who could appreciate this value. The gated developments then became 'a practical affirmation of an inevitable difference' (Bourdieu 1984: 56), which provided ways to valorise the taste and culture and by extension the lifestyles of those who would live in them.

Urla is an unlucky place. While it could have been a much better place, due to politics and municipality, it did not develop. Locals are little like this – not civilised. Its farmers in the market sell you things in high prices, they gossip. I do not like Urlaites. [Aysen, resident, interviewed in Turkish]

Aysen reflects Bourdieu's (1984) notions of distinction and taste by creating a binary differentiation between the 'refined' culture of the gated development residents, and the 'vulgar' practices of the Urla residents. Her narrative implies a perception of Urla locals as

peasants, uneducated, Islamists and hence anti-cosmopolitan. The gated development residents on the other hand aligned themselves with the aspirations of Turkey to join the European Union (EU). They likened the Urla locals to Turkey's neighbours – Iraq, Iran and Syria, countries they said were Islamic and therefore a threat to Europe. As another resident said how she felt after she moved in, 'it is not only in terms of prices, but to choose this lifestyle you need to be cultured. After having that cultural level, places like this can function.' [my emphasis] (Interviewed in Turkish)

This moral construction of themselves as 'cultured' was also a way of distinguishing themselves as a rational, secular and modern Turkish social group, identified by their inhabitation of globally recognisable suburban homes easily accessible from the city. The economic capital and lifestyle changes required for living in these gated communities gave value and meanings to different forms of (social, cultural or motility) capital available to the residents. One of the most important criteria, the morality of 'culture' became then a metaphor for distinguishing themselves from the working- and farming-classes amongst local Urla residents. 'Culture' acted as a moral signifier of their class status that underpinned their (reluctance towards) social interactions with the Urla locals. Participants thus distinguished themselves on the basis of moral differences from Urlai-ites who had the tendency to gossip, were uncivilised and so on. The moral qualities of culture seemingly embodied by those in the gated developments were normalised to stake claims to the moral character of their life and practices and hence to higher social positioning.

How did the women reconcile their urban identities and lifestyles within this moral landscape? Most of the women continued to visit Izmir and meet their friends, shop and eat out during the day as they used to before. This was because unlike other gated communities in Istanbul or Ankara, the Urla gated developments were largely residential. In order to access groceries, clothes or any social/leisure activities, these women had to drive to Izmir. In

addition, the men who were still employed or retained their businesses in Izmir had to commute everyday in the rush hour traffic. Thus both men and women retained enduring links with Izmir even after moving out from the city. Maintaining these links however often came at certain personal costs.

This place is really a radical decision. You should want this new lifestyle and you should be ready for it. There are people who started to go to a psychiatrist after moving here, since they disturbed the order of their life. In order to live here you need to own a car, and you need to be able to drive that car. You should be ready for the traffic; you need to be a serious driver. It is very important. Your child needs to be either very small or should not live here—otherwise, he/she should have a car. These are all radical decisions. As a result it affects your life, positively or negatively.

(Ahsen, resident, interviewed in Turkish)

‘Urban social life has always entailed various mobilities but the car transforms this in a distinct combination of flexibility and coercion’ (Sheller and Urry 2000: 739). This observation by Sheller and Urry confirms the sense of simultaneous freedom of mobility and reliance upon the car that was expressed by almost all residents we interviewed. The car enabled them to live in the countryside in high-end luxurious homes, yet this freedom also entailed an increased reliance on the car – something that they were not used to from Izmir. Some residents noted that in a couple of years since they had moved in, they had changed two cars since the road to the expressway was very poorly maintained. They also noted that the traffic had increased since they moved in especially during the rush hour, and some were concerned that very soon it would take them as long to reach Izmir as it used to before the expressway was constructed. Unlike what Sheller and Urry suggest, this increased dependence on the car was not noted as coercion, rather as an inconvenience compensated by the proximity to ‘nature’.



Figure 3: Framed views of the Aegean Sea from the villa. Photo: Author.

