The Erosion of Public Space and the Collapse of Agoras: An Evaluation of the Gated Communities in Istanbul[1]

Kadir Şahin[2]

Abstract

When urban life is considered in its natural state it is easy to say that, it is a spatial synergy based on diversity. However, the increasing ongoing effort of 'urban planning' became a reality that battles with the natural state of the city. Especially when the presentations of 'gated community' in late modern cities considered, it can be seen that traditional modern cities contain major changes in terms of its nature. It can be said that the most remarkable points with the emergence of those sorts of changes are the changes in terms of private and public spaces. Thus, with the emergence of the new housing forms where the natural city security is cancelled, the values of the street and neighborhood life 'in traditional modern city' became a factor of danger and uncertainty. The social relations that can be expressed as 'urban uncanny', 'randomness', 'deformities' and 'routines' of the 'traditional modern city' life gradually became a reality that is based on distrust and danger. However, in the agoras (intermediate spaces) of the 'traditional modern city' all the factors in the name of 'gated community' which enable these sorts of interactions are changed into public passivity. On that sense, the new urban areas (gated communities) which had been formed because of the security concerns are changing and making agoras non-functional, which results in the cancellation of the nature of the city and the natural security. In this paper, we are discussing the sociological reasons behined the emerge of 'public passivity' and the collapse of the agoras (its neighborhood and streets) of the traditional modern city through the residences of 'gated communities in Istanbul'.

Keywords: Gated communies, Public space, Private space, Agora, Neighborhood, Traditional modern city, Late modern city, Public passivity.

---

[2] Asst. Assoc. Dr., Karabük University Department of Sociology.

1. Introduction: The History of the City and its Nature

More than two thousand years ago Aristotle told: "A city is consisted of differences; things alike together cannot form a city" (Aristoteles, 2013). However, since the 1990s the nature and the development of the modern city tell us a totally new story. When the historical state of the city is taken into consideration, it cannot be expected to be monotonous, homogeneous and predictable. There are many urban planners who think about it in this way, and they call it 'regular city'. Yet, -as Jacobs puts it - what is hidden behind this 'order nonsense' does not at all mean the social life based on social life. On top of what is experienced, we also come across a new urban problem arising every day from the 'killing of the city' (Jacobs, 2011). On the other hand, it must not be forgotten that "there are more in the city than what eyes can see and ears can hear" (Lynch, 2012: 1). When the practice of social cohesion is considered, it is also necessary to take into account that the nature of the city cannot merely consist of single-row houses or grid designed streets. In this respect, the city determines the nature of its social characters or their relationships (Harvey, 2007). Not taking cities into consideration from this aspect may as well mean that possible problems to be faced regarding "the nature of our society" are being neglected.

> "As the well-known urban sociologist Robert Park once stated: 'The city is a world created by the mankind… When humans build a city, they have also rebuilt themselves'. Should Park is right, the questions of what kind of a city we want cannot be considered apart from the questions of what kinds of people we strive to be, what kind of social relations we are looking for, what kind of relationship with the nature we value, what sorts of aesthetic values we have. Contemplating about how a city's process of action which has been prompted by the powerful social forces shaped and reshaped us… connate to the fact that we have been transformed over and over again as well" (Harvey, 2013: 43-44).

From this stand point, the 'construction of a living space' where individuals are able to live by ignoring others is impossible. On the contrary to the view of the existence of others as a threat, it must be realized that there is room for opening up to differences in so much as associations. "The city is obliged to be a school that teaches how to attain a focused life. By opening up to others, we learn how to discuss what is important and what is not important. We are in need of seeing the differences on the streets and in other people's lives neither as a threat nor as an emotional call; however, we need to evaluate them as necessary actions to be seen. These differences are necessary for us to learn how to pursue not only individual but also collective life in a balanced manner" (Sennet, 1999: 15-16). In addition, many philosophers have stated that the city can merely be tenable with diversity (even with chaos).

For a long time, the works of writers namely Simmel, Park and Wright have made us think that the nature of the modern city has been built thanks to such realities. "There is a growing awareness as to how to understand man-made environments make sense for its inhabitants. To exemplify, the interiors of the buildings give a reasonable amount of clues about the social order and the nature of the social procedures which is considered to be ongoing within it. Similar to that, Lowenthal and Prince have drawn attention to the fact that each era reflects the readily available social norms by shaping them according to its needs. Regardless of its out of shape modern state, the city still maintains this symbolic character as a whole… If we want to comprehend the spatial form, firstly we must understand the symbolic character of this form" (Harvey, 2003: 35-36). Nevertheless, the situation that has arisen in the course of time shows that we are

being carried away into a city environment and life which is far away from the historical accumulation of the city.

2. The City Notion of the Planners

In the late modern (neoliberal) period which is currently lived in, the 'naturalness' and 'mediocrity' of the history of the city began to be perceived as a danger. According to determinations made by urban planners supports that the current state of the city is full of evil. In a sense, the city planners are in a secret battle with the natural state of the city. "(According to them) The street is a wicked environment for the human beings. Houses must be far from the streets... Frequent streets are lavish... The basic unit of the city is not the street, but it is the block, and moreover, it is the superblock... The presence of other individuals is what we bare whether we want it or not, and a good city planning should aim at isolation or at least the illusion of isolation of the suburban privacy" (Jacobs, 2011: 40). These types emphasized expressions are of those that are commonly used by planners who advocate the construction of space. Based on what is missing on the planning process related to our lives, we are unable to understand what we are missing out on life most of the time.

In this respect, we need to take a closer look at the things we call 'naturalness of the city' in order to be able to focus on the permanent absences. Since, when the cities are being transformed and planned, spaces that often cause in the overlook of 'social factors' are being constructed. Social naturalities disappear quietly as a result of this process (construction of space). The biggest reason for this situation perhaps stems from our way of thinking about 'how we want living spaces to be'. The thought of the existing problem will also be able to give us an opportunity to think about the societies that are lost in the space we want to build. With the reconstruction of spaces, individuals are being pushed into a rather passive social life. As much as they are obliged to be passive, social relations are increasingly becoming ignored realities. The issue of what we have lost with the construction of 'new places'in this respect (especially in the neoliberal spaces) is an important issue to be put thought into.

Among many of them, the increasing amount of variables such as 'insecurity', 'uncertainty' and 'fear' in the neo-liberalizing world, one of the most important is the big transformations of our habitats (or our public spaces). For, at this stage with the change of the public spaces, there is no longer the construction of the spaces that had the former values of the city. Especially recently, the understandings of the 'space is a merchandise' are marketing strategies that cause the city's social background to be utterly ignored. In fact, we are "using up" new public spaces; we are creating new public spaces that are not very compatible with the social life without realizing it. In this respect, it is possible to say that 'late modern cities' do not contain the characteristics of the encompassing 'traditional modern cities'. While living in cities in which social diversity has been equated with fear and anxiety search for security, homogeneity and individual retreat has become the normality of the late modern city.

> "Similar to all the previous phases, the radical expansion which is observed recently in the urban process has brought unimaginable changes in lifestyles. Quality city life became a commodity for those who are wealthy... The antidote to the inconsistent, prosaic and monotonous detached constructions of the suburban areas which still dominates many regions is found: the movement called 'new urbanization' promotes the boutique style of life similar to neighborhoods which will make dreams regarding the city come true. It is a world which neoliberal morality based on extreme individualism is fed by ownership of properties is a model

for the socialization of individuals. In the middle of the city, which is one of the biggest social achievements that has been built in history, the consequences are individual isolation, anxiety and neurosis" (Harvey, 2013: 56).

When the history of the city is taken into account, it is understood that one of its most significant achievements is its nature of 'trust' or 'safety', which is the indicator of social capital (Low, 2004). However, the way of maintaining safety cannot be to build 'neutral spaces' (Sennett, 1999; 2011) for not using the spaces in unique ways specific to their natures (as it is called as a safe lifestyle in gated communities), only desolate the streets or even make them blunt. This means abandoning its public spaces to crime and the deviants. Jacobs claims that cities that are built from homogeneous structures in the name of 'city regulation' will not bring security, for according to him, the city becomes functional with the diversity and only cities that function in a public sense are able to produce safe environments.

"Supposing that we desire a city citizen to identify and address social problems, the starting point ought to be to support practical forces which protect the public order and civilization in existing cities. It is doltish to construct new districts that are suited to commit crime easily. Nevertheless, at the moment (under the name of planning) this is exactly what we are doing... The first thing to be comprehended is that the protection of public peace in the cities - the peace of the pavement and street - is not primarily conducted by the police forces, though the compulsory presence of the police forces. What protects the public peace are the webs of voluntary inspections and standards of the public whose inspections and standards are complicated and almost unconscious; moreover, it is the people who are the doers of this" (Jacobs, 2011: 51).

One of the most pronounced features of the modern societies nowadays in city life is '*the fear of opening up'*. On the basis of the fear of opening up, perceiving the specific features of a city as a danger lies. *When this perception settles into the base of our views regarding the city, to separate it into its parts, to support each separation with intransitive borders and walls, it finds itself a place in the context of danger and fear which is designed having considered life with regards to military aims.* Every action which will violate the limits becomes one of the most severe types of fears. "The outlook of the cities reflect a huge and unimaginable fear of opening. 'Opening' refers to more of the possibility of getting hurt than of being warned. *The 'Fear of opening' is nearly a military look at the everyday life.* Attack and defense is almost liable to be a model of subjective life just as much as it is of war. *The characteristics of our way of constructing cities are the walls created by the diversity among people, and the assumption of these diversities' to be mutual threats as well as mutual stimuli. Therefore, the things we build in the cities are places that eliminate the possibility of an impersonal, neutralizing and social contact"* (Sennett, 1999: 14-15). Because of this reason, *the city has a form far from the narrative as a result of historical accumulation and the lifestyles that public experiences enable*.

