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Abstract: Today, there is a tendency to regenerate the historical cores of many cities in different locations of the world. Nevertheless, the efforts of their rehabilitations frequently bring a serious problem of gentrification of the neighbourhood which result in the changing of the inhabitants involuntarily.

“Gentrification” in a large scale may surely be regarded as an inevitable fact related with the capitalist restructuring systems of the world. Many cities located on different territories of the world with variable economical, political and social characteristics come face to face with this reality in relationship with how much the city is open to globalising currencies. On the other hand, gentrification could be considered as a ‘place’ related fact. Although it should be regarded as an international reality, gentrification of the dilapidated historic neighbourhoods in different cities of the world may surprisingly show different responds compared to eachother.

In this paper, examples of gentrification period from a metropolitan city, Istanbul will be given to clarify this diversity in regard with socio-economical and cultural aspects of this fact. This paper aims to give an overall picture of gentrification movements affected by the local parameters which are special only for this city; the differences occured in different neighbourhoods and the innovatives which give a start to this period beginning from 1980’s.

Within this frame, other examples rather than the general negative ones which unfortunately rule this change will be studied. In our opinion, these ‘other’ examples rise new hopes for the future of gentrification in Istanbul by including the inhabitants of the neighbourhoods to this period that may result in a more sustainable way of life.

Introduction

“Apart from all other cities, Istanbul has always been a world city” (Keyder, 1999a; p. 3). The location of Istanbul, a city which has acted as the capital of an empires more than 1500 years has always been the subject of admire in regard with its vastness and legendary grandeur as a reflection of the Empires, both by the East and the West till the modern times. The history has inclines and declines, nothing stays permanent. As stated in Calvino’s gorgeous book “The Invisible Cities”, “...many decline and revival follow one another. Societies and tradition change constantly. What remains afterwards is merely the name, the place and things which are harder to be broken.” (Calvino, 2003; p. 151).

In today’s city, like all living things, these countless declines and revivals stated in Calvino’s sentences find their reflections on the same platform almost simultenaously. When it came to
talk about a city on the crossroads of the globalising tendencies like Istanbul, which still possesses at least some of the values from its past, gentrification would surely be an inevitable experience happening in this city. Thus, Istanbul’s experience is neither accidental nor planned.

Istanbul, a city with a collection of historical residential buildings senses gentrification since approximately 30 years. The area occupied by the districts gentrified in Istanbul is comparatively small in a city with a population of circa 10 million people. On the other hand these districts are all well known in the history and an important piece of the cultural character of the city. Only particular ‘distinguished’ districts are influenced by this development. Therefore their locations in the whole city, qualifications and how they have gone through this process and what common features they have should be studied and clarified.

This paper aims to find out the appearances of the city under the influence of parameters like time and space special to its own and to stress these on an axis of local and global differences.

**The Global-Local Dialectic in Istanbul Example**

The functions of the cities are transformed according to their location in the world and these functions add physical, cultural, social new meanings to the cities. Sometimes the districts can turn into different forms in order to adapt themselves to the new functions insisted by the city. Since over 30 years this restructuring period which has taken over modernism as a change paradigm sails with the winds of globalisation (Keyder, 1999a). The influence of globalisation in gentrification shows itself by the strategies embraced by the new middle class. But what these new cultural strategies actually determine are about the “place”, the context of being local which existed before the globalisation period. Thus, they describe first of all gentrification itself and secondly the physical atmosphere that this activity will take place.

**The Formation of the Residential Area Suitable for Gentrification**

The historical housing reserve which Istanbul has had so far dates back mostly to the end of 19th century and the beginning of 20th century. These housing units were generally built at the last decades of Ottoman Empire. At those days due to the of pluralist ethnic and religious structure of Ottoman society they hosted muslims, but moreover a non-muslim class consisting of Armenians, Greeks, Jews and sometimes europeans. After Turkish republic was founded, these houses changed owners many times related with economic and political reasons.