When it rains, you can see the rain, you can observe everything on the sea. It gets cloudy but when the clouds leave, you can see places far, far away. It is a different feeling with the sun, another with the rain. Every season, every moment is different. Daylight is beautiful, the moonlight is beautiful. Do you have this in the city? You have nothing in the city! (Gulse, resident, interviewed in Turkish)

As Bourdieu suggests, “in matters of taste, all determination is negation” (1984: 56). Similarly, the construction of the gated developments as desirable was based on differentiating and assigning value to nature and natural elements – moonlight, rain, sea, sun, daylight and so on, and hence by extension associating this with the cultural capital of those who lived in these developments. The value of this cultural capital was validated through a construction of tasteful and ‘natural lifestyle’ within the developments in contrast to the

vulgarity and filth of city living. 'Natural lifestyles' largely referred to a proximity to bucolic landscape which was largely consumed as an aestheticized product. Natural lifestyles therefore were not embodied; rather they were based on viewing and framing natural elements through the siting, landscaping and design of the villas. Significantly, his differentiation was made by the women, who unlike the perception of the architects, constructed their relationship to gated communities through this aestheticized 'nature'.

Fixing mobilities

The reorientation of lifestyle that the gated developments demanded of its residents increasingly made their activities more confined to the private spaces of the home. While participants were engaged with the aesthetic and consumptive aspects of 'nature', this had a constraining impact on their bodily health. I have already mentioned that participants were more reliant on the car and hence spent more time confined within it along the expressway, but they were even more confined when it came to exercising their bodies.

I miss walking. The land was very flat in Karşıyaka, but it is very hilly here. I tried walking from [development] sign to the road below three or five times. When I reached home I was all purple. My mom said this will not work so I bought an exercise machine. I walk on the treadmill now.

Thus the move to the villa in many ways produced a total reorientation of their lifestyles, which was contradictory to the discourse of 'natural lifestyles' associated with the 'healthy town' which was promoted by the architects and the residents themselves. The gated developments made them more reliant on the car, while offering the freedom to access the city with relative ease via the expressway. In other words, while the women claimed to being exposed to 'nature' and natural lifestyles, they were simultaneously constrained by the hilly terrain, long distances, general suburban nature of the gated communities and their location

within the countryside to lead similar urban lifestyles. This transformation of their mobilities was not just around everyday routines, but also around seasonal routines.

I have already mentioned that most of those who moved into these gated communities had earlier owned both an apartment in Izmir and a summer house in Ceşme. They would live and work in Izmir all year, but during the summer they would take their families to their second homes in Ceşme for extended periods. The mobilities of Izmir's middle-classes therefore had been largely seasonal between apartment living by the Izmir bay and summer house living by the Ceşme beach. The Urla gated developments changed this radically.

We used to live in Izmir, my husband would come to the summer house during the weekend. I would go back to the city with my husband on Monday – clean the house, cook, etc. Then go back to the summer house not to leave my parents alone there!

This was our summer! Can you call that a holiday? Now I am living in my summer place all year around! [Ozlem, interviewed in Turkish]

The move to the gated communities therefore had 'fixed' the seasonal mobilities of its residents. Although residents maintained enduring relations with the city and with the beach, they did not feel the need to live in Izmir or Ceşme since Urla (as a place half way between the two) provided them with easy access to both. Most of the residents therefore had sold their second homes in Ceşme (and sometimes even the Izmir apartment) to pay for the villa in Urla. Second, the labelling of the villa as the 'summer place' served to reinforce the notion of living close to nature and natural settings – the place where one went for holidays – and hence a place of well-being. In other words, the villa in the gated development was now able to offer them the best of both worlds – easy access to the city while enjoying a 'natural' lifestyle away from the pollution and congestion of the city – and hence the maintenance of urban lifestyles without necessarily locating oneself in the city. This validated their cultural

capital, and sustained their marking as a 'cultured' group distinguished both from the city dwellers and Urla locals by their lifestyle and mobility choices.

Conclusions

In recent years, five interrelated factors are seen as key to the rise of gated communities – emergence of the middle classes; international demands for all-inclusive lifestyles within a residential neighbourhood; perceived benefits from living within these neighbourhoods; neo-liberalism and increasing private provision of services and infrastructure; and geopolitical instability and urban malaise (Kenna and Dunn 2009). The Turkish case however, illustrates that these factors are also gendered and therefore far more complexly interrelated. First because Izmir's middle-classes, the main proponents of these gated developments cannot be so neatly related to the rise of neoliberalism, rather to a far more complex history of the making of Turkish republic and its relation to the binaries of Islamist/secular beliefs that are largely seen as parallel to rural/urban lifestyles in the region. Second, because the production and consumption of gated developments in the Izmir region relied upon a series of constructed binaries and contradictions between – nature and culture, modern and parochial, city and town, healthy and polluted, Turkish middle-class women and suburban lifestyles. These contradictions were built from the ways that high-speed expressways, legal ambiguities in masterplanning and desires for bucolic 'nature' overlapped in particular localised ways. And finally, because these contradictory constructions were simultaneously related to the value systems embodied in middle-class women and in the moral and subjective experiences of class in Izmir. They suggest that class and gender cannot be neatly separated, rather it were through their dialectical links and cleavages that the moral value of the gated developments as 'Culture' were sustained. While Sayer (2005) notes that class morality has a conventional character, the dualisms of the gated developments

generated through the intersections between class and gender suggest that they are far from conventional or universal.