'We design the city, but we design the city in a way that we perceive our bodies' (Sennett, 2011). These expressions are assumptions linked to all the variations of public and private spaces in the 'late modern city'. According to Sennet, one of the most important results that modern architecture caused by the culture of planning is the fact that it made the bodies and the spaces that are owned to be disconnected. According to him, spaces (or public spaces) which are compatible with the way bodies perceive are no longer constructed. This situation; as a result, causes the individuals to get trapped in places where they

are socially inactive. In exactly the same way it is in the lives of the individuals living in today's cities, Sennett states that 'Bodiless spaces (the spaces where people fail to be active) desire passive citizens'. Nonetheless, any state that passivates the bodies, so to say undermines the personalities of a public space because for him, 'Individuals are observing (not acting), and they live more passively at the moment in that they are merely observing (Sennett, 1999). For this reason, the sole thing that 'the lives which have run out of public experience' shoulders is the uncertainty about the public sphere. A condition like this makes the living urban space 'neutral spaces'. Neutral spaces; on the other hand, are not spaces that link individuals to social conditions or active public spaces. On the contrary, it results in an urban life trapped in isolation. In a way, it serves to the emergence of public spaces that are lifeless and that make interaction impossible. The realities that bearer of these conditions are hidden in the planning as well. The real fear in cities which are a result of planning, is the fear of touching and interaction.

In this respect, there are 'neutral spaces' which are 'killed by the public spaces' in the core of the opinion of comfort and order that are in promise of planners (or as they are in this study housing companies) the fear of the individuals who are the consumer of these neutral spaces turned in to the 'fear of touching'. That is why the late modern city individual lives in spaces where there is, no interaction'. However, 'touching' which is the indicator 'sincerity and warmth' used to enable making inferences in a way, that the individual was safe. However today, to be able to touch has become the source of risk, uncertainty and the biggest fear factor (Delibaş, 2017). This is why the promise of the new living spaces (gated communities) is lives shaped in the context of the lack of contact

> "The desire to rescue the body from reluctance is conjoined with 'the fear of touch', which is clearly seen in the modern city design... Day by day, neighborhoods/gated communities surrounded by fences, accessed through large doors and kept under tight protection are being sold as an image of a good life. In today's world, order stands for 'lack of contact'... (In) The disorganized geography that is catered towards desensitizing the human body with modern technologies, modern city (especially late modern city)... the physical presence of other people in crowds are conceived as a threat" (Sennett, 2011: 14-16).

The dead streets constructed in 'new style housing presentations' (living spaces surrounded by intact walls or gated communities) never provide a medium for the emergence of expected city practices. When taken a closer look; in fact, these city practices ensure the rise of a public space audit based on congruence. Nevertheless, the transformation that is led by the individuals who are becoming uninterested to public problems/life also causes them to perceive the end result of what they do as 'distrust'. Because of this, it prevents the late modern individuals to realize the safety of the busy streets and avenues for they perceive them as chaos. In this respect, it is important that the streets are open spaces to the practices of those who live there. The reality in gated communities is quite the opposite. The streets that are dedicated to activities such as only passing by or wandering around with cars are being the tellers of them not being used in their natures. The street is a medium of communication but it cannot be seen only as a mean of communication. At the same time, it is a station in terms of the formation of social life with its tradesmen, sidewalks, and neighborhood (Fukuyama, 2005). In a way, they are the agoras of a 'traditional modern city'. This mission makes the streets and avenues alive and functional.

"If people do not want to use the streets, you cannot force them to make use of the streets. If people do not want to observe the street, you cannot make them. It may sound like with observations in the streets and everyone becoming a police person of their society is a strict implementation, yet it is not the reality. So long as people voluntarily use and enjoy the streets, the safety of the streets is ensured in the best manner naturally, with little hostility and thanks to skepticism; it is for the better when people are less aware of the fact that they are the ones provide security" (Jacobs, 2011: 56).

In this respect, the perception that is loaded to the practices of the city in the late modern times is understood to be nothing but a misinterpretation of its qualities. However, the bigger the 'misunderstanding' (especially the views of the planners) or the 'deliberate misinterpretation' (especially the view of the market -just like in gated communities-), the more faults the actions based on solutions have. "The reformists who observe the townsfolk hanging around in crowded spaces, walking around the confectioners and pubs, and drinking soda in front of the doors for a long time, finally settle on what can be summarized as follows: 'What a misery! Had these people proper houses, or more intimate or green outdoor spaces, they would not wander idly in streets!'... This judgment is a sign that cities are vastly misunderstood... the property of the social life of city pavements is the fact that they are open to the public. With sincere and intimate social life they bring together people who do not know each other, and in most cases, people are not disturbed to get to know each other in this way by any means" (Jacobs, 2011: 75). It is expected for the similar conditions to be in people's lives in these contexts. In this respect, neighborhoods or streets of the traditional modern city are in a way agoras which make social interaction possible. What can keep the social life active is the fact that those spaces carry on business. Taking a closer look at how these kinds of conditions emerge in the everyday practices of the city will provide a quality analysis setting to understand the situation. From this point on, the paper will proceed with the interaction details of the daily life of the traditional modern city.

3. The Public Sphere and the Traditional Modern City

When focused on the 'traditional modern practices', it is easily understood that much of what is now regarded as a drawback is in fact ordinary. Mayol argues what Jacobs and others emphasize in the context of street, pavement, and neighborhood 'in the context of the relation to the public and private life of the neighborhood'. Mayol also presents important perspectives in order to understand the content of Jacob's analysis on the traditional modern city and neighborhood routines. According to Mayol, a neighborhood is not limited to its physical boundaries.[3] It is a living space which is entirely an output of human relations. "By definition, the neighborhood is almost the authority to manage the social environment, since for a user; it is a part of a well-known public space where he knows he is being respected. Therefore, the neighborhood can be understood as a part of the general public space (anonymous, open to all) were 'allocated public space' slowly penetrates into the allocated public space because of the practical daily usages" (Mayol, 2009). In this respect, the neighborhood is, in fact, valuable in terms of the codes of everyday life. On that sense, the analysis of the neighborhood by Mayol in terms of understanding the

---

[3] According to Lefebyre, spaces have abstractedness specific to them (Lefebyre, 2014).

content of urban life and the imposed qualities are findings that can stress the differences between what is private space and what is public space.[4]

> "Neighborhood... is a part of a border in the middle of the city which separates the private space from the public space... The neighborhood is a dynamic concept that necessitates a gradual learning process... It can be considered as a progressive privatization of the public space in that its common usage. Its function is a practical system allowing the breaks in the continuity between the most intimate (the personal space of housing) and the least known (the entire city or even the entire world)... The neighborhood is a medium ground of an existential (on the personal level) and social (on the user's group) dialect between the inside and outside... Hence why we can say that the neighborhood is, in fact, housing on a bigger scale; for the user, it can be summarized as a total of routes opened from his home. The neighborhood, rather than being an open or statistically measurable urban surface, it is an opportunity of several routes which the core is always the sphere of the private, and it is available to all" (Mayol, 2009: 34-35).

These valuable practices regarding the city actually reveal the 'intersection surfaces' of 'public space' and 'private space'. For, encountering 'the other'; what's more, 'interacting' and having a contact make the individuals involved in common spaces. In places where there are no such 'intermediate spaces' (Sennett, 1999) or agoras (Bauman, 2011a: 2012a) about the public space and the private space, in time isolation in terms of relationships is experienced. The enclosing of 'private spaces' with not only sociological but also physical walls becomes an outcome of such a deduction thanks to the abandonment of urban spaces. Because of the intransitivity of the borders between 'private sphere' and 'public sphere', it results in the loss of the relationships or the 'social capital' based on social interactions. As a result, the permanent effects of isolation are becoming a city practice day by day. Nevertheless, Mayol says that the fact that neighborhoods still exist in traditional modern city that ensures the functionality in terms of making the transition between 'inside' and 'outside'. In this sense, Mayol claims that the interaction facilitated by the public sphere of the traditional modern city are spaces that include 'intermediate spaces' or 'agoras'.

> "The neighborhood is a space of interaction established as a social entity with the help of the other which requires special treatment. A person's leaving home and walking on the street is an act of an involuntary cultural action. It makes the residents a part of a network of social clues (neighborhood, the outlook of spaces) that formerly existed. The connection between inlet/outlet and inside/outside intersects with other connections (home/work, known/unknown, hot/cold, moist air/dry air, efficiency/passivity, masculine/feminine...); this connection is always between the person himself and the physical and social world; this uncertainty is a regulator of an archaic order of a person who takes the true social reality with social interference and retreat. This order also grounds the awareness about the primary foundation of its dialect (which is inseparable); besides, it is about the first step of a public subject which tirelessly makes no progress" (Mayol, 2009: 35-36).

---

[4] This is an important emphasis on the reality which we will discuss later about what Bauman refers to as 'the collapse of agoras'. Hence, -when being considered through Mayol's perspective- it can be said that the neighborhood has the properties of an agora of the modern city, and it is one of the connection of private and public spaces in terms of our social lives.

These sorts of emphasis express the context of the social background of what the 'traditional modern city' includes. In this respect, as we have already mentioned before, looking at the living spaces as 'a group of constructions to be seen regularly' or 'solely physical elements' results in missing the social context in them. The effort to improve the concept of 'controlling' life or to 'organizing' (as planners say) will be to prevent 'opening up', 'touching' or 'interaction' emerging in the randomness of the nature of the relationship of the city (Sennett, 1999: 2011). Hence, the most important aspect of the social opening up/interaction in the public space of the city lies in its ever-existing 'randomness'. However, recently the daily routines that are incidental; the effort to see 'directionlessness' and 'distrust', is emerging as a reaction to perceiving readily possessed situations (or naturalness) faulty. Because when the sayings revealed in the context of 'neighborhood' are being rendered to the planner's mentality, it allowed them to be declared as 'the elements to be eliminated'. However, when being focused on the content of these efforts of negligence, it showcases how we are losing naturalness in the name of the sociality of the city. From this standpoint, the content the neighborhood possesses is the naturalities being lost in the late modern city through urban planning.

