

- Hamnett, C. (1994). Social Polarisation in Global Cities: Theory and Evidence. *Urban Studies*, 31(3), pp.401-424. Doi:10.1080/00420989420080401
- Hamnett, C. (1996). Social Polarisation, Economic Restructuring and Welfare State Regimes. *Urban Studies*, 33(8), 1407-1430. Doi:10.1080/0042098966727
- Jałowicki, B. (2010). Miasto i przestrzeń w perspektywie socjologicznej. Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR, Warszawa, pp.246-262.
- Hellenic Statistical Authority (2011). Census data 2011. Data base after a request of Laboratory of Social and Demographic Analysis
- Kandyliis, G., Maloutas, T., & Sayas, J. (2012). Immigration, inequality and diversity: socio-ethnic hierarchy and spatial organization in Athens, Greece. *European Urban And Regional Studies*, 19(3), pp. 267-286. Doi : 10.1177/0969776412441109.
- Labrianidis, L. (2011) Investing in Getting Away ; Brain Drain from Greece in the Globalisation Era., Athens: Kritiki [in Greek].
- Pumain, F. Godard, A. Chenu. *Anthropos*, Paris, pp. 191-206.
- Maloutas, T. (2004). Segregation and residential mobility: Socially entrapped social mobility and its impact on segregation in Athens. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 11(2), pp.171–187.
- Maloutas, T. (2007). Segregation, Social Polarization and Immigration in Athens during the 1990s: Theoretical Expectations and Contextual Difference. *International Journal Of Urban And Regional Research*, 31(4), pp.733-758. Doi:10.1111/j.1468-2427.2007.00760.
- Maloutas, T. (2014). Social and spatial impact of the crisis in Athens: From clientelist regulation to sovereign debt crisis. *Région et Développement*, 39: pp.149-166
- Marcuse, P. & van Kempen, R. (2002). *Of states and cities* (1st ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Musterd, S., Marcińczak, S., van Ham, M., & Tammaru, T. (2016). Socioeconomic segregation in European capital cities: Increasing separation between poor and rich. *Urban Geography*, pp.1-22. Doi: 10.1080/02723638.2016.1228371.
- Preteceille, E. (1995). Division sociale de l'espace et globalisation: Le cas de la métropole parisienne. *Sociétés Contemporaines*, 22-23(1), 33-67.
- Sassen, S. (1991). *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Wirth, L. (1980). *Le ghetto*, Grenoble: Presses universitaires de Grenoble :

ID 1736 | FRAMING THE SOCIAL AMPLIFICATIONS OF RISK IN URBAN TRANSFORMATION OF ISTANBUL

Pinar Ertan Saracoglu¹

¹METU

pinar1saracoglu@gmail.com

1 REDUCING DISASTER RISK AND ITS SOCIO-ECONOMIC DIMENSIONS

International disaster risk reduction framework concentrates on global cause and effect relations of natural disasters from a nominal perspective that hardly copes with developing countries relative socio-economic conditions and turns in to a matter of internalization. There is a requirement of a complementary perspective to observe and measure the socio-economic effects. From a theoretical research perspective, social amplifications of risk introduce us the how social and economic feedbacks in a social system could amplify or repress disaster impacts.

Common efforts on reducing disaster risk has been defined comprehensively through International Decade for Disaster Risk Reduction (1989). Yokohoma Strategy (1994) and Hyogo Framework for Action (2005-2015) were the concomitant procedures followed by Sendai Framework (2015-2030) recently. The general emphasis of sustainable development other than reducing disaster risks and poverty were determined as the main coordinated tasks. In order to reduce disaster risks Hyogo Framework (2005-2015) focused on national goals integrated to local action plans as the top priority and an institutional commitment. As a precondition of determining urban risk drivers in each country mainstreaming information, innovation and education were identified as urban scale targets that would lead to develop a prevention culture and resilience. In disaster risk management, objectives have been shifted from post disaster perspectives as

preparedness, response, emergency and recovery to proactive strategies as disaster risk reduction and mitigation. (UNISDR, 2004) Sendai Framework held in the 3rd World Conference of UN in Japan, makes clear determination in reducing disaster risks while preventing the new risks to generate in urban systems. Poverty, inequality, climate change and unplanned-volatile and rapid urbanization were depicted as urban risk drivers that generate the impacts of disaster risks. Last decade, the perspective on risk as a social phenomenon truly altered the risk perception from a sole physical statement in to a social statement affected by, social, socio-economic and cultural statements. The similar emphasis in Sendai Framework (2015-2030) reclaimed that reducing disaster risks, vulnerabilities and urban poverty demand new priorities from urban planning and disaster risk reduction.