The gated developments in the Izmir region were also embedded in dialectical relationships between seemingly opposing conceptions of nature and culture, town and city, healthy and polluted and so on that served to simultaneously connect and separate them from Izmir and Urla. The meaning and value of one part of the binary could not be appreciated without reference to its counterpart, and this assignation of values to each part of the binary formed the basis of validating and reinforcing the 'taste', 'culture' and moral superiority of those who lived in these gated developments. Significantly this dialectical relationship between binary counterparts pointed to the social fault lines within the wider Izmir region and society. This was evident in the tensions that ran between the Urla locals (including municipality officials) and the residents of the gated developments. While the Urla locals made arguments on a moral high-ground of social exclusion and ecological harm inflicted upon by the residents from gated developments, the residents themselves used discourses of 'Culture' as a way of distinguishing themselves from the 'vulgar' practices and values of the locals.

The Izmir case suggests how the production of gated developments is not just about political economics of the city and countryside, but also about social, cultural and gendered processes through which the dialectics between nature and culture are reframed. It suggests how nature itself is gendered in very different ways to westernised notions and how this 'gendered nature' becomes central to the making and proliferation of this new form of suburban housing. Thus although these gated communities were similar to their counterparts in the Anglo-American context, yet in their conceptualisation and marketing they were modelled on gender roles that sought to reverse the perceived identity of middle class Turkish women as urbanised, secular, consumerist and hence separated from 'nature'. Selling 'nature'

to women therefore became the most important strategy for the architects, developers and realtors. The women who lived in these gated communities however saw themselves as drawn by the nature offered in these gated communities, which was constructed through a visual and aesthetic relationship between the house and the landscape around them. Living in these houses produced a discourse of natural lifestyle which ironically was related to their location in Urla as a 'healthier' place with which they had little engagement.

Taken together these binaries and the dialectics between them point to the wider fault lines in the very concept of sustainable development. In other words, the ways in which particular human-nature relationships are valorised within particular landscapes and built environments suggest how values embodied in certain forms of capital are presented as objective and final. A large part of this was related to the aesthetic capital of the gated developments and the mobility capital of car use, which when combined became objective and moral signifiers of middle-class 'Culture'. The contradictory relationship to nature embodied by residents of the gated developments in which they argued for a caring for nature and yet this care came at tremendous costs to the natural environment and resources in the region spoke to some of the inherent contradictions of these forms of capital. The ways that these contradictions echoed the wider gendered divisions in society then further suggested how the nature/culture, masculine/feminine divides are 'vernacularised' in Turkish gated developments.

Acknowledgements

I am extremely grateful to the residents of the gated developments in Urla and the architects who answered my questions and assisted me in completing this research. The funding for this research was made available by Queen's University Belfast which allowed me to visit Izmir Institute of Technology. I remain deeply grateful to my host and collaborator Dr Sebnem Yucel from whom I have learnt much about this project and about

the wider contexts of Turkish society referred to in this paper. My gratitude also extends to the editor Maria Kaika and the three anonymous reviewers who provided very helpful and constructive feedback for improving this paper. All other errors and omissions are mine.

Bibliography

- Alvarez-Rivadulla, M. J. (2007) Golden ghettos: gated communities and class residential segregation in Montevideo, Uruguay. *Environment and Planning A* 39, 47-63
- Amin, A. and N. Thrift (2002) *Cities: Reimagining the Urban*. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Ari, K. (1995) *Buyuk Mubadele: Turkiye'ye Zorunlu Goc, 1923-1925 (The Big Population Exchange: The Mandatory Migration to Turkey, 1923-1925)*. A Publication of the Turkiye ekonomik ve toplumsal Tarih Vakfi. Istanbul, Numune Matbaacilik.
- Arkon, C. (1989). *Izmir'in Kisa Ozgecmisi (A Short History of Izmir)*. Unpublished research prepared by Dokuz Eylul University, Department of City and Regional Planning, Izmir.
- Atkinson, R. and S. Blandy (2005) Introduction: International Perspectives on The New Enclavism and the Rise of Gated Communities. *Housing Studies* 20.2, 177–186.
- Atkinson, R. and J. Flint (2004) Fortress UK? Gated Communities, the Spatial Revolt of the Elites and Time–Space Trajectories of Segregation. *Housing Studies* 19. 6, 875–892
- Ayata, S. (2002) The new middle class and the joys of suburbia. In D. Kandiyoti, & A. Saktanber Eds., *Fragments of culture: The everyday of modern Turkey*. London, Tauris & Co Publishers, 25–42.
- Baydar, G. (2002) Tenuous boundaries: women, domesticity and nationhood in 1930s Turkey. *The Journal of Architecture* 7, 229-244.
- Blinnikov, M., Shanin A, Sobolev N, Volkova, L. (2006) Gated communities of the Moscow green belt: newly segregated landscapes and the suburban Russian environment, *GeoJournal*, 66, 65–81