> "The neighborhood is defined as a common regulation of individual paths. For its users, it is an arrangement inevitably making individual's bump into each other to meet their daily needs. However, the interaction between the individuals running into each other is random and unpredicted… in the elevator, in the grocery store, on the market. When gone out to the neighborhood, it is unlikely not to encounter someone 'who is been seen before' (a neighbor, an artisan). Yet, it is not possible in advance to say who and where it will be (on the stairs, on the pavement). The link between the obvious necessity of the encounter and the random nature of its quality leads the user who is in a society where an uncertainty of this kind having caused by the neighborhood -therefore, undetermined and cannot be determined-[5] leads to pretend to have a "vigilant" state in a place where all are gathered around the notion of being accepted in social norms (Mayol, 2009: 38-39).

As much as this uncontrollable 'randomness' (uncanny) of the neighborhood leads to a supervisory process, it includes a process of a common agreement. The terms of the common agreement contain both a benefits practice and a series of occurrences open to the public supervision. Such conditions also construct a sense of security by making the supervisory conditions of living together possible. In the neighborhood culture, 'security' is directly proportionate to being open to the public (in a way, the relationships related to agora). Should this openness is lost, the security that is based on mutuality will leave its place to uncanny and doubt.[6] This, as a result shows a supervision that can turn into exclusion in the context of uncanny.

To be more exact; the neighborhood also contains a security element based on supervision within. "In fact, there is more here than mutual acquaintance: it is a social exchange. Every resident of neighborhood or village gets a benefit from this neighborhood if they agree on the cost to be paid. They receive small prizes from others; smiles, hellos, greetings, words of encounter that ignite the feeling of existence, acknowledgment, appreciation, and admiration. For some, the interest that the neighborhood brings goes further. When the old woman does not go to buy bread at her usual routine, some neighbors get worried.

---

[5] This can be called as uncanny.
[6] As a matter of fact the 'radical uncanny' in 'late modern city' (gated community) is of that sort.

However, in order to obtain these outcomes, an individual must obey the rules of neighborhood or village, and should do what is needed, but should not do what is not. Those who do not obey to those rules object to some unpleasant criticisms, and then to somewhat exclusion: not to play the game means to get out of the play" (Prost, 2008: 120). In this sense, it is possible to say that the nature of the city has enabled social relations in the context of randomness.On the other hand, all the space designs of the 'late modern/postmodern' (it can be named as 'neoliberal') city impose quite the opposite of the highlights of this sort in a dictatorial manner. Even, not everything that is 'random' in this kind of spaces is considered to be acceptable. The regulation/plan build all up to be predictable, and do not consider anything except for calculation. As a matter of fact, all that is left out of these accounts is launched as 'directionlessness', and claims that such a condition involves risks (Jacobs, 2011; Sennett, 2011: Le Courbiseur, 2013). In the security context, this setup clearly cancels the natural flow of everyday life and all public relations (Bauman, 2011b: Sennett, 1999). To see these conditions in 'gated communities' is a usual matter. In fact, such spaces are built conveniently to 'non-confrontation'; hence, they try to prevent any possible encounters or randomness (Sennett, 2011).[7] In the end 'the state of social life which does not allow interaction and vacates agoras' has become the general acceptance.. In a way, there is growing tendency to view all of our interactions in public sphere and agora as a new kind of risks, social relationships in neighbourhood being excluded.   In this respect, the existing conditions of the new habitats (gated communities) constructed in the cities are closely linked to the erosion of the concept of the neighborhood of the traditional modern city (for us by the erosion of agora as well).

4. The Late Modern Cities, the Collapse of Agoras and the Lives Being Shaped in Gated Communities

While private life's renewed qualities in late modern cities undermine public life, the distrust specific to neoliberal life makes risk and uncertainty common features of everyday life. Therefore, today's public spaces have become spaces that do not promise any responsibility. Individuals living under these conditions also live 'the destruction of the freedoms caused by their private life' (Baumann, 2006) or the 'weight' (Sennett, 2010). The unbearable lightness of 'routine' (or traditional relations) is no longer a theme of such privatized lives (Giddens, 2004). The more ordinary 'autonomous strategies' (Bauman, 2011a) -or the life of a reflexive person- become, the more permanent of lifestyle risks and fears get in the name of new cities. Because of the everyday life strategies they exhibit, new lives in the late modern city which are 'unwilling to be in the public eye', now attributes much more importance to borders (or security-justified boundaries). In this respect, everything outside their boundaries they themselves had created became a source of danger for them. The 'private life fanaticism' (Bauman, 2012a) builds on the erosion of the public sphere and based on that the 'fear culture' (Furedi, 2001) which is the product of risk and uncertainty (Delibaş, 2017). Because the emerging social (or spatial) distances do not fail to create intellectual (or psychological) distances quickly. What is experienced in the context of 'late modern city' is nothing more than the formation of such practices.

The assurances of happiness (liberty) expressed as 'living the moment' without the social duties, which emerged in the housing presentations of the new cities, assert the history (the traditional public spaces even) as a problem entirely. Even though what is promised is usually 'about the future', the public spaces that break free from the past and its urban traditions cannot turn into the future into a form other than

[7] As much as the language of their presentation is different, when looked at the practices of the neighborhood and the traditional modern city, a contradictory situation to the randomness of the city is observed.

the uncertainty of the future anything but uncertainty. In this aspect, the only logical thing individuals whose relationships Bauman refers to as 'lives that do not leave a mark' (Bauman, 2012a) can do is to shut themselves down by altering all the social factors into uncertainty factors. Even though the 'freedom of privacy' presented to them is usually regarded as more "comfort" or "security-based on comfort" (Sennett, 2011) it is, in fact, nothing but normalizing isolation (confinement) in terms of city traditions or public relations. The less valid the permanent long narratives get in time in such lives, the less of a rational behavior it is to invest in public spaces that transcend people's lives or the interactions in those spaces (Arendt, 2012: 98). Situations like that are realities that operate at a high level in the nature of gated communities which are crucial outputs of late modern cities. As opposed to the great narratives and permanent relationships in 'traditional modern city', it is a conclusion that such a reality is experienced more and more in new urban settings (gated communities). The fact that the late modern individuals, who are the carriers of the late modern city, do not appreciate permanent relationships makes urban interactions to be reconstructed in the context of distrust.

It is by now a well known fact that we live in an era of risk and uncertainty. Nowadays almost everything including health issues, food, child minders, electronic household goods, the stranger on the streets and so on have become source of fear and anxiety (Delibaş, 2013). Bauman makes one of the most crucial debates in the context of our rising fears of the transformation of the public space (2000: 2003: 2006: 2011a: 2012a). It is also important to understand the content that categorizes the societies in order to comprehend Bauman's findings of 'public space'. Bauman divides societies into two basic categories: The first is 'heteronymous societies' and the second is 'autonomous societies'. Bauman emphasizes that 'heteronymous societies' create their own references but while doing so he says that he has taken the source from non-social realities. To exemplify, ancestors, gods, and heroes can undertake this mission.[8] 'Autonomous societies' criticize the accepted permanent rules (in a way, designation). They reject 'closed meanings'. Heteronymous societies believe in mortality but this mortality makes immortality possible by building 'super ordinates'. References in societies of that kind are not indexed to death, yet they work on immortality (Bauman, 2012c). However, from this point of view, it enables 'autonomous minds' and 'autonomous individuals'. The elimination of any permanent references here abolishes routines. In this respect, the things that are show stability get ineffective. The 'autonomous mind' is nothing but a mere uncertainty. 'Heteronymous societies' respect routines profoundly. Designation and stability are the most permanent; the distinction between private and public space is uncertain. Here, the concept of 'us' which is inherent to the private space and public space, and also which makes to the community possible, is everywhere. Nevertheless, in 'autonomous societies' the distinction between the 'public and private space' is much more clear. For the healthy functioning of such societies, there is a need for 'intermediate spaces' (agoras), namely connection points. If autonomous societies do not have such connection points, their specific social life criteria will be shaken deeply (Bauman, 2011a: 2012a). As a matter of fact, it is the situation in the late modern or publicities that we can state as postmodern. [9]

---

[8]Giddens names it the routines and stability provided by the past (Giddens, 2004). Similar to Beck, he alleges that the references that shape the present before the late modern life are in the past. (Beck, 2011).
[9]The gated communities we discussed in this article are the sites that are a result of these kinds of public spacest hat Bauman stresses. One of the main points that make our work valuable is the fact that this article makes these sites debatable in the context possible.

Bauman gives an example from Ancient Greece of 'autonomous society', he expresses that this function is undertaken by 'agoras'. Agoras are 'intermediate spaces' that allow private spaces to be included in the public space. The agora used to be a way of interaction and had a very important function like inviting individuals to the public space. Here individuals used to be able to bring together social space with their 'private spaces'.[10] Bauman uses the expression 'private/public spaces' of Castoriadis for the 'intermediate spaces' function (Bauman, 2011a).[11] Agora, in this respect, has utmost importance for a truly autonomous society (for the city) which is based on the true autonomy of its members. Therefore, Bauman says that the way to make individuals useless in an in order society can be done with the destruction of agoras (Bauman, 2012a).