Disaster risk reduction not only concentrates on the impacts of disasters but also vulnerabilities that imply potential dangers and gaps in the physical environment. Vulnerability includes the socio-economic attributes of disaster risks, and defined as the potential referring to physical, economic, natural and social losses and losses in human life. (UNISDR, 2009) Vulnerability and poverty have an intertwined relationship in urban system. Poverty is defined as insufficient nutrition, sanity, education and habitation conditions as well as safety and all other basic needs. (WB, 2001) As an urban component of poverty, squatters are in the first rank in reducing disaster risks for environmental degradation, policy changes, rural unemployment, urban immigration, strict building codes, and other physical vulnerabilities. In fact factors determining the urban poverty and vulnerability differs.

In society, all low-income groups might not be vulnerable to disasters while mid to high income groups could be vulnerable. (Bankoff, 2003) As stated in Sendai Framework, vulnerability to natural disasters, urban poverty and risk drivers indicate for explanatory qualities in determining disaster risks in urban environment. Distinct socio-economic groups in urban environment have been also exposed to disaster risk relatively distinct. In Turkey, low income groups have been faced with the major negative impacts drastically. Referring to recent approaches in Turkey and international frameworks this paper aims to seek authentic definitions for social amplifications generated by/doubling up socio-economic drawbacks and vulnerabilities in urban transformation process of Istanbul.

2 INTERNATIONAL APPROACHES ON URBAN TRANSFORMATION AND DISTATER RISKS

There have been distinct periods shaped the urban fabric of Istanbul that was initially triggered by industrialization and migration in 1950s, then by adaptation to neoliberal politics in 1980s and by the impact of disaster events after 1990s. 1980s were specific to new modes of urbanization and new urban typologies converted through the introduction of globalization. Industrial development shifted to urban development in Turkey in line with the sharp tendency of adapting in to global politics.

Bourdieu (1984) identifies 1980s as a period of reshaping urban realm through distinct classes, through the differentiation of their roles in production and consumption. The sharpness of spatial differentiation is visible in housing areas, offices and public space. Regarding Harvey's (1973)

redistribution of income, urban transformation is pumped for rearranging and reproducing urban processes. More, it has been utilized as a strong tool for rearranging the redistribution of income, increasing the flow of production to consumption and diversifying the spatial differentiation patterns in between urban poor and urban elite.

The entrepreneur local governments, promoted policies and implementations to advertise historical fabric of cities to attract capital and human. Production spaces as the object of industrial production became in to consumption spaces subjected to tourism and recreational facilities under deindustrialization. In scope of these changes, flagship projects including EXPO areas, stadiums, theme parks were all concentrated on large-scale events in UK, USA and North America. (Ünsal & Türkün, 2014) In short term, best use, highest revenue and capital transfer were targeted other than urban renovation. Late developing countries are eager to utilize urban transformation for this purpose to integrate in to global production by maintaining service sector and housing-led urban development.

The nucleus of post-industrial city had been framed via the segregation of urbanization, labor and economic development. Agricultural production was pressured by IMF policies through cutting subventions

to the small producers. (Ünsal & Türkün, 2014) Migration to large industrial cities and decentralization of industry generated housing areas settled as urban corridors. (Davis, 2006) Squatter areas developed rapidly at the periphery of industrial cities had been a common picture starting from 1960s especially in Mexico, Venezuela, Peru and Nigeria. (UN-HABITAT, 2003)

After 1980s in western countries urban transformation developed to endorse sales and privatization of housing areas. Inevitably in 1990s, drawbacks of the previous term has been observed as unemployment, poverty, social exclusion and socio-spatial segregation. (Crump, 2002) Housing policies once defined as a solution to eliminate impoverishment became an instrument for rearranging the redistribution of income despite offering urban poor and low-income groups affordable houses. In order to attract mid-class families to urban deprivation areas, mix-use and mix-class projects were developed in many western countries to impede class segregation in urban environment. As a reflection of neoliberal tendencies on housing policies, in USA; privatization of housing areas was supported by facilitating redevelopment and sales of the former social housing areas. (Ünsal & Türkün, 2014) In UK, urban renaissance was adopted as renovation of housing areas settled at urban centers to prevent emerging housing units at suburbia and diminish spatial segregation. By the support of IMF and WB neoliberal policies with increased impacts have been emerged in new forms of policies such as sustainability, livability, good governance, competition and financial accountability. (UN-Millennium Goals, 1999) On contrary public policies have been focused on poverty, inequality and environmental problems. UN-led urban policies propose alternatives to planning in squatter rehabilitation based on increasing the efficiency of market, civil society and NGOs; collaborative and active partnerships in between local governments and private sector, legalizing squatter areas by integrating them in to housing sector. (Nijman, 2008)

