BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

[1] Jane Jacobs,&Jin Heng Shan. (2006).The Death and Life of Great American Cities . Yilin Publishing House

[2] Jan Gehl, Lars Gemzoe, SiaKirknaes, etal.(2006). New City Life. Copenhagen: The Danish Architecture Press, 2006:20.

[3] Zhang Bing.(1997) .The Concept and Problem of Urban Planning Professionalization. Journal of Urban Planning 1997(4), 1-9.

[4] Tehran.(2014).Asian Conference on Environment-Behaviour Studies Chung-Ang University, Seoul, S. Korea.

ID 1535 | BOUNDARY-MAKING AROUND A “TRANSGENDER GHETTO” IN A NEIGHBORHOOD: A CASE IN ALSANCAK, IZMIR (TURKEY)

Özlem Arslan1; Fatma Şenol[1]
[1]İzmir Institute of Technology
mim.ozlem@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: This study inquires how a transgender community negotiates and re-identifies its living and working space against the socio-spatial boundaries drawn by urban planning decisions, media images and policing strategies. It develops as a case study in Alsancak, a central-city neighborhood in Izmir, known as "the tolerant city" in Turkey. Alsancak is notorious for housing a transgender community most of whom are sexworkers. In the "sexed city", the sexual codings of the urban spaces and the populations associated with them demonstrate the modern societies´ conflicts and contradictions (Knopp, 1995). This study assumes that social identities and differences are established through constantly negotiated power relations, at which space plays a major role. Identities have spatial dimensions which are "constructed together and constructed through interaction" (Massey, 1994). Urban planning, policing strategies and media images are part of the dominant power relations that draw socio-spatial boundaries around marginalized groups as "others". However, boundary drawing is not only an act of control by the powerful but also an act of resistance by the weak (Pratt, 1999). Through their everyday practices, individuals and communities (here, transgenders) can produce, negotiate, and re-define such socio-spatial boundaries through social interaction, social conflict and social struggles. Despite the prevailing stigmatization, criminalization and policing of transgender people in Turkey, Alsancak neighborhood with its diverse socio-economic, religious and ethnic groups, and commercial and service uses (with a vivid night-life) appears as a safe space for the transgender community. Transgender community lives and works in the inner streets of the neighborhood, which they call the "transgender ghetto". They experience significant social consequences ranging from discrimination to violence, even in this relative "safe space". Through archival research on urban planning decisions and media images about this transgender ghetto and in-depth interviews with local associations (including a LGBTI association), this study compares the socio-spatial acts of boundary drawing by the powerful and the weak. The findings of the study will be interpreted for developing urban planning decisions for an "inclusive city".

1 INTRODUCTION

This study, as part of a discussion about diversity is about how the socio-spatial boundaries are formed around the living space of the transgender community in Alsancak neighborhood in İzmir. The part of the neighborhood where they live and engage in sexwork is referred by the transgendered as their “ghetto”. Transgender ghetto in Alsancak is an appropriated space, formed as the transgender community negotiates and re-identifies its living and working space against the socio-spatial boundaries drawn by urban planning decisions, policing strategies, and media images.

Cities are often described and studied as sites of difference (Young, 1990; Massey, 1994; Eade and Mele, 2002; Valentine, 2008). Coexistence of different cultures and different lifestyles in the cities is deemed to

bear the potential of merging, and creating hybrid cultures, thus difference in the city is often celebrated. However living with difference in the practice is often left undescribed. Contact with difference, instead of changing values and promoting a general respect for others, might result in the hardening of the values and attitudes. Many communities living in close proximity to one other maintain “series of parallel lives” which co-exist without really touching each other(Valentine, 2008). We argue that this is the case in the Alsancak neighborhood, where diverse social groups including some of the city’s transgender sexworkers reside. Transgenders are the common ‘others’ for multiple social groups in Alsancak. The otherness of transgender sexworkers, as gendervariant individuals engaged in the immoral act of prostitution, is likely to produce polarization and division instead of an inclusion. Furthermore, overall process of othering them might result in their further marginalization. In an overly heterosexual ‘masculine’ society (Efe Güney and Demircioğlu, 2015), difference signified by gender identity and sexual orientation is unlikely to be regarded affirmatively.

Massey (1994) argues that “identities have spatial dimensions which are constructed together and constructed through interaction”. Whereas power constitutes both identities and spatialities. Act of drawing boundaries by different groups determine continous processes of inclusion and exclusion as group identities rely on the recognized similarities between members and recognized distinctions with the members of other groups. Normative mechanisms, such as shared understandings of contextual codes and social practices emphasize boundaries between social groups Cohen (1985) (as cited in Jackson and Benson, 2014). Like identities and difference, spatial boundaries are negotiated, defined and produced through social interaction, social conflict and struggles between different groups (Gotham, 2003). In Alsancak, the most significant conflicts and struggles exist between the transgendered sex workers and the ‘decent’ residents of the neighbourhood. Power relations between these groups are exhibited as both claim the neighborhood as their living space. While media images and policing strategies openly take sides against the transgendered, institutions of urban planning concerned with the area disregard their existence completely.