Bauman also emphasizes that 'autonomous societies' are a permanent value of 'agora' with regards to 'public orders'. In ancient Greece, 'agora', which states the space between the oikos (household) and the public sphere ecclesia (politics) in ancient Greece, used to provide a great contribution to the collective life, both public and private, and this made the Ancient Greek society an autonomous society. Nowadays; however, there is no 'agora'; hence why, the language of communication to connect the private and the public space also perished (Bauman, 2012a). Especially in a certain period (late modern or neoliberal stage), such a state was even encouraged. The artists (especially the avant-garde artists), and politicians started to not want the 'autonomous individual' who can think critically. They preferred to be thinking and deciding on behalf of individuals (the intellectuals willing to do this were already the majority). Consequently, this brought 'the totalitarianism that makes people useless' as Arendt puts it, to the center of our lives (Arendt, 2012).

At this stage the agoras gradually became unworthy. The state of active, thinking, questioning individuals was oppressed. The power was operating independently of their thinking anymore, which, in turn, killed the traditional communications that existed in agoras. The voices in the public space have become monologues. This condition has been internalized in the form of a 'modernist order' -just as it appears in gated communities. But in time, the link between thought and practice has been disconnected. These occurrences led to the separation of public and private spaces, and even individuals to be enmired (Bauman, 2011a). Formerly politics (power), later market powers as new power have continued this language of totalitarianism and monologue 'by passivizing the individual in public space'. In return, the individual gets more used to their privacy, namely the promise of security in private life. Now the transformations experienced are transformations of the kind which make it unnecessary to go out into public space. Even if the individual wanted to go out into the public space, the public attractions were no longer available. Even though there has been 'momentary upsurge' time to time, none of them have become a persistent reaction anymore.

> "In the totalitarian tendency, the communication channels between public power and private power -whatever is left behind- and are shut down. There is no need for having a dialogue, for there is nothing to be talked about... The routine takes over the ideology... a logic that is not grounded… In   agoras,   the   private   interests   to   accommodate   itself   to   the

---

[10] Similar findings regarding agoras can be found in Sennett's works as well. Sennett regards agoras as a public space that is a continuum of the private. Besides, he suggests that in agoras where nudity is a continuation of home, are practices coming out for a body that is not at home.
[11] In this study, we decided to use 'intermediate space' as Sennett (1999: 2011) uses it.

needs/demands/oppressions of the public were expected. What was expected to be in the agora had distinctive pedagogical/enlightening/adaptive sense: agoras were firstly placed the sharp edges of incompatible interests were blunted, contradictory pressures were balanced. It was also a place where dreams and ambitions were shaped accordingly not to lead to any conflicts and to make them a harmonious whole as well as a place to cool down possible flare-ups. In agoras, what is 'public' and 'private' used to face each other unequally. The 'public' was the subject and the 'private' was the object of its action" (Bauman, 2012a: 98-107).

In modern times, agoras became a space of invasion by the market powers.[12] This invasion used to be a partnership of the market and politics.[13] However in time, (in late modern period) this balance has become favorable by the 'market powers' that deploy itself with the look of a 'private space'. This power which is more uncertain and less ordered invaded the 'private space' unlike the ones before.[14] This process of invasion made the gap between the power and politics broader. But now the war zone is deserted because the agoras have become less important than ever. It is not even possible to find a door in agoras.

> "Agora is an invaded space like before but this time the roles are the exact opposite, and invader groups have been gathering along the fault line of the private space. Nonetheless, as opposed to the public which is represented by the legislator and executive government is not an army that has a general headquarters and is ruled by the operation center. That is mentioned here is a colorful and disobedient crowded consisting of intruders. There is nobody to cease the progress; the army of "the public" have receded having lost its combat forces, will of pursuing the invasion or maybe both. When it comes to the power of the public, agora looks more like a stray space. The battlefield is deserted and all the adventurers who are a fan of this invasion" (Bauman, 2012a: 107).

As a result of these changes; supremacy became quasi, the powers became anonymous and the seats of the members of the power became empty. The question regarding the public problems "What to do?" has become out of question. Even though it is asked, the answer is being glossed over with answers like 'No Other Alternative' (NOA)[15] The biggest reason for that is the belief that there is no doer to bear the thinking and act it out, for the question of "Is there a doer to do it?" gets a similar answer. On the other hand, the undefined state of the new power (the market) which shows 'uncertainty', does not require the instruments of the old power. Because power has broken all the links with the traditionalism existing with the agora, which is why it no longer needs the philosophers, educators, and preachers who can only be universal with agoras. It does not even require the public appearance. As every responsibility with make it questionable, it makes itself uncertain by taking the side of uncertainty (Bauman, 2012a: 25-28).

---

[12] For the phase that Bauman expresses here, usually 'global capitalism' is used (Bauman, 2012b). However, we used 'neoliberal phase' instead of this. Therefore, we did not shun away from using using 'late modern publics' as 'neoliberal publics (cities or spaces).

[13] In many of his studies, although Bauman uses 'local capitalism' (Bauman, 2012b: 2016), we did not mean 'liberal capitalist' phase.

[14] This activeness of the market powers are more obvious in residence market as well. 'Fake public spaces' that are promised -indoor spaces in the form of agoras- are built in a non-functional way. They look like agoras but do not possess the qualities of them.

[15] We are studying the coding of Bauman here with respect to the Turkish translation of this work.

"While traditional doers are unable to do efficient actions, doers who are genuinely powerful and skillful are acting in quiet places where political means of action cannot reach… These 'new actors' are celebrating the fact that they are independent of and disconnected to agoras… They do not consider anything they receive from formative regulations a benefit and therefore, they do not need agoras. They feel themselves comfortable in the world like a cyber world where there is no control mechanism and responsibilities have become a web. As they don't have a mission of making betterments of the moral level of the masses cultural crusade or altering the masses, they of course applause the doers of prospective" (Bauman, 2012: 108-109).

The process is, in fact a narrative of permanent passivity 'in the public of late modern city' to become daily routines under 'no other alternation'. Because in places where action becomes worthless, the public roles will also be of less value, the efforts of individuals in that sense become useless. This tells how permanent passivity of the city life emerges. Therefore gated communities are out one of theses passivity turning into a lifestyle through the qualities and the promised lives of gated communities. The invasion of the public space by private space with these sorts of reasons and solutions does not increase the quality of the public space unfortunately, the outcomes are nothing but attributing private issues to public issues in this respect nobody (no doer) are able to bring up the main agenda. What's experienced is only caring about the momentary and temporary state of 'private lives'. Hence, everything exceeds the privacy corresponds to public indifference (or passivity) for the late modern individuals.

"The private invaded the stage of what is supposed to belong to the public, but not to interact with the public. The private cannot gain a new quality even when it is being brought to daylight in the public view. It is only supported within itself… Nowadays, lonely individuals go to agoras to be with individuals like them. They fail to return their homes having dealt with their concerns and empowered but rather they return home alone... The increasing number of the practical weaknesses of the public institutions eliminates the common problems and the concerns regarding the possible solutions. At the same time, the reduction of the talent of making private concerns public problems and the eradication of the power on this direction makes it easier for global power which causes more weaknesses thanks to the outcomes of the weaknesses of people" (Bauman, 2011a:. 250).[16]

The society is no longer an association that has an effect on the individuals of late modern publics, and can express permanent narratives. The channels that make individuals 'us' are gradually becoming outdated. Long-term relationships or togetherness in public lives are no longer a concern. Everything happens in short form. "Unless there are strong and continuous bridges, or the abilities to read the codes become dull or completely forgotten, the private problems or pains cannot accumulate and become a common issue… The community is so-called amphibious… As our sense of community lacks the opportunities of a regular outpouring, it burst itself out with a big show, which is a similar to all the bursting for a short term… The ways of bursting can sometimes carnivals of mercy and benevolence and sometimes attacking jag towards a newly found public enemy (namely somebody who most of the members of can regard as an enemy) when we get back to our daily businesses, a host everything stays the same. When the sparkling lights of togetherness are gone, lonely people wake up just as lonely as

---

[16]Including the global construction companies.

before" (Bauman, 2012a: 11). Everything that calls individuals to the public space is short-term. They transform into the loneliness that gradually makes public life in the public space of the late modern cityless valuable.

The special shape of the postmodern phase (shaped by the neoliberal market) that we are in, becomes more of a divider of its residents by this way. The public space no longer a unity of sectioned lives and spaces (Bauman, 2003). The fears concerning the public space position the daily life in the context of anxiety and distrust. As security becomes a private issue, the defense has to be done individually. Public spaces; therefore, are no longer able to make sure of security in terms of public togetherness. In this respect, in the reversed process that Freud emphasizes "The special (personal) securities is sacrificed" started to become quite common. For public spaces have such expectations, it is impossible to value the relationships there.

This, as a result, opens a new era when public security is being sacrificed in the name of private lives, because it is no longer possible to pledge a permanent security with this separated state of the public space.People are now scared of the relationships in public space and the uncertainty it might bring. Fears condemn people to their private lives, and the way out is only for *private matters*" (Bauman, 2011a: 2012a). All that is experienced are a result of the realization of insecure people that cannot leave the secure islands (or private lives) specific to postmodern/late modern character. In this respect, anxiety and fear are quite common a phenomenon in the public of the modern city, but they show rather individualistic features. For the solutions are tried to be produced appropriate to these premises, fears based a distrust are the main determinant of daily life (Bauman, 2006). According to Bauman, that is why the postmodern individuals are in fear, but they are afraid because of the changing public spaces -that is different than traditional fears- (Bauman, 2003). This situation is closely linked to the collapse of the agoras. When individuals attribute big values to a world where there is no truth but theirs, trust becomes an impossible reality. The social conditions are rise of a lifestyle that 'distrust' (ambiguities) effect, which is why fears and permanent unrest become a routine 'of the new life' (Bauman, 2011a). These are routines that the escape in public sense is quite difficult. As a result, like in gated communities, an impact reason for public lives filled with fear is the collapse or uselessness of the agoras. From now on in this study, we will try to present the practices emerging in gated communities in the light of our field data.