A chronological analysis can highlight these changes (Sen, 2005):
1914-1924: The non-muslim population started to abandon the country because of economical and political reasons.
1923-1924: The obligatory exchange of people between Turkey and Greece
1948: The jews started to leave Turkey and move to the new founded Israil
1950s: The heavy immigration movement towards Istanbul; attacks aganist non-muslims on 5-6th September 1955
1974: The non-muslim greeks started to leave the country after the disagreements between Greece and Turkey due to Cyprus Operation
1980s: Second immigration movement from rural areas towards Istanbul
The Formation of the Potential Gentrifier

The year 1980 is a breaking point for Turkey. The closed market economy was abandoned and the open market economy which liberalized the import trade totally was taken over (Behar, 2006; Keyder, 1999c). The clearest sign of this evolution was the increase in the import trade numbers (Islam, 2003). Between 1980 and 2001 the import and export trade capacities increased respectively 5 and 10 times, whereas the increase in foreign capital was 28 times. At this same period there is also a 75 times rise in the number of foreign companies active in Turkey.

These foreign originated economical activities which Istanbul hosted had many influences on residential structure of the city. Suddenly there was a need for more employee at jobs related with finance, real estate and reassurance and after 1990s advertising and media works. Another dimension of these economical restructuring was experienced in everyday life on the shop windows, on printed media and on television screen. The signs of the end of monopoly and state control were trying to tell people that soon this western life-style would penetrate into their lives (Behar, 2006).

The inhabitants of Istanbul got used to living with new cultural consume habits. The economical and cultural changes were inevitably felt on public life. As it became easier to get hold of every kind of consume material, the privileged position of the middle class eroded away. Being educated lost its meaning with the new culture offered by television. When in the past reading was an important act, after 1980’s television took over its mission and became the only necessity to follow the actual events, to state opinions.

As a conclusion, during this period when Istanbul’s economy was on the treshold of opening to the world, it was almost impossible for the middle class to find an escape for themselves (Oncu, 1997). Some people from the middle class who lost their central characters have re-discovered the old settlements characterized by a more cosmopolitan structure which were still fresh in their memories (Aksoy, 2001). They tried to establish a new character over the value that these districts offered to people.

It is not only the ex-middle class who establishes a new cultural place related identity over the old settlements of the city. A new middle class which is composed young professionals working at one of the sectors developed after 1980s has started to be the actor of the gentrification period in Istanbul.

The metropolitan cities have to eventually reconstruct themselves. The changing conditions and material powers affect and are produced by the cities. Since 30 years this reconstruction period goes under the control of globalisation. As the lives of Istanbul inhabitants’ are transformed in an unavoidable way, there rises a direct reaction against this by creating a local dimension almost in an anarchist mood.

Globalisation is not the messenger of the disappearance of local differences. It would not be wrong to state more peculiarly just the opposite. By underlining the place and what’s local and different, globalisation helps to reconstruct these meanings once again in another sense (Bartu, 1999, quoting from Watts, 1991). The global and the local; the old and the new; the living and the rotten; the changing and the stable are all two dialectic inevitables.

In our opinion, the best thing to do is to try to solve the ‘moment’ and the ‘place’ we are living in, the city Istanbul.

Examples from Istanbul

Starting from 1980’s the social and the architectural regenaration in the city has gone through a change and this change has been especially influential on the residential texture (Uzun, 2001). It is certain that each renewal needs a ‘history’ to exist. According to the definition, if
there is an increase in value and it is impossible to resist to this increase, this will naturally bring a fact like gentrification along.
In order to solve or maybe just to fully comprehend this difficult equation which many cities are face to face with, we need to take a closer look at the space we are living in.

Kuzguncuk

Kuzguncuk is a district on the asian side of Istanbul. It was formerly a village along Bosphorus with a main valley axis towards the sea which is a characteristic of all the other Bosphorus villages. The boundaries of the settlement have naturally been built by the hills on three sides of this axis, Icadiye Street. All these topographical elements have in time helped to build a rather introverted and sheltered athmosphere which is today dominant in Kuzguncuk.

The first settlements in and around Kuzguncuk date from 15th century. The district has always been distinguished with its population of christian Greeks, Armenians, jews and muslims and the relationship between these groups without prejudices based on religion. Today there are still many masonry buildings in Kuzguncuk which were built at the beginning of 20th century by these different ethnic groups. Besides there are also wooden houses which date from late 19th century, the last decade of Ottoman Empire (Figure 1, 2).

The first big change of the texture of Kuzguncuk’s typical settlement has started to appear in the middle of 20th century. With the return of the non-muslim community living in the neighbourhood in 1950’s their emphasis on the settlement has weakened. Nevertheless, although with a loss in its meaning the cultural the entity based on the unity of ‘others’/different sides has survived (Uzun, 2001).