Relating to the studies about the relationship between planning and diversity, as well as gender, sexuality and sexwork, this study examines the processes of boundary making around a transgender ghetto in Alsancak neighborhood. Inquiring into the subject; we intended to find out the role of urban planning, local communities, media images, and policing as well as the transgender community in the formation of these boundaries. Interrogating the existence of the transgendered and the sexwork, as well as the problems and safety concerns in the Alsancak neighborhood, we intended to portray the making of sociospatial boundaries. In the following section, overview of the concepts related to gender variance, sexwork and the place of sex, sexuality and sexwork in the discipline of urban planning is given, followed by the description of the site and the methodology of the study. In the next section, the study findings are discussed on the basis of queerness of the Alsancak neighborhood, the situation of sexwork and the formation of sociospatial boundaries.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Sexual diversity and freedom, an urban phenomena arising out of the density and cultural complexity of cities, results in the development of minority sexual subcultures, communities and social movements linked to them in the cities. Nevertheless, concentration of these subcultures and movements in the urban space makes it easier to both stigmatize and control them in an attempt to protect majority cultures. Eventhough, the sexual codings of cities, districts within cities and the populations associated with them are complex, they demonstrate the conflicts and contradictions of the modern societies. Furthermore, these codings are associated with power relations, therefore they are deeply contested (Knopp, 1995).

Hubbard (2000) refers to the spaces dominated by heterosexuality as ‘moral geographies’, and states that judgements on the acceptable types of peoples, behaviours and practices are made daily in different settings. Moral approval of the forms of acceptable heterosexual behavior is sustained by social and legal regulations which discipline those who violate this moral order. Sexual dissidents are excluded from the public spaces which are constructed around particular notions of appropriate sexual comportment due to a citizenship based on heteronormality (Hubbard, 2001b). Civil society is both a heterosexual and a patriarchal concept determining the acceptability in the public realm, making it very difficult for those whose sexualities are considered immoral to enter into the public realm. The rights of the individuals who do not fit into dominant sexual standards are almost erased as they are tagged as ‘sexual others’, who are

denied of proper citizenship. These individuals often experience social stigmatization for being unable to fit into the definition of a 'good citizen' becoming "second-class citizens not only by the state but also by 'decent', 'respectable' sexual subjects" (Hubbard, 2000). Transgenders and sex workers are among the sexual dissidents who experience stigmatization and othering (Knopp, 1995). They are viewed as they need to be spatially contained hence they are excluded through the construction and maintenance of spatial boundaries (Laing and Cook, 2014).

GENDER VARIANCE AND SEXWORK IN SOCIOSPATIAL BOUNDARY MAKING

Transgender as a collective term signifies individuals who do not perform or identify with their assigned gender and have taken some steps to present themselves in another gender (Valentine, 2003, pp.27-28). Hence, transgender describes an individual who cross the boundaries of gender defined by culture (Bockting et al.,1998). The 'transgender community' refers to a broad range of gender variant people not necessarily including information about their sexual orientation or their views on gender reassignment surgery (Salisbury and Michael, 2016). The transgender population is one of the most vulnerable and marginalized populations in the city as they often experience significant social consequences ranging from discrimination to outright violence for transgressing gender norms (Doan, 2007). When trans people look for shelter even within queer urban spaces, they are tolerated but not always welcomed warmly (Doan, 2009). Challenging gender norms can provoke acts of violence, which is called gender bashing. Especially transwomen who live full time as women become potential targets for harassment, abuse, and violence (Namaste, 1996).

Transgender individuals face serious discrimination and lack legal protection when they do. They might be refused as tenants or as employees just because of their gender identity (Doan, 2001a). Unconventional gender presentation makes it difficult for transgender individuals to find or maintain employment. As most transgendered individuals are forced into sexwork, they work at risk of substance abuse, unprotected sexual experiences, and various mental health problems (Cochran et al., 2002). The internalization of the social stigma in the transgender community results in the suicides and attempted suicides (Doan, 2007). Moreover, safety of the transgenders is systematically dismissed from the general legislations, sustaining the violence and crimes of hatred against this group which might result in killings (Doan, 2001b).