5. The Findings and Data Analaysis

 The aim of this study is to grasp the sociological realities of the social life in 'traditional modern city' environment which has active agoras (street, neighborhood, etc) and the urban environments comparing with the'late modern city'in where publish space and agoras have been losing their vitality. Even though we useda snowball technique (namely, random selection), none of the interviewers turned out to have spent their childhoods in a gated community. For this reason, the questions that are addressed to 'compare the city of their childhood to today's city and living spaces' became more meaningful.Interviewers were asked to compare 'the cities they lived in their childhood' (or the cities their parents live) with the city in which they (and therefore their children) currently live; in several contexts such as social relations, solidarity networks, and security conditions. Indeed, with the questions posed to them, they expectedly made determinations that we consider very important in the context of 'the private and public spaces of the city' whose agoras (intermediate spaces) are functional. As a matter of fact, a vast majority of the interviewers did not express any negativity when they were revealing their

childhood street and neighborhood narratives. With this context, they do not attribute the uncertainties they put on the 'late modern (for us neoliberal) city', the images of danger and fear (in a way, the conditions necessitate them to live in gated communities) to the cities of the cities of their childhood and to the cities where 'traditional modern' relations are active. As understood by all the emphasis made in the study, one of the biggest meanings of living in gated communities is that agoras (neighborhood and street), which are important links between private and public spaces, have gradually been lost. As a result of the new urbanization style and the proliferation of the gated communities, a big withdrawal process of the public lives that are becoming privatized is experienced in the name of urban life and public spaces. In a way the factors that lead us to experience 'the end of the public space', the unqualified of the city and, of course, the 'end of the city' are the outputs of the agoras (streets and neighborhoods) we lost while adapting to the 'late modern city', from the ''traditional modern city'. In the following sections of our study, the findings of the field data we will be elaborating on the findings.

5.1. "There is no Unexpected Visitors We Have a Civilized Togetherness"

When the 'interviewer 9' was replying our question similarly mentions that at Izmir where he spent of his childhood 'agoras/intermediate spaces' were quite common; moreover, how the lines between the inside of the home and public spaces were thin and transitive. Much stress is given by the 'interviewer 9' to the fact that home (private space) is a continuum of the street. The street which is the place for entertainment for the togetherness of the 'traditional modern city' provide a basis for the social interaction in which the private matters intertwines, as narrated by the interviewer. When he needed money at the university, the fact that his mother told "let me get some from aunt Sevim" (one of their neighbor), is an example of how active the economic interactions in private lives were. In this respect, intensive interactions of the 'traditional modern city' images are in being talked about, parallel to what is shared in public lives, it makes success also a part of the public space, which makes the feeling of 'us' that promises permanence meaningful.

The example of the interviewer "when I got into the university, people gave a party in the neighborhood" shows the individual success is a part of the 'notion of common success' in the togetherness of 'the traditional modern city'. In this sense, 'the togetherness of the traditional modern city' which makes economic and social etc. interaction possible was also a case that could eliminate in the uncertainties and distrust towards the city and the public space of it. Besides, the fact that the interviewer could get involved in the private lives (homes) of the neighbors in an uncanny manner whenever he wanted, as well as because both his family and "aunt Sevim I will have a sleepover at your house", it was an acceptable case for the family. The factor which eliminated the uncertainty here was linked to the fact that living conditions were allowing conditions which made the interaction possible and which were open to all the private lives and interactions.

> **Interviewer 9:** "I grew up in Izmir. We were in Yeşilyurt. There were five houses and a common space as a garden. All of the houses were single floor or duplex. I used to come from school and someone would immediately say: "Don't go to your mother, she has done the laundry today, come and dine with us". I used to go and eat there. I used to tell, "sister Gülizar, I will sleepover at your space to play". She would reply; "sure thing sleeps in Artun's room". I would go there and sleep. It was such a place. The garden was common space. Everything there, fruits and

vegetables were common. On Sunday, we used to come together and play board games. We used to make barbeque. We would have such fun. In that garden, a party was thrown when I got into the university. Everyone had been ready when I came. I grew up in such a place. When my mother used to send me pocket money at the university, she would say "wait. I'll borrow some from Aunt Sevim". Brother Hüseyin would give me money while I was coming to Istanbul. Imagine such a life! We are still in contact with all of them… I have a brother and Brother. Hüseyin is also like my own blood. Sister Gülizar is like my own sister."

'Interviewer 9' stresses that late modern city he currently lives in has a completely different reality than what is narrated before. The paints he makes such as "we become a society that does not trust each other", "we are all very civilized here as opposed to there", in essence, are the points which prove the decline in the integrity and interaction of the private lives in the public space. What is more, the topic the interviewer explains as "we started valuing foods after 80's" in fact a determination of the city life as a result of the neoliberal economic transformation. What he pointed out about his childhood were 'outcomes of permanent relations'. In his speech, what he said "Brother Hüseyin used to always get me a soda, I never asked how much it cost" is basically a lifestyle as a result of the togetherness brought in by the "we" conditions. However, like he stresses out, in social lives produced by the neoliberal business network, as the 'private lives' transform into 'closed and intransitive lives', the uncertainty based on them gradually increases. What he regarded as "self-seeking" in his expressions are narratives of the lives in which personal stories rise and never transform into public interaction. In a way, the points allowing 'the late modern city', where agoras gradually lose their significance, is this.

> **Interviewer 9:** "There is no unexpected dropping in here, there is a civilized togetherness. A togetherness that is refined and remote. We have become a society without trust after the 80's. We started valuing the goods more. We started attributing money more importance. Education becomes simpler and less quality. This society became consumerist. We reached to 90's with what we have seen in the 80's. There is only one important thing for the consumer societies: Materiality, namely money. I have never spoken about money with Brother Hüseyin. He used to always get me a soda. I have never thought about the price of the soda. After this society has been led to here, distrusts formed. An intensive self-seeking has started."

One of the things the interviewer pointed out in his later speech inhibits the emphasis on the inability to use the agoras/intermediate spaces and public space actively. What he expresses as "my wife is very skeptical" in his interview, is a result of what his wife attributes to the uncertainties in public spaces. Hence, the reason why his wife considers the ordinariness of the 'traditional modern city' and uncertainty of every sort (greeting, etc) a threat is this. Indeed, the reaction his wife gives to the type of relations in 'traditional modern city' where interviewer 9 lived in is a result of distrust specific to the uncertainty her own life in 'late modern city'. It becomes usual for all sorts of relations to be considered as a fear, threat as uncertainty becomes a daily routine when the public relations in 'late modern' conditions run out. In fact, the emphasis he puts on his wife is the answer for the reason why they live in a gated community. It is not only for the sake of the individualized society that he calls "cosmopolitan city" a "mess". The way of becoming individualized is an outcome of the rise in the lives opposed to the communities of the city. The basis for the private space is full of fear is this.

Interviewer 9: "My wife is very skeptical. She says: "Why did he say hi to us? Has he got an interest or will he want something from us?". I brought my wife to my neighborhood. I hug and kiss sister Gülizar. She told me "What are you doing?" Sister Gülizar looks young but "She's my sister! I hug her". We are experiencing the transformation as a result of the 80's. As we are more individualistic, materialistic and it started to reflect in the relationships. The old Istanbul was a plain and healthy society. On the other hand, it is now a mass and cosmopolitan. It is like an ever ending city."

5.2 "Neighbourly Relations Were More Intimate… I Don't Have Neighbors Like My Mother Had"

'Interviewer 39' whose childhood was in Dragos, Istanbul revealed similar results when addressed to similar questions. The interviewer stresses out what is missing in where he lives now was available in the city of his childhood with neighborliness, traditionally and permanent relations. Based on the roles of the traditional modern city the 'interviewer 39' put emphasis on the fact that his mother was a housewife, which was why they had "relations of fifty years". In fact, as a result of the time regarding jobs or what the left out of jobs, he says the agoras of the traditional modern city is relationship style can build social interactions that can prevent uncertainties, because of the busty lifestyles of agora. The point he emphasized in his speech: "The neighborliness was more intimate" could, in fact, deriving from his mother's lifestyle that allowed 'interactions' and 'uncanny'. The situation, that he regards as "more than blood" for his mother's neighborhood was stressing the permanence of the relationships. What emerges as a result, based on the fact that intimacy and sharing eliminate uncertainty, is the active state of both the public space and the agora, which is the main reason for his mother's permanent relationships.

Interviewer 39: "My childhood was in Dragos, Istanbul. We lived in Dragos. I was there until I got married. Dragos was a place where there were detached houses. There were affluent people. We were not as an affluent as them… We had built our own house. The neighborhood cannot be built on in gated communities. Close friendships were possible there because neighbors need one another. It was the quitter in my childhood. Everyone know each other. We used to play games in my childhood. Neighborliness was more intimate. Mothers did not use to work… There were close neighborhoods. My mother still has neighbors of fifty years, and they are still in contact."

As opposed to his mother's life, the 'interviewer 39' points out he has not got any relations of that sort in his life. He, later on, expressed the fact that "everyone is so busy" and "everyone is working" does not permit such social interactions. He then includes, "not only is it impossible to have such interaction with people in his neighborhood but also with the people who live in the same floor". 'Interviewer 39' says he can not drop in expectedly to the closest neighbor while his mother's life allows uncanny. However, even when he is explaining the reasons for this situation, and also envying his mother's social conditions, he tells: "It is good to have a distance". At this point, as is can be understood from the emphasis of the interviewer, all sorts of relationships in which 'agoras/intermediate spaces' and 'interaction' is not active started to contain uncertainty. New specific 'intimacies' the interviewer possesses means their privacy is not subjected to interaction. The expectancy of a 'new life' perceives all sorts of uncanny (including intimacy) an uncertainty. The most logical thing in these lives to close up and be passive. Because as Baumann (2009; 2012a) says private lives that are temples of the secular new lives get disturbed by all sorts of interaction. In this respect, 'long-term relationships' are worrying in these new lives. Like

'interviewer 9' said, "we are together but we have a civilized way of life", the point the 'interviewer 39' makes "it is good to have a distance" shows that the 'public traditionalism' which they say had lost is, in fact, lives as a result of their expectancies. Because in 'late modern city' intimacy started to be seen as being too free when 'uncanny' became directionlessness and uncertainty. Just like the stories of 'us' about the public life dies out. When public life makes all the relationships a burden in such a life, success or mess of all sorts because individualistic. Every 'non-private' situation is a public burden to be eliminated in interactions that do not have a togetherness of that sort. In lives with no trust in the erosion of agoras, both unities and common sense become unbuildable.