- Bourdieu, P (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (1989) Social Space and Symbolic Power. *Sociological Theory* 7.1, 14-25.
- Bozdogan, S. (2001) *Modernism and Nation Building*. Seattle, University of Washington Press.
- Breitung, W. (2012) Enclave Urbanism In China: Attitudes Towards Gated Communities In Guangzhou, *Urban Geography*, 33(2), 278–294.
- Brunn, S. and K. Frantz (2006) Introduction, *GeoJournal* 66: 1–3.
- Cagaptay, S. (2004) Race, Assimilation and Kemalism: Turkish Nationalism and the Minorities in the 1930s. *Middle Eastern Studies* 40.3, 86-101
- Cinar, C., Cizmeci, F. and Koksak, A. (2006) The New Address Of Social Polarization In Istanbul: Gated Communities, 42nd ISoCaRP Congress.
- Coy, M (2006) Gated communities and urban fragmentation in Latin America: the Brazilian experience, *Geo Journal*, 66,121–132.
- Coy, M. and M. Pohler (2002) Gated communities in Latin American megacities: case studies in Brazil and Argentina. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 29, 355-370
- Candan, A. B. and B. Kolluoglu (2008) Emerging spaces of neoliberalism: A gated town and a public housing project in Istanbul. *New Perspectives on Turkey* 39, 5-46
- Caldiera, T. (2000) *City of Walls: Crime, Segregation and Citizenship in Brazil*. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Datta, A & Yucel Young, S (2007) Suburban Development and Networks of Mobility: ‘Sites’ in Izmir, Turkey, *Global Built Environment Review*, vol. 6(1), 44-55.

- De Duren, N. L. (2006) Planning à la Carte: The Location Patterns of Gated Communities around Buenos Aires in a Decentralized Planning Context, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol.30(2), 308–327
- Duncan, J. S. and N. G. Duncan (2004) *Landscapes of Privilege: The Politics of the Aesthetic in an American Suburb*. New York, Routledge.
- Durington, M. (2006) Race, space and place in suburban Durban: an ethnographic assessment of gated community environments and residents, *GeoJournal* 66,147–160
- Falzon, M. (2004) Paragons of Lifestyle: gated communities and the politics of space in Bombay, *City & Society*, Vol. 16(2), 145–167
- Gadgil, M. and Guha, R. 1995. *Ecology and Equity: The Use and Abuse of Nature in Contemporary India*. Routledge, London and New York.
- Genis, S. (2007) Producing Elite Localities: The Rise of Gated Communities in Istanbul, *Urban Studies*, Vol. 44(4), 771–798.
- Glasze, G. and Alkhayyal, A. (2002) Gated housing estates in the Arab world: case studies in Lebanon and Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, vol. 29, 321- 336.
- Grant, J. and Mittelsteadt, L. (2004) Types of gated communities, *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, vol. 31, 913-930.
- Goix, R. and Webster, C. (2008) Gated Communities, *Geography Compass*, 2/4, 1189–1214
- Gupta, D. (2000). *Mistaken modernity: India between worlds*. New Delhi, HarperCollins.
- Haraway, D. (1990) *Primate Visions: Gender, Race and Nature in a World of Modern Science*.
- Hayden, D. (2002) *Redesigning the American dream*.
- Hook and Vrdoljak 2002) Gated communities, heterotopia and a ‘rights’ of privilege: a ‘heterotopology’ of the South African security-park, *Geoforum*, 33 , 195–219