At the end of 1970s, the well-known Turkish architect Cengiz Bektas bought an old house at the district. This can be considered as another change which became the initiator of the social and urban reneval called gentrification. Cengiz Bektas was followed by friends who wanted to buy property at Kuzguncuk. Slowly, the district got popular and became a place where architects, artists and writers preferred. The social relationships which had started to be forgotten at the neighbourhood were regenerated by activities guided by architect Bektas and his companions. The number of cultural events, like plays, workshops with children, and summer schools for children, increased. So has the collective spirit in Kuzguncuk started to cherish once again. All these were intended to improve the environmental quality of the neighbourhood at the same time. Inhabitants became interested in the restoration of the houses in the area. Discussions were held about how the buildings should look after being restored.
(Bektas, 1999). The legal arrangements which came into force in 1980’s put some restrictions to the new building activities and thus supported this conscious rehabilitation period (Figure 3).

![Figure 3: New construction area next to an old house, 2005](image)

Under the leadership of the incoming artist groups, the residents have upgraded the environment, in the broadest sense of the term mobilizing local initiative. As a result, it would not be wrong to describe what has so far happened in Kuzguncuk as a reunion of the attempts of an architect who has evoted himself to this location, with the desire to create a tranquil place far from the center, yet easy to connect.

**Arnavutkoy**

Arnavutkoy is also an old Bosphorus settlement along the european coast of Bosphorus (Figure 4). It developed on a valley along an old stream bed. On two sides of this axis rise two steep hills which becomes lower towards the sea. The settlement has developed first on this flat piece of land on the shore. The civil architecture which characterizes Arnavutkoy date from 19th century. It is a dense texture consisting of humble two or three storey timber houses.

![Figure 4: A general view of Arnavutkoy from the sea, 2006](image)
These houses used to belong to the middle-class Ottoman-greeks whose occupation was usually merchandise. This community can be stated as being the majority in this settlement where many different ethnic groups used to live together. There are still traces of this reality, like the Orthodox-Greek church which is one of the biggest in Istanbul and the Greek school sharing the same square with the church.

After 1950s like what happened in the whole city the structure of the society based on understanding and ethnic plurality of the settlement started to change. The political atmosphere dominant to this era was very influential. Many Greek origined Turkish citizens were forced to leave the country after 1960’s and in 1974 more abandoned their homeland due to the problems caused between Greece and Turkey after the Cyprus operation. When the greek origined habitants of Arnavutkoy left their village a new immigration current from small Anatolian cities, especially from Black Sea region to Istanbul had begun. The deserted houses of the greek community in Arnavutkoy were occupied by these immigrants. So changed the old buildings their owners.

Although quite worn out, the physical appearance of Arnavutkoy could stay the same during 1960s and 70s. The reasons for this are first of all the poverty of these people who were not capable of building new apartment blocks instead of the old ones and that the lots on which these old buildings stood were so small that it wouldn’t be advantageous to build new apartment blocks.

In 1980s a series of forceful bureaucratic applications –with conservation purposes- were effectuated and the houses started to be restore done after another. But within the frame of the dominant atmosphere of that period this new act served the new middle class to take hold of the residential area where once the poor used to live (Keyder, 1999 b). This ‘new’ class has made a dream real which was almost impossible to the poor people of the district . The gentrification of Arnavutkoy is generally framed by a young middle class who work usually in finance, advertising or education and can afford their lives themselves They are in search of a residential area reflecting their choices shaped around a longing of a multi-cultural past.

Ortakoy

Ortakoy, a small district on european side of Istanbul which is also a former Bosphorus settlement has lived one of the early gentrifications in the city.

Due to its location , the settlement is easily connected to the centres by sea transportation. Therefore, the square which is formed around the mosque and the tiny ferry port typical for such neighbourhoods on Bosphorus has a great value.

Ortakoy square was declared as a historical place which has to be protected by the legal authorities in 1970. This was the first sign of a new understanding for the historical buildings on the area. Later, in 1989 the local authorities started a revitalization act. The square and the little streets opening to this place were re-functioned with cafes, restaurants, art and antic artifacts shops and facilities like art workshops (Figure 5). This has brought a new, contemporary value to this small old Bosphorus village. The 19th century apartment buildings around the square with a sea view have been bought by a community with higher income and they have been restored one by one. Other buildings around the square have started to be occupied by artists and intellectuals (Isozen, 1992).
Figure 5: Ortakoy with its clean, well cared little streets, 2005

Ortakoy’s location has always enabled the residents of the city to reach to Bosphorus settlements easily. Its square can be regarded as one of the most convenient, protected and largest squares in its scale in the whole city. It has always given a value to the district. Thus, Ortakoy has subsequently become a popular area in the city, even in the country.

Figure 6: On a weekend day in Ortakoy with its ferry-port at the background, 2005

The traffic flowing to Ortakoy started to cause new problems not only for this settlement but also for the other Bosphorus districts after Ortakoy. The insufficient parking possibilities have also become annoying obstacles for the dwellers of the neighbourhood. The gentrifiers of Ortakoy who started a new life in their restored properties were not very happy with the new change occurring to a small scale district like Ortakoy. Soon they got irritated with crowds who visited the area and the entertainment places serving these people (Figure 6). Finally some have decided to leave their houses, sell them to settle to another more tranquil area. Recently some of the residential area in Ortakoy are deserted, many converted into restaurants, clubs or boutique hotels waiting to be reused.

**Galata**

Galata, a district adjacent to the historical center of Istanbul, is an old Geneiose quarter, is located on the north shore of the Golden Horn overlooking the sea. What characterizes its topography is a steep slope beginning from the Golden Horn shore rising up to a hill which is crowned by the famous Galata Tower. In the past it has always been formed by a multi-layer structure based on functional needs. Down on the seaside, related with the docks there used to be a busy trade region; whereas on the halfway to the hill on the famous ‘the Banks Avenue’
there was another commerce area based on money transfer. On the hill, around the tower a residential area existed.

This historic finance centre of the city was affected sharply by the transformations in the inner city after the 1920’s and it became a dilapidated area following the 1970’s. Social and functional changes after 1980 affected all of these areas. Today the residential blocks surrounding the tower are still the masonry apartment buildings (Figure 7) built at the beginning of 20th century (Oncel, 2002). When their owners who were generally of non-muslim origin deserted the area these buildings were sold and re-functioned by the new owners.

The new residents were immigrants from small Anatolian cities. They didn’t hesitate to change the interior of these buildings to make them fit to their own needs. The entrance floors have been functioned as small workshops and storage areas unfamiliar to their original use (Belge, 2002).

The rehabilitation projects starting from 1980’s by Beyoglu Municipality which Galata is a part of have shown the first attempts to revalue this dilapidated area (Figure 8).
Because Galata is so much in the ‘core’ of Istanbul compared to Kuzguncuk or Fener-Balat districts, the artists, architects and people from different other occupations as well have shown great interest in settling on this district. They have started to buy or rent flats of these nice apartment buildings with high ceilings and a beautiful view of the city. Gentrifiers in Galata were mostly singles or childless couples that were either postponing child bearing or having adult children that had left the family. Another variable, a very significant indicator that sharply distinguishes gentrifiers from other groups in the society, was the high rates of unmarried couples living together, a marginal attitude in a Muslim society (Islam, 2002).

Although the prices today are much higher than the beginning (1980s) more people including scholars, journalists, writers, etc. are keen on Galata. New cafes and restaurants are opening, people have carried their offices to this area. The restored interiors, buildings and the care given by the local authorities to the public area affect the neighbourhood in a positive way (Figure 9).

The gentrification of Galata can be regarded as the survival of this dilapidated area.

![Figure 9: The view from the terrace of a chique restaurant in Galata, 2006.](image)

**Asmalimescit**

Asmalimescit is a smaller district of Beyoglu in comparison with Galata. It is located at the other side of the Istiklal Avenue facing Golden Horn from a higher position. Its area is limited between Istiklal and Mesrutiyet Avenues. The lower part ends with Tunel Square and the upper part with a relatively small street called Asmalimescit Street. It is the next door neighbour of Galata and Pera (old name for Beyoglu district) that were always remembered with a western life style. The first municipality organisation of the Ottomans, the Sixth Office (today it is the administrative office of Beyoglu Municipality) is also within the borders of Asmalimescit (Celik, 1998).

All these elements which represent the western look of Istanbul have played an important role on the formation of Asmalimescit. It is “bohemian, quite from Pera and very levantian” according to Scognamilo who has lived at this neighbourhood in the first half of 20th century (Belge, 2003). It is well-known with its restaurants, cafes, nightclubs and taverns. They are side by side with masonry row houses and apartment buildings from 19th century which were built in an western style.

The servants of the wealthy european who used to live in this area took over the apartments of their employers who deserted the country in the beginning of the 20th century.
In 1970’s, a lot of building were face to face with abandonment and decay caused by this. They were illegally taken over by others (Ince, 2003). The socio-cultural structure of the settlement has meanwhile changed and become deteriorated. There was a security problem going on, especially after dark on the streets (Berk, 1990).

Asmalimescit has always been famous with the bohemian life-style on the surroundings. Today, with many 19th century masonry apartment buildings, the area is an attractive place. Its nearness to the sub-way called the ‘Tunnel’ has also influenced its development in a positive way (Figure 10).

Nevertheless, these qualifications could not stop the inevitable decline of Asmalimescit happening in 1980’s like other districts of Beyoglu. The commerce stopped in the area and the rent prices went down. Meanwhile some artists and intellectuals (writers, architects, etc.) who always liked the neighbourhood were interested in buying places in Asmalimescit to use as workshops. These people who have a culture of eating out, going to clubs, art galleries and concert halls were followed consequently by restaurants, cafes and small-sized art clubs which have especially become popular after 2000 (Figure 11, 12).
In time, the entrance floors of these badly cared buildings were filled by art galleries, book shops as well serving to a class with lower income group. This end of the famous Istiklal Street in Beyoglu has become an alternative as a place for going out for everybody as well as foreigners or so-called ‘expats’.
These conscious and unconscious renewal activities will surely gain another dimension by the opening of the new sub-way stop close to Asmalimescit.

**Cihangir**

Cihangir is the old residential quarter of the city where the elite lived during the Ottoman Empire. It is located on the European side of Istanbul with an outstanding bird eye view of Bosphorus and historical peninsula (Figure 13). It possesses maybe the most beautiful view of the city.

![Figure 13: A view from Cihangir towards the historical peninsula](image)

It was named after the Ottoman Emporer Suleyman’s (known as *the Magnificent*) son who died in his early age. In 16th century, Suleyman had ordered a mosque for his son Cihangir in this area where today still stands on a step hill with a terrace where due to its nice view even tourists enjoy visiting.

The population in the neighbourhood started to get denser at the beginning of 19th century. The architecture was then of timber constructions typical for that era. This scene was interrupted related with the big fire disaster at the beginning of 20th century (Belge, 2002). Instead of timber 2-3 storey houses, multi-storey masonry apartment buildings have started to appear. These buildings constructed by the on-muslim population of Cihangir change owners when in 1950’s this community left the city and moved out of the country. So became the district a dilapidated area where people with lower income and sub-culture groups lived together.

The gentrification period begins in mids of 1990’s with the help of regeneration activities in Beyoglu which is a very closeby, also gentrified district. This period has a lot of things in common with the gentrification of other cities in the world (Ergun, 2003).

The scholar couple Beril-Oktay Anlanmert who first preferred to settle on this area were later followed by others (Uzun, 2001). Cihangir’s location and the characteristics of its architecture, as well as its nearness to some universities with architecture and fine arts faculties played a major role when this choice was formed. Although during gentrification period the composition of the inhabitants has obviously changed, there hasn’t been any functional change in the buildings. The buildings are today still used for residential purposes. With the positive influences of the “Cihangir Beautification Foundation” which was founded
in 1995, the regeneration activities in the neighbourhood finally get rid of its individualism and gains a rather organized structure (Ergun, 2003) (Figure 14, 15).

As Cihangir gets more popular each day among Istanbul dwellers, the rent prices start to rise. In Cihangir, we are now confronted with a gentrifier and a gentrified profile and the individual and organized investors are eager to serve to this tendency which still continues today.