> **Interviewer 39**: "Old friendships and intimacy are no longer available. It is very hard for people to trust each other. I, for example, have been living in this gated community for 5 years. You cannot build up intimacy all of a sudden. There is no relationships like my mother's. Not at all. There are maybe one person on the same floor. You still think it is better to keep distant. *I don't even have time…* Even more distant than before. More different. *Everyone is so busy*! Financial measurements bring out such relationships. I can just drop in my neighbor that I am intimate with. However, it is not as spontaneous as it could be."

5.3. "In Those Days Everyone Knew and Loved Each Other in the Same Neighborhood"

When the same questions were posed to the 'interviewer 2', he says he lived 'the conditions of the traditional modern city' in Istanbul a very satisfactory level in his childhood. He; however, points out that they are living in a gated community, for him himself and his wife are working; therefore, the children are lonely. The security, he also mentioned in his interview, which was available in 'traditional modern city' was based on "everyone knowing each other". In fact, he says "everything was consumed together" proves the principle based on togetherness. Similar to 'interviewer 9 and 39' pointed out, 'interviewer 2' also express the old neighborhood conditions as "everyone was like relatives or siblings". It is understood from the expressions of the interviewer that are being mentioned, 'the traditional modern city' togetherness of his childhood allowed a lifestyle that had social responsibilities and associations. In these expressions, it is understood that the traditional modern city togetherness based on sharing made neighborhood (agora and public space) a functional living space. Nowadays, on the other hand, what they desire for their children as an adult is for the kids to not "knock on anyone's door" in the context of security. Their positive attributions to the 'traditional modern city' are those they don't wish for their own children. Because as a result of the new lives deriving from the economic conditions (both parents working), 'city and security' brought up lives whose agoras and public relationships are ending public interaction which was the security condition of their childhood has turned into a factor of distrust and uncertainty. In this respect, the security of their own children lies on 'providing them lives without interaction (or public spaces)'.

> **Interviewer 2**: "We've been living 'in My Town' Çekmeköy for 10 years. Before that, Sultantepe, Üsküdar. Before in Libadiye. When I was not married, in Çekmeköy. I was born in Ortaköy. We are from Ortaköy. We are in the suburbs now. *For the security*. For the comfort of our children, for nobody to knock on the door when they return from school... Old neighborhoods are not available anymore. Our conditions in Ortaköy were very good, like a relative or a sibling. Everyone in the same apartment or neighborhood knew and loved each other. You could play outside and eat. I don't think that is the case now even in the neighborhoods."

On the other hand, 'interviewer 2' talks about his own experiences in 'the traditional modern city' (the city of his childhood), which is far from the security conditions of today's world based on lack of interaction, like his utopic city. He mentions a city in which everyone knew each other, knocking on the door without appointments (you could be bothered anytime) was possible, which is impossible to experience in the cities with are open to a number of effects on private lives are discussed. This expectancy from the city which he says is now lost is the 'security of not being bothered'. In a way, what they do is to withdraw from the public space in the name of their private lives, as well as wishing the end of the public space.

> **Interviewer 2**: "That environment is no longer available in the gated communities. There is neighborliness in the gated communities as well, but not like what we lived in the neighborhood there was a familiar and free neighborliness. You would ring the bell and get in. People would not choose people because of their education or their outlook. You would not consider the world view, clothes, education or origin. In gated communities, they are all taken into consideration. At least at where I live. Especiallyworld view"

5.4. "Doors and Windows Were More Open"

'Interviewer 34' reveals similar factors with another dimension. 'In the old Istanbul', in terms of his own childhood, he also stresses how active 'neighborhoods, namely agoras/intermediate spaces' were. The interviewer talks about the lack of the uncertainty which in fact was a condition of security: "Everybody knew each other". In addition, 'interviewer 34' in his interview, points out the context in which the routines of the streets (traditions) are making 'the permanent watchers' (like in artisans) possible. When economic operations are active in agoras, artisans are getting the watchers of the social interaction. That observance used to ensure security. As "face to face interaction" and "the friendship of the grocer" made the surveillance of the private possible, the situation that "everyone knows each other" emerges. Right at this point, based on the activity of the 'intermediate spaces', the interviewer point out that the situation he mentions is a factor of the condition of a secure city.

> **Interviewer 34**: "I was born in Emirgan, Istanbul. We used to live in Boyacıköy before "Koru". It is very stunning there. Exactly the old Istanbul, neighborhood. Fishermen and grocery store were next to each other… We had a very nice childhood in Boyacıköy. I can remember the last few years of it. A grocery store in Boyacıköy. We had a caretaker there. The region, or else all that we know were like that. We were familiar with the grocery. With the artisans there… We used to meet up the evenings. It was a closed community, the neighborhood was good. Face to face interactions was common. When I was 6-7 years old, my parent (both are the teacher) would leave me with the grocer. I'd snack at the grocery store and go to school after putting on my school uniform. There was a secure and familiar environment."

The point that 'interviewer 34' stresses out later in his speech is to reveal a permanence depth as an outcome of the social conditions provided by permanent relationships. His neighbor he calls "my caretaker" was someone who was taking responsibilities of the parents off of the working parents' shoulders -and was doing it with no economic interests. As a matter of fact, the reason why the interviewer used this concept does not stem from this notion existed in his childhood. It is more because of the conditions of paid 'caretaker' of his own child. Although it is fundamentally the same, he uses 'caretaker' here, for he cannot figure out the conceptualization of a selfless neighborliness which is a part

of the social behaviors of his childhood. In a way, these are expressions of how much the practices of 'traditional modern city' that he alienated at home been lost. In his speech, where he says "my mother used to leave me there, I'd a sleepover there" is a product of the intensive interaction and publicity that eliminates the uncertainty of private lives. Hence, later on, he says "people used to know each other". Which is specific to the 'uncertainties' (privacy) of the associations in where he currently resides. The daily routines in gated communities made the 'traditional modern city' individuals who touch each other. What he expresses as "people used to know each other", "they were familiar", "they used to greet each other" (for people used to be not afraid of social requirements of interaction) before, are in fact behaviors as an outcome of the activeness in agoras/intermediate spaces. All of these make uncertainty and obscurity of the privates disappear. Even the behaviors of the neighbors when there is an extraordinary situation happening at night are products of relations that uncanny makes open to sharing. Openness in private lives -as stated by Arendt (2012)- is a promise of security and activeness in public space. In a way, renouncing personal freedom and confidentiality create main factors that make a network of unity and therefore, security in public space possible. In this respect, the security in where 'interviewer 34' talks about was 'the activeness of intermediate spaces'. Surveillance was the eyes of the artisans of the hood who could limit the freedoms instead of 'technical eyes' of the cameras. In this context, security is no longer a more private argument, but is a 'public responsibility.'

> **Interviewer 34**: "I call her my caretaker, but we didn't pay her any money. She was our next door neighbor. My mother would leave me there and I'd a sleepover there. A trusted relationships; people know each other, were familiar and greeted each other when they bump into one another. There weren't even any supermarkets, there were grocery stores. If we got sick at night, we'd go to the doctor with any neighbor we rang the bell of."

'Interviewer 34' points out another very important issue. He told in his childhood "doors and windows were wide open" which exemplifies they did not contain external uncertainty. It also is a proof of how much private lives were in open agoras as a result of "unlocked doors". Socialites open to uncanny are determinations that stress the fact that 'people trusting one another'. Since they enabled interaction security in a way, is a factor as a result of the freedom of "leaving the doors-windows open" or "the level of public (overt)". As a consequence, security beyond being a more individualistic factor is a concept of mutual life or society, which is possible with active or functional agoras.

> **Interviewer 34**: "Doors and windows were more open our hose was in the slope, and we lived on the first floor. I could reach the window when I jumped of the road. We; however, used to sleep windows open. There weren't windows grills, neither have we heard of a robbery story. At those years, we locked outdoors, but we have never experienced any unwanted case. Those were hard times -in the 80's- but people trusted each other. We used to play on the street."

Again, when looked at what the 'interviewer 34' says about his childhood, active 'intermediate spaces' that open to permanent relationships and that allow genuine interactions made long-term social interactions also likely. What he gave as an example, that "his parents are still in contact with their friends of 30 years" stems from the public private lifestyles that allow former narratives and relationships. As mentioned already, in the 'traditional modern city' in where his parents lived long term relationships were the common part of the social life.

Interviewer 34: "They had long-term friendships with my parents. They still keep in contact.. I remember, after school, we had our next-door neighbor, Aunt Nilüfer to go to if we didn't like the meal.."

The basis for the socialites that were permanent marks on their lives is the conditions that active agoras of private spaces made possible. Because of the realities of them, active public spaces are conditions made possible. Socialites, when its individuals scatter, do not build active public spaces that are genuine, as a result of real/face to face/body to body. As a matter of fact, they are expressions of socialites that leave marks regarding life. The reason why they can still keep in contact after 30 years, is because they live real public lives as a result of agoras.