- Jurgens, U. and M. Gnad (2002) Gated communities in South Africa: experiences from Johannesburg. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 29, 337-353
- Kagıtcıbası, C. (1986) Status of Women in Turkey: Cross-Cultural Perspectives. *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 18.4, 485-499.
- Karadağ, A. (2000) Kentsel Gelisim Sureci, Cevresel Etkileri ve Sorunlari ile Izmir (Izmir with its Urban Development Process, Its Environmental Impact and Problems). Izmir: Titizler Baski Hizmetleri.
- Karasapan, O. (1986) Turkey's Super-Rich. MERIP Middle East Report No. 142, Wealth and Power in the Middle East, 30-31+34.
- Kaufmann, V., Bergman, M.M., and Joye, D. (2004) Motility: Mobility as Capital, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 28(4), 745-56.
- Kenna, T. E. and Dunn, K. M. (2009) The Virtuous Discourses of Private Communities, *Geography Compass*, 3/2, 797–816
- King, A. (2004) *Spaces of Global Cultures: Architecture, Urbanism, Identity*. London, Routledge.
- Kuppinger, P. (2004) Exclusive Greenery: New gated communities in Cairo, *City & Society*, Vol. 16(2), 35–62.
- Landman, K (2007) Exploring the impact of gated communities on social and spatial justice and its relation to restorative justice and peace-building in South Africa, *Acta Juridica*, 134-155.
- Low, S. (2001) The Edge and the Center: Gated Communities and the Discourse of Urban Fear. *American Anthropologist* 103.1, 45-58.
- McCarthy, J. (2008) Rural geography: globalizing the countryside. *Progress in Human Geography* 32.1, 129–137

- Oncu, A. (1997). The myth of the 'ideal home.' In A. Oncu, & P. Weyland (Eds.), *Space, culture and power: New Identities in globalizing cities* (pp. 56–72). London, Zed Books.
- Pandey, G. (2009). Can there be a subaltern middle class? Notes on African American and Dalit history. *Public Culture* **21**(2): 321-342.
- Polanska, D. (2010) Gated Communities and the Construction of Social Class Markers in Postsocialist Societies: The Case of Poland, *Space and Culture*, 13(4) 421–435
- Pow, C. P. (2007) Securing the 'Civilised' Enclaves: Gated Communities and the Moral Geographies of Exclusion in (Post-)socialist Shanghai, *Urban Studies*, 44(8), 1539-1558
- Pow, C. P. (2009) Public intervention, private aspiration: Gated communities and the condominiumisation of housing landscapes in Singapore, *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, Vol. 50(2), 215–227
- Pow, C. P. and Kong, L. (2007) Marketing The Chinese Dream Home: Gated Communities and Representations of The Good Life In (Post-)Socialist Shanghai, *Urban Geography*, 28, 2, 129–159.
- Roitman, S and Phelps, N. (2011) Do Gates Negate the City? Gated Communities' Contribution to the Urbanisation of Suburbia in Pilar, Argentina, *Urban Studies*, 48(16) 3487–3509.
- Rosen, G. and Razin, E. (2009) Enclosed residential neighborhoods in Israel: from landscapes of heritage and frontier enclaves to new gated communities, *Environment and Planning A*, vol. 40, 2895- 2913.
- Sayer, A (2005) *The Moral Significance of Class*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sheller, M. and J. Urry (2000) The City and the Car. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 24.4, 737-757.

- Sonmez, I. O. (2009) Re-emergence of Suburbia: The Case of Izmir Turkey. *European Planning Studies* 17.5, 741-763
- Suher, H. (2004), "Exploring the Potentials of Mass Housing in Terms of Urbanisation" in *A|Z ITU Journal of the Faculty of Architecture*, vol1, no1, p. 60-78.
- Urla Development Foundation of Urla Municipality. (1996) *Urla Cevre Durum Raporu (Urla Environmental Assessment Report)*. A study funded by United Nations development Programme and Global Environment Facility-Small Scale Projects Program (UNDP, GEF-SGF). Ankara: MF Tanitim, Tasarim Ltd. Sti.
- Urry, J (2002) *Mobility and Proximity*, *Sociology*, vol. 36(2), 255-274.
- Varma, P. K. (1999). *The great Indian middle class*. New Delhi, Penguin.
- Velibeyoglu, H. (2004). *Development Trends of Single Family Housing Estates in Izmir Metropolitan Fringe Area*. Unpublished Masters thesis on city planning. Izmir Institute of Technology, Izmir, Turkey.
- Wu, F.L. (2005) Rediscovering the 'gate' under market transition: From work-unit compounds to commodity housing enclaves, *Housing Studies* 20: 235–254.
- Wu, F. and Webber, K. (2004) The rise of "foreign gated communities" in Beijing: between economic globalization and local institutions, *Cities*, vol. 21(3), 203–213.