Recently in determining new problems and priorities in today's cities, there has been a requirement for introducing a new research field in scope of the relation in between disaster risks, urbanization and poverty. According to the new statistics of increasing frequency of natural disasters, population density and urbanization movements; reducing natural disasters becomes a top priority. UN identifies global risk tendencies as rapid urbanization, urban impoverishment, global warming and climate change. Global disaster impacts initially affect urban development tendencies in developing countries. In mid-scale to mega cities and being exposed to natural disasters is primarily related to geographical distribution, scale and urban functions. UN states that recently, $\frac{3}{4}$ of 1000 large scale cities are exposed to at least one natural disaster. Low-income groups and urban poor have been mostly affected by natural disasters. (UNISDR, 2014)

When international frameworks focusing on managing disaster risks and urban processes have been reviewed; resilience, sustainability, reducing poverty and squatter rehabilitation are set as effective goals including main projects of redevelopment and urban transformation. As a pre-disaster approach, urban transformation has been developed as a part of a broader plans and programs based on reducing future losses and existing vulnerabilities. In post-disaster approach, urban transformation is basically implemented as a redevelopment process that targets to eliminate demolishing impacts of natural disasters. On the other hand, international case studies and UN reports declare that as a redevelopment process in post or pre-disaster approach, urban transformation stimulates rapid urbanization, haphazard development typologies and increase potential hazards during disaster.

3 THE CASE OF ISTANBUL: URBAN TRANSFORMATION AND REDUCING DISASTER RISKS

In Turkey, the relation between urban processes and disaster risks is weak and unstable in consonance with the urbanization trends. Urban transformation had started in 1950s by the transformation of squatter areas. Until 1960s, urban transformation was set for providing social housing to the new comers in immigration movements but latter it got commercialized. (Keleş, 1990) As a template for today's urban transformation, Squatter Law 775 was enacted for coping with informal settlements. However, in 1980s squatters changed by economic policy. New development movements brought housing speculations and rent competition by economic change and large scale urban transformation projects. The problem of titling squatter dwellers as illegitimate income generators certainly promoted the efforts of legalizing squatters to get political votes via housing development plans.

After 1980s the entrepreneur role of local governments weakened the authority of central government and accelerated privatization movements in urban areas. Mega projects, shopping centers, office areas as well as housing grants for mid and low-income groups and social housing projects were mushrooming by global tendencies in Istanbul. For facilitating large-sale international investments, a legislative, administrative and practical re-structuralization had been employed by authorities. Not only an economic one but also ideological and cultural transformation had been adapted. The visible impacts of this transformation were observed on large-scale urban projects as the second Bosphorus Bridge while invisible impacts were only seen in housing areas of urban poor and low-income groups. The transformation of Istanbul from industrial to post-industrial city; and production space to consumption space has been called as the first steps to become a world city.

Before 1999, urban transformation was developed accordingly to inner dynamics of capital and political processes such as migration, inadequate infrastructure, and privatization. The most observable and measurable consequences of political changes had been squatter amnesties. In between 1983-1984 legalization process of squatters was supported by private deeds offices. Under Prime Ministry, the Mass Housing Authority (TOKI-1984) was established to provide social housing. Though the distribution of ownerships by reclamation plans in squatter areas was failed as the law no 3414 was established and had given squatter dwellers the right of transferring their dwellings to others which led to housing speculations immediately. By these implementations the squatter areas were settled and left in urban centers differing from the previous forms settled in peripheral areas.

The Great Marmara Earthquake (1999) was a turning point for legislative and administrative restructuring for accelerating urban transformation. More than 18.000 people died and 100.000 buildings were demolished. The extension of duties and rights of the Mass Housing Authority (TOKI) by Urban Transformation Law 6306 (2012) given TOKI the authority to construct new housing areas at public land (2003) and to establish partnerships with local governments.(2005) Through the revisions adapted in TOKI Law 2985, it has become the full authority to clear, rehabilitate and transform squatter areas. The law on Conservation by Urban Regeneration (5366, 2005) was also an unclear implementation by the limits of conserving and regenerating historical urban areas that totally pillaged many historical districts and opened them for gentrification.