5.5. "Everyone Started to Withdraw from the Puclic Life… Chitchats on the Porch Declined"

The 'interviewer 51' explains about his own childhood includes security conditions that have formed based on efficient use of the public space of the city. In response to the point, Jacobs (2013) says 'empty and useless spaces are factors of feat' is very important for 'interviewer 52' because he told 'security is only possible in places it is actively used. Given that "the street is a playground", "artisans are a part of the social chain", "the presence of a sociality that can be active till late at night", "the chitchats of the parents on the porch" etc. are all products of the (willing) state of readiness of the private lives to get into the public space. When intermediate spaces are active, permanent people and socialites are inevitable.

This state of the relationships enabled agoras (intermediate spaces) that link private lives with public lives. At this point, it can be possible to say that the routines in the 'traditional modern city' activate permanent social networks. On the other hand, as the genuine relationships in the 'late modern city', individuals started to encounter structures where these problems are solved. In that respect, the city of 'interviewer 51's childhood was, in fact, a city where 'intermediate spaces' (agoras) are active and 'traditional modern individuals' out there. In addition, the father was also working on the street of the interviewer, which represents that street was not only a space to socialize but also to work. It was an embodiment of both work and free time activities together, and neighborhood could be a place that tied sharing, encounter and private lives in public space. Street and neighborhood was an extension of the home in the light of the expressions of 'interviewer 51'. This situation by thinning out the borders between the private space and public space, 'as opposed to today' prohibits them to become intransitive spaces.

Interviewer 51: "I was born and raised in Istanbul. My parents settled in Güneşli when they came, and they have been living there for 42-43 years. Where I grew up was a neighborhood. It was more like a village. It was called Güneşli Village. There were slums. There were only a few houses. Our voice echoed while we were playing. There were poppy fields, we used to collect than with the moms. We used to bring poppies to our teachers on the Teacher's day… We used to play all together in the hood. We didn't use to go home at all and played till 11 pm, 12 pm. Our parents would weep up and sit on the street in front of the houses. My father had a traditional cafe under our house. He used to work there and everyone knew him. We had such an environment. Our friendships still last and we still see each other there."

He, later on, says that the 'street that was their playground' 'in Istanbul of his childhood' are no longer spaces to go out at. This situation is a result of the 'distrust' and 'withdrawal'. When looked at the sayings of the 'interviewer 51' closer, it can be seen that he attributes uncertainties to agoras, which voice the

abandonment of active use of 'intermediate spaces'. The 'uncertainty' he intensively feels in his life is the main reason for him becoming mistrustful. As he says, when everyone is in 'their private space', the active usage of agoras die out. The end of "chitchats", "meeting up", "evening tea meet-ups" and "breaking of relations" show that the active use of agoras (intermediate spaces) which in fact link bond private lives to the public space. It is natural for people in their own spaces to perceive what is outside as uncertainty. The transivity in his childhood between the private space and the public space was what made the city secure, which was possible with the active use of intermediate spaces. His parents in his childhood made use of public space in a way that was secure and without uncertainties. What he says in the following sentences like "robbery increased", "distrust increased" and then "everyone started to seek comfort at their homes" are results of the reverse interpretation of the process. Security (especially 'natural city security') is a result of using the encounters and spaces effectively. The rise in the uncertaintiesand fears is caused by deserting 'agoras' or 'intermediate spaces'. More clearly, empty streets are spaces that thieves favor. Deserting public spaces nurture fear and anxiety. Namely, the opposite of the cause and effect interviewer 51 reveals is true.

> **Interviewer 51:** "Istanbul was a village in Güneşli for us. Istanbul has changed a lot. While we could play untill midnight on the streets, it was not possible to go out when we got into the university. There has been a wide range of immigration... therefore, various people came from the East. Crimes increased. When that is the case, distrust increased as well. Such occurrences started to be experienced often because people were jobless and illiterate, which started to make us uneasy... Everyone started to because more individualistic, relationships reduced. Meeting in the front gate and meet-ups lessened... Evening tea ceremony ended. Those relationships are gone. Living conditions caused this."

5.6. "Everyone Used to Know Ache other... Now We Are Living Isolated Lives"

'Interviewer 13', like other interviewers, is emphasizing how thin the lines of the house (private space) and the house (public space) and how permissive the styles of the city of their childhood was. The "unlocked state of the doors", which the interviewer emphasizes in his speech, is the result of the 'traditional modern' features of situations that are actually the product of social security elements. Besides, the examples of "the probability of someone to expect you at home while you are absent" in the narrative of the 'interviewer 13' is basically an expression of the fact that inside of a house is not only a private space and that it is an open space for possible public relations at all times. In this respect, it is an extension of concepts such as neighborliness, street, neighborhood, which connects a private space with a public space is an area. The kind of "folksy" life he expresses in his speech as a result ensures that unplanned and unhappy socialites can get even into the houses. As a part of this socialites, the involvement of the local artisans in this relationship that is stressed is a proof of how much effective the 'we' concept which the neighborhoods possess is. Such 'uncanny'' were able to build socialites of sorts that could bring all kinds of public experience to the door of the house.

> **Interviewer 13:** "We live in a gated community in Acıbadem. Before that, we were living in a flat in Göztepe... I have been in İstanbul since 1979. I'm from Hatay. The doors of our houses would not be locked in where I grew up. When we went somewhere there could be a neighbor, relative or familiar waiting for you in the house. It was quite natural, you could go somewhere folksy. There were those who went to the kitchen and brew their own tea. My wife is from

Cyprus. Similar cases were seen there too. We went to Kyrenia for a break. When we came back, there were neighbors waiting at home. We know the artisans, we still see each other. We had a grocery store. Our child despite being grown up in Istanbul knows him too. He knows our child. There was a relationship like that."

'Interviewer 13' also compares the experience of the city he lived in his childhood to the experiences of the urban conditions he now presents to his children. As a matter of fact, he even regards to the struggles in which he experienced in his childhood as 'the gain as a result of childhood failures' and he says that he provides an urban experience as to his own development. In fact, the examples of experience that he gives for the life of a child in the 'traditional modern city' like "we used to fight with the children of the other neighborhood" reveal how childlike can be felt (as childhood associations that are made possible by game-based cohesion). In this respect, the 'uncertainties' (according to his current perceptions) that the city possesses were, in a sense, a part of its social development. But when the interviewer spoke on behalf of their own children, they are putting emphasis on how far they are to these conditions. His children, he is saying are "growing up in a bell-glass" and. "do not even a have a street experience on your own until the age of 13-14". Because they are considering everything is a danger to children outside their private spaces they are trying to control everything else. In this respect, they are planning to control all sorts of situations outside their 'private space'. The reason why the plan is a mean of eliminating uncertainties is a proof of how the external world is actually perceived. Since his childhood is a "bell glass" it is unlikely that he will be able to gain immunity from public circumstances. Because - as Furedi (2013) says- 'children stepping into the public space alone is just as big an event as humanity's stepping into the moon'.. From this point of view, as urban experiences are getting lost, we live the end of the public space is a natural outcome.

> **Interviewer 13:** "Now we are raising our child in a bell glass. We grew up in the neighborhood. Brutally fighting with the children of the opponent's neighborhood... I still have the marks of the fights on my face. My daughter hesitated to go out to the street until a certain age. Until the age of 13-14. However, we raised her in a sterile environment. We were happy for her, but I do not know how it was for her. My children -both of them- go to the school with the school bus. They get on the bus at our door, they get out of the bus at school, and vice versa."

The points made by 'interviewer 13' in his speech are also important determinations in terms of our study. By complaining about the situation that exists and saying that "I would like to raise my child in the neighborhood where I grew up" he proves the fact that they are not satisfied with the urban experiences they are currently experiencing. Indeed, in the place where 'traditional modern city' relationships continue, their children who were lost were brought home by someone they knew, which he links to the ongoing traditional modern city interactions. In his speech, the points he said "they were just like a gated communities" are in fact the products of those conditions that are not 'gated communities'. The situation that he lives now does not allow real contacts and real interactions, it does not make such a relationship possible. If we think that a case of he told us is lived in a 'gated community'; the one who finds the child would not know whose child she was because of *'uncertain neighborhoods'*. The only good intentions to do would be to deliver to the security as 'control panel of regular life'. In fact, even such a critical event will not make a realistic social contact with their neighbors because of inactive agoras. In this respect, what he said was 'like a gated community' was actually a result of not being a gated community entirely.

What he calls "natural security" in his speech is a consequence of the active uncanny that daily routine. Things that could not be guessed in the neighborhood, and that were uncanny, would have created situations in which the real relations of the individuals were also possible. It was the intensity of this kind of relationship that made everyone to know one another. For 'genuine interactions' in the agoras prevent the escape from reality/from the public, it obliged the individuals to take responsibilities in a social sense. The real danger in such an environment could only find you when you were outside of the togetherness. It is the social contacts itself that can not be avoided at this point. What the interviewer said was "we are isolating ourselves because we can not find them any more"; in fact, are the outcomes of the 'traditional modern city' experiences they are avoiding in the urban environment that he provides to his children. It is nothing more than an end of the public space and the collapse of agoras as a result of the isolation based on the personal choices and choiced lives.

> **Interviewer 13:** "I wanted to raise my children in the neighborhood where I myself grew up. There was a natural security environment. A peculiar incident I experienced was that my daughter was still a toddler. She couldn't get back to her grandpa's home while she was walking around the town. Someone has seen her and brought her back home. There was not any worry in that sense. The thread out there was always external. The threat can only from outside the neighborhood there. The neighborhood was like a gated community. It had a natural security. Everyone knew each other there, everyone knew everyone else's children. Everyone helped one another. It was an environment of that sort. It is no longer possible to find such an environment in Istanbul. We are living isolated lives. That is our choice, which alters the views of the outsiders."