Transgendered individuals experience the gendered nature of space as what Doan (2010) refers as "the tyranny of gender" which begins when certain individuals entitle themselves as "heteronormatively constructed gender enforcers in public spaces". The policing behaviors of these individuals are often accompanied and exacarbated by the silent but supportive watchers. Transgendered individuals are regularly profiled and approached by the police in public spaces for the "crime" of being transgender hindering them from moving freely and existing in public spaces (Doan, 2010). Difficulty in finding and maintaining employment forces the transgenders to sexwork (Doan, 2007). They usually choose to work on the streets which comes on the expense of more exposure to violence as well as more pressure from the local communities and the police. Street-based sex workers are exposed to high levels of violence, intimidation and corruption. Instances of extreme violence, including murder are reported frequently on the medi All sex workers experience occupational stigma and discrimination, however the negative effects of sexwork related stigmatization and criminalisation are deepened for sex workers who are members of visible minorities. Because of their visibility and gender identity transgender sex workers face exacarbated stigmatization and violence. Sex work related stigma adds to the stigma of the gender variance in shaping the interactions of the transgendered sex workers with the police and the community. Consequently, they are often displaced both for their marginal gender identity and for being a sex worker. If displaced, transgender sex workers, who usually work in specific locations, where regular and new clients can easily find them, are pushed to the more marginal urban spaces where they potentially face more violence (Krüsi et al., 2016). Furthermore, transgender sex workers, usually experience harassment, abuse, and violence with little protection from police (Nichols, 2010). Studies on transgender sex workers show that they are routinely subjected to violence, public humiliation, and, not infrequently, to murder (Brooks-Gordon, 2008).

SOCIAL CONTROL OF SEXWORK

Sexwork, commonly an urban phenomenon takes place in a variety of indoor and outdoor settings in the city (Laing and Cook, 2014). Street sexwork, mainly in residential areas forms the most visible and

controversial form of sexwork (Hubbard, 1997). Sexwork is frequently referred as a 'nuisance', as something that should be isolated from the 'mainstream' society, moved away from residential neighbourhoods and prime city spaces. It is viewed to disturb neighbours, passers-by, and potential investors. The location, actors, and the outcomes of sexwork cause conflicts. Inherent territoriality of sexwork is influential in setting physical and discursive boundaries which determine what can happen where (Laing and Cook, 2014). Street sexwork has been viewed as inevitable while being simultaneously comdemned as immoral and sickening. Therefore, commercial sex is a contested realm often subjected to the politics of NIMBYism (Hubbard, 2001).

In heterosexually ordered cities, the sight of the sexed body of the sexworker in the public realm disturbs the moral expectations about sexuality. The eroticisation of the public realm they cause by their outlook and behaviour provokes legal and moral response. The state, the law and the 'good' sexual citizens start to police the limits of spaces of sex work in order to hinder prostitution from spoiling the public realm (Hubbard, 1997). The stigmatization of sex workers is central to the constitution of the social order as they are viewed as a risk to the society for threatening family values. Consequently, spatial displacement from the urban landscape by law enforcement or community protesters has been the most common method of the social control of sex work (Krüsi et al., 2016).

As one of the instruments of social control, the role of the media in identifying sex work and sex workers as a threat to the society cannot be ignored. Since sexuality is frequently used to define acceptable social behaviour, the conflicts related to the sexuality are usually presented in the media provoking sensations, thus leading to 'moral panics' about certain individuals and groups. Resultantly, Sex work and sex workers often appear in media causing moral panics (Hubbard, 2000; Hubbard, 2001b). As fears of otherness are a, whereas many unreported lesser physical assaults are also common (Harcourt et al., 2001).

magnified in the context of the city, media becomes instrumental in shaping the daily encounters with those who are considered as potential threats providing support for the exclusionary urban policies (O'Neill, 2008).

LOCATION OF SEXWORK

Moral geographies assume that the visibility of sexworkers is more acceptable in some spaces than others, therefore street sexwork is often only tolerated in the areas reserved for it. Street sexwork is mostly confined in certain, notorious inner city districts where the vice police controls it while simultaneously keeping it away from neighborhoods where it might have caused most controversy and dissent (Hubbard, 1999). The control of sexwork is primarily aimed at reducing the 'nuisance' experienced by people living in areas of street sexwork, justified by the "the right of the normal decent citizen to go about the streets without affront to their sense of decency". Therefore, the judicial system considers sexwork as an offence against standards of public morality and decency when it is visible in the public realm (Hubbard, 1997). Neighbourhood nuisance concerns, closely linked to sex work related stigma and policing, affect the working conditions of the sexworkers as they confront residents, neighbourhood watch groups and security guards. These interactions are determined by an understanding which focuses on the riskiness of the existence of the sexworkers in the neighborhood, not by concerns about their safety (Krüsi et al., 2016).

Spaces of sex work are shaped by continuous struggles between sex workers, neighbourhood residents, businesses, and the police (Hubbard and Sanders, 2003). Imbalanced