After 1999, urban transformation was restructured by a new form of legitimacy based on externalities likewise earthquakes. Planning and other development tools were excluded by the dichotomy of providing earthquake-safe housing and redistribution of income. Urban processes have been governed by the central political authority and the rights and interests of differentiated socio-economic classes were opened for competition. Urban transformation expanded rapidly in Istanbul and around Turkey for the purpose of reducing earthquake risks. The background of disaster management in Turkey is rather responsive to political change. Starting from the Republic Period, post-hoc laws and administrative reforms had failed to generate a holistic approach and institutionalization. Post-disaster framework concentrating on a long term post-disaster redevelopment after damages and demolitions.

4 CONCLUSIONS ON SOCIAL AMPLIFICATIONS OF RISK

As a supporting theoretical framework, the social amplification of risks by Kaspersons has been developed in the mid-1980s in scope of institutional risk assessment. Risk events are experienced through physical harms and society create interpretations of risk as social and cultural processes. Social and technical aspects of risk and various theories related to social science perspectives as communication theory, and referring findings are gathered in a holistic framework. Through assessing risk technically, the main theory relates psychological, cultural, sociological perspectives and risk-centered social behaviors that express the risk perception. Although risk perception is prioritized within the framework; the fundamental hypothesis is that risk and impacts harm humans and ecosystems directly while social amplifications of risk harm economy, social institutions and socio-economic differences in society indirectly. At first glance, social amplifications of risk primarily occur in the information flow in society and then in response mechanisms of society accordingly. Risks are sensible to information flow with the aspects of psychological, social and cultural processes and by increasing or diminishing the risk perception. In fact, responsive social behaviors or reactions could hold secondary social or economic impacts that alter the structure of risk by its perception in society. Physical risks and their impacts could be duplicated by

decreasing their visibility while they could even be decreased by increasing their visibility through political notions and manipulations of specific socio-physical indicators and structures.

Within this scope, the social amplification of risk refers to a socio-economic criterion focusing on the relation of urbanization and social structure through amplifying the physical impacts of disaster risks. The fundamental relation of the theoretical analysis is the correlated relation in between disaster risks and transformation-led urbanization that is both steered by and led to socioeconomic differentiation. Urban transformation in Istanbul has been grounded in socio-physical facts such as disaster risks, social amplification and vulnerabilities. Though, their physical and so-called impacts on urban system could be clarified by developing a holistic approach.

Theoretically urban transformation for the purpose of reducing disaster risks has two outcomes. At first, there are two separate sets of means and ends within the same process and their quantitative impacts are led to transformation-led urbanization. Secondly, urban transformation process and impacts are concluded in to distinct outcomes for differentiated income groups.

Rather than focusing on the amplification process of risk through the social medium or social stations, secondary impacts of disasters based on behavioral and communicative responses are identified. In scope of the socio-economic criterion; secondary impacts go beyond individuals or groups but the whole social system. In Turkey, during the process of urban transformation in disaster prone areas in the redistribution of income, urban poor or low-income groups are neglected by absorbing the rent rise in to power actors such as the government, contractors or mid/high income groups. Low income groups are prevented from getting their share from increase in value by urban transformation are totally excluded by diminishing returns and the negative impacts of living in a disaster area. When free market inequality and the inequality imposed by urban transformation are compared it is found that the second one is much more oppressive, ideological and also targeting to consume the share of urban poor. Considering the urban transformation process by all of its complementary legal and defacto extensions, it reveals two major consequences. First, during the urban process; the emphasis on disaster risk reduction is switched to urban rent. Secondly, after the urban process; the requirement of a feedback mechanism regarding the impacts of urban transformation on reduced/prevented disaster risks in disaster prone areas is suppressed by the muddling arguments of reconstructing the new building structure.

Physical Consequences referring to physical attributes of disaster risks include both visible/natural and invisible/socio-economic/ideological risks that have physical outcomes as vulnerabilities and changes in the nature of risks.