Conclusion and Evaluation

Because 'real public spaces' used to necessitate active agoras (intermediate spaces) individuals did not use to have worry about public interactions 'where agoras were active'. Thus, in such spaces, public passivity allowing individuals to stay out of public relationships were unacceptable. In places where there are active agoras that connect privet lives with public life, individuals could not live a life dependent uncertainty and isolation. In public spaces on that are traditional like agoras the ability of individuals to inhibit social relations were valuable virtues. In this respect, in the public of Ancient Greece citizens who felt home in agoras did not feel uncomfortable being naked because public spaces were an extension of their houses; therefore, there was not distrust. However, in 'late modern city' which is an outcome of our new living conditions (gated communities) the daily life is increasingly becoming an outcome of the battle for private lives. As this happens 'reel', 'transparent' and 'permanent' relationships that are possible with agoras or public spaces have become turn spaces. Public uncertainty which is in raise under such conditions have placed worries based on private lives at the center of the city life. People; therefore, started to react to public experiences as if it's of their private lives. The public uncertainty in such conditions have dragged all the interactions regarding agoras or public life to a vagueness and danger. The will of 'closing' of the people who are afraid to interact in public life caused all the relations in the public to be perceived useless. A product of such conditions, public life left its place in isolation, lack of interaction and non-functional agoras (neighborhoods and schools).

Gated communities are raising settlements as 'post-traditional lives' of'late modern era' (neoliberal conditions). When taken a closer look at those settlements, one of the main reasons for worry is that the

private lives are in the rise as opposed to the public lives. As a conclusion, it can easily be said that these settlements have a significant diversion with regards to the diversity of the public and private spaces qualities. This new process called as the 'dismemberment of the city' increasingly results in the rise of unqualified lifestyle in terms of their public features. 'Late modern lives' which are expressed with their increasing number of indifference to the public space request gated communities in the context of an escape from the city (in away, public space). In this respect; 'public lack of qualification' as a result of the separation in the late modern phase, contain a reality that can be expressed as the 'fall of the agoras' (or 'the separation of the public space') thanks to gated communities. Unlike traditional city spaces, these types of settlements create lives without a public presence. Thus, gated communities that became more common are becoming spaces that blunt agoras/intermediate spaces (street and neighborhood) which can keep the ties tight between 'private space' and public space specific to 'traditional modern city'. What we express as 'post-traditional settlements' in this study are 'late modern city' settlements. Their most significant quality is the fact that they are spaces where daily lives are coordinated in the home of the lives gradually losing their public qualities. Therefore, in the rise of privacy entered lives, 'public lack of qualifications' (lives without agoras) experienced in gated communities has a significant role.

One of the key findings from our field study is that all sorts of public traditions and relations are getting less valuable in the new city conditions. This is the most recurring testimony of our interviewers. Depreciation of traditions linked to the non-functionality of urban traditions is at the risk of conclusion. Because traditional modern city relations such as street and neighborhood that invites individuals to active participation in the public space, become things to abstain from in the lives of a 'late modern individual' (resident of a gated community). 'Traditional modern lives' which make use of public space live public lives to permanent relations. Therefore, they all in its individuals' permanent social responsibilities. On the other hand, things that lose their meaning for 'late modern individual' (residents of gated communities); make public responsibilities of the city life in time, which makers at impossible to abolish. In the 'late modern city' where mutual narratives seize to exist (or gradually become less valuable), public relations that enable togetherness are inevitable. When that's the case, the lives designed by the gated communities promise lives appropriate to the fear of 'opening up'. 'Late modern publics' that emerges as a result of permanent distrust of individuals who experience the fear of opening up in their everyday lives, have become important determines in terms of in-city relationships. In this context, the city has forgotten from the cultural heritage and it is also in a process of public separation. 'The residents of gated communities', by making the common public spaces vile are the bearers of this situation. Agoras are getting vile for them, for they tag danger and uncertainty to non-public contexts rather than in-public relationships (neighborhood, street relations). For this reason, being in the 'late modern city's' public space (or agora) is no longer a virtue of then. As opposed to that, the real virtue in the new cities is the ability to avoid public relations. Because one of the most significant reasons of privacy centered lives in gated communities is to be able to take precautions to the distrust end uncertainty of the public life. This term that channel the individuals of the late modern city to build (passive) 'lives based on inaction' becomes the reason which is offensive (and also reasonable) for the into life in the gated communities. What happens as a response to the occurrences in this process, streets and neighborhoods have been dulled, though their important roles regarding public life. Although all the participants gave positive examples for their former experiences in 'late modern city', their 'late modern' qualities do not allow them to experience a similar context like their parents (or their childhoods). The expectation of lack of

interaction in the new lives, in this case, make the traditional modern city relations in agoras (neighborhood, street relations) unexpected realities.

Such 'late modern individuals' as a result of a product of restructured strategies of shaping the daily life are becoming people who cannot keep up with the promises of the traditional modern city. Therefore, an ordinary lifestyle concerning the public space of the 'traditional modern city' and 'diversity' promising security or 'interaction' or 'uncanny' have been things that are corresponded to ambiguities which take place in places where agoras become less valuable they can create (uncanny) hard to control. As a result, obtaining from all the public ordinariness become a new public strategy. Hence, lives put out by the opted communities; are public spaces where agoras and publics lose their functionalities. As the main topic it promises to its individuals, is passivity, lives free from agoras and lack of contact and uncanny are not being regulated. As all sorts of confrontation and interaction are canceled. These types of lives are becoming lives in which public relationships are in a way suspended.

Being channels of linking the individuals of the traditional modern city's agoras (neighborhoods and streets) to the public life, they were lives that inhibited the traditional instruments 'randomness', 'uncanny', 'diversity' and 'informity' in traditional cities. However, the randomness and uncanny in the public lives of the modern city could eliminate the ambiguities as they promise openness and clarity for people's daily lives. 'Late modern individual' who perceive informity a chaos started perceiving all the randomness and uncanny of the city on the image corresponding to uncertainty. The thick lines, walls, and confidentiality that the 'late modern individuals' who live in the gated communities of the 'late modern city' are hiding behind, are to secure their 'sacred lives', for the most important factor to hide behind privacy is the transparency in city to be no longer a provision of security. As the privacy specific to the city alters to be a condition of security in the name of the late modern individual, the public freedom that arose like in traditional era has ceased to be a thing that is desired for the individuals. As a result, it becomes easier to understand why individuals who feel distrust forwards the traditional modern city and avoids it canceled agoras/intermediate spaces.

As everything for the sake of daily life gets uncertain, the notion of freedom 'late modern individuals' equals to thing that is limited to their private lives. The deep meaning of 'freedom and security' that late modern individual attributes to the gated communities, as a result, comprises a significant reality on behalf of the fall of the agoras and public lives (or the traditional modern city). In this respect, the fact that the public space problem experienced in streets and neighborhoods are on the rise in the metropolitan spaces of Turkey, represent theproblems arose as the result of erosion of public sphere and collapse of angoras.

References

Arendt, H. (2012). The Human Condition, İletişim Publications, İstanbul.

Aristoteles (2013). The Poetics, Say Publications, İstanbul.

Bauman, Z. (2000). Liquid Modernity, Polity Press.

Bauman, Z. (2003). City of Fears, City of Hopes, University of London Press, London.

Bauman, Z. (2006). Liquid Fear, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Bauman, Z. (2011a). The Individualized Society, Ayrıntı Publishing, İstanbul.

Bauman, Z. (2011b). 44 Letters from the Liquid Modern World, Habitus Yayıncılık, İstanbul.

Bauman, Z. (2012a). In Search of Politics, Metis Publications, İstanbul.

Bauman, Z. (2012b). Globalization: The Human Consequences, Ayrıntı Publications, İstanbul.

Bauman, Z. (2012c). Mortality, Immortality and Other Life Strategies, Ayrıntı Publications, İstanbul.

Bauman, Z. (2016). Community: Seeking Safety in an Insecure World, Say Publications, İstanbul.

Beck, U. (2011). Risk Society: Toward a New Modernity, İthaki Publications, İstanbul.

Delibaş, K. (2013). *Sağlığa ilişkin Korkular: Güven Erozyonu Bağlamında Sağlık Korkularını Anlamlandırmak* (Der. Dr.Osman Elbek), *Kapitalizm Sağlığa Zararlıdır*, Hayykitap.

Delibaş, K. (2017). Risk Toplumu: Belirsizlikler ve Söylentiler Sosyolojisi, Ayrıntı Yayınları, İstanbul.

Fukuyama, F. (2005). Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity, Türkiye İş Bankası Culture Publications, İstanbul.

Furedi, F. (2001). Culture of Fear: Risk-Taking and the Morality of Low Expectation, Ayrıntı Publications, İstanbul.

Giddens, A. (2004). The Consequences of Modernity, Ayrıntı Publications, İstanbul.

Harvey, D. (2003). Social Justice and the City, Metis Publications, İstanbul.

Harvey, D. (2007). A Brief of Neoliberalism, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Harvey, D. (2013). Rebel Cities: From the Right to the City, Metis Publications, İstanbul.

Jacobs, J. (2011). The Death and Life of Great American Cities, Metis Publications, İstanbul.

Le Corbusier (2013). Toward an Architecture, Yapı Kredi Publications, İstanbul.

Lefebvre, H. (2014). The Production of Space, Sel Publications, İstanbul.

Lynch, K. (2012). The Image of the City, İş Bankası Kültür Publications, İstanbul.

Mayol, P. & others (2009). The Practice of Everyday Life: Living and Cooking (Vol. 2), Dost Publications, Ankara.

Prost. A. (2008). A History Private Life: Riddles Of Identity in Modern Times: Volume 5, p. 13-160, Yapı Kredi Publications, İstanbul.

Sennet, R. (1999). The Conscience of the Eye: The Desing and Social Life of Cities, Ayrıntı Publications, İstanbul.

Sennett, R. (2010). The Fall of Public Man, Ayrıntı Publications, İstanbul.

Sennett, R. (2011). Flesh and Stone: The Body and the City on Western Civilization, Metis Yayınları, İstanbul.