**Fener and Balat**

Fener and Balat which are two neighbourhoods located on the Golden Horn shore of the historical peninsula. They can be regarded in another aspect. First of all, they are the only settlements in the historical peninsula which have been subject to this change called ‘gentrification’. And furthermore, this period has been related mostly by an international institute which developed a rehabilitation project for this region in cooperation with the local authorities. This project was planned after meetings of 1996 Habitat II Congress in Istanbul where Fener and Balat districts were declared as protection zones of UNESCO. Following that the local authority of that period proposed to develop a management plan with the support of UNESCO. The non-governmental organisations wanted take part in this Project, too. Consequently it was announced that the European Union could find some additional financial support from its non-governmental organization fund.

This project which started in 1997 was significant for gentrification of these districts. It put forth a rehabilitation opportunity not only for the architecture of Fener and Balat, but also for the inhabitants of these two dilapidated areas (www.istanbullife.org: Ersin Kalkan). What Fener-Balat Rehabilitation project basically aimed was the restoration of 200 houses with a historical value and the reintegration of the inhabitants who are from low-income groups with these two neighbourhoods (Figure 16, 17).
These houses were built by the wealthy Greek minorities and Jews who used to live at this area until 1950s. They stand usually on narrow lots, are 2 or 3 storey houses, with a jutty projecting to the street. Later these buildings have been occupied by the people immigrating from eastern-anatolien or Black Sea region. This community who found it hard to adopt to urban conditions became in time the actual residents of Fener and Balat. In 1980s some of the wealthy families living in this area had to desert their places because of a series of economically influential acts. After they were gone, their houses have been taken over by another group of residents with less practice of urban life who were mostly from rural settlements. These people could not take care of the houses as well as the previous owners. So the houses were usually in bad condition, when the Fener Balat Rehabilitation Project (www.fenerbalat.org) began.

By the time the houses were restored one after another, although small in scale, a group of people consisting of artists and journalists started to settle on Fener and Balat. In fact, the number of the houses planned to be restored (only 200) during this project are too few compared with the amount of historical buildings (1400) in the area. This indicates that the gentrification act of Fener and Balat which is already quite limited and slow has the potential to follow a different path.

### Conclusion

What has so far experienced in the name of gentrification in Istanbul are activities answering the spatial desires of the new ‘elite’ class formed under global interactions and local dynamics. By examining the existing examples, it would be possible to infer some opinions about the determinatives behind the place, time, this activity.

1. **Place related:**
   
   First of all, determining a unity by looking at where these areas are located doesn’t seem possible. In Cihangir, Galata and Asmalimescit cases, their nearness to Beyoğlu, the cultural and finance centre of the city has always been influential. The other examples don’t have such characters. As small seaside settlements on Bosphorus, Kuzguncuk, Arnavutköy and Ortaköy are themselves somehow urban focal points with their introverted, self-sufficient characters and their distant intercourse even with the nearest settlement. Fener and Balat are also two seaside settlements, but this time on Golden Horn. In spite of their location in the historical peninsula they resemble an isolated island.
On the other hand, it is clear that all these examples are attractive related with the physical characteristics of where they are located. There are very qualified and unique examples of residential architecture of a profound past in each of these districts. Additionally all these houses, timber or masonry, were built mostly by the non-muslim community and in time deserted due to political reasons. Furthermore, the motivation of the gentrification process in Istanbul is not the ‘place’ itself, neither its location or physical characteristics, but what the place means. In other words; memories which belong to this particular ‘place’, the memory of the ‘place’.

2. Time related
When chronologically evaluated, Kuzguncuk would be the first to experience this process. On the other hand, it is not meaningful to fit the gentrification activities to just one specific period of time. As a result, this process has as a long-term, irregular rhythm. For each of the settlements, it prefers to go from a different path.

3. Related with the factors effective
According to Behar, if one word should be used to describe the process this would absolutely be ‘nostalgia’ (Behar, 2006). Maybe Behar’s statement can be formulated with these words: all these settlements which confront gentrification are, in fact, characterized by a multicultural society who lived on these lands in the past. After 1980, this fact met the desires of the middle class who were trying to gain a new cultural identity related with the ‘place’ (Aksoy, 2001). This new middle class who wanted to distinguish themselves from others discovered the tremendous past of their country which was on the threshold of opening to international market economies (Oncu, 1997). Therefore, it has become for some people a frequent tendency to long for the previous neighbourhood atmosphere which formalized the multi-cultural past of the city and to feel proud of being a resident of Istanbul. With this frame, it is possible to say that in Istanbul’s districts where gentrification processes have been effective, are actually preferred due to the cultural background of past residents of these settlements.
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