Social amplifications in urban transformation refer to socio-economic vulnerabilities and disadvantages of urban poor as wells as ideological hazards and politicized risks. As an effective devise for the relocation and redistribution of disaster risk, urban transformation reproduces the built environment by its exchange value. The outcomes are measurable both as an input and output in the urban process. Harvey (1982) states that economic crises often intersect with the intensification in creative destruction through large scale projects and high rates of construction. Although urban transformation in Istanbul is set to reduce disaster risks; in common market-led interventions adopted by urban and regional authorities, the highest and best use is kept sustained during the process. More, the redistribution of income prioritizing disadvantaged urban areas is neglected because of the absence of planning mechanism. As social amplification risk becomes a commodity or a destructive good pertains the favorable conditions for extensive crises to reproduce means of production. Risk changes in to a liquidatable commodity and becomes tradable through power actors; governmental institutions, local administrations, contractors and dwellers.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- Bankoff, G. (1999) *The Pacific Review* Vol. 12/Issue3. A history of poverty: The politics of natural disasters in the Philippines, 1985–95.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Crump, J. (2002) Deconcentration by demolition: Public housing, poverty and urban policy, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 20.

- Davis, M. (2006) Planet of Slums, Verso, New York.
- Harvey, D. (1973) Social Justice and the City, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kaika, M. (2005) City of Flows. Nature, Modernity, and the City. New York: Routledge, (2005).
- Kasperson X. J. & E. R. (2005) The Social Contours of Risk Vol.1 Publics, Risk Communication and the Social Amplifications of Risk. USA, Earthscan, 1-99.
- Keleş, R. (1990) Kentleşme Politikası (The Policy of Urbanization), İmge, İstanbul.
- Nijman, J. (2008) Against the Odds: Slum Rehabilitation in Neoliberal Mumbai, Cities, 25.
- Swyngedouw, E. Moulaert, F. & Rodriguez, A. (2002) Neoliberal Urbanization in Europe: Large-Scale Urban Development Projects and the New Urban Policy, Antipode
- Swyngedouw, E. (2000) Authoritarian governance, power and the politics of rescaling”, Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 18:63–76.
- Swyngedouw, E. (1999) “Modernity and hibridity: nature, Regeneracionismo, and the production of the Spanish waterscape, 890–1930”, Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 89(3) 443–465.
- Tekeli, İ. (2003) Kentleri Dönüşüm Mekânı Olarak Düşünmek (Thinking Cities As the Spaces of Transformation), Kentsel Dönüşüm Sempozyumu Bildiriler, YTÜ Basım-Yayın Merkezi İstanbul.
- Ünsal Ö. B. & Türkün A. (2014) Neoliberal Kentsel Dönüşüm: Kentsel Alanlarda Sınıfsal Tahliye, Yoksullaşma ve Mülksüzleştirme (Neoliberal Urban Transformation), Türkün, A. (Eds.), Mülk Mahal İnsal İstanbul'da Kentsel Dönüşüm (Urban Transformation in Istanbul), İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul, 17-36.
- IBB (2004) Earthquake Masterplan for Istanbul , Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality prepared by Bogazici University, Istanbul Technical University, Middle East Technical University. Yıldız Technical University,
- JICA-IMM (2003) The Study on a Disaster Prevention / Mitigation Basic Plan in Istanbul including Seismic Microzonation in the Republic of Turkey – Japan International Cooperation Agency and Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality (JICA – IMM)
- UNDP/ISDR (2010) Local Governments and Disaster Risk Reduction Good Practices and Lessons Learned, Geneva Switzerland, ITC.
- UN Millennium Task Force on Improving Lives of Slum Dwellers (2005) A Home in the City. London, Earthscan.
- UN, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division (2015) World Urbanization Prospects: The 2014 Revision, (ST/ESA/SER.A/366).
- UNDP/Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (2004) A Global Report Reducing Disaster Risk a Challenge for Development. NY, USA.
- UNISDR, How to Make Cities More Resilient/A handbook for Local Government Leaders (2012) Geneva, Switzerland.

ID (1017) | TOWARDS A THEORY OF CHANGE: MARGINAL AREAS AND DEVELOPMENT POLICIES IN A CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE

Claudia Meschiari¹; Viviana Fini²

¹Faculty of Architecture RomaTre University; ² ISBEM
cmeschiari@uniroma3.it ; vivianafini@gmail.com

1 INTRODUCTION

The paper aims at exploring the relation between processes of policy-making and cultural dimensions, assuming that cultural and symbolic dimensions are relevant in the ways in which both policy-makers and beneficiaries understand and respond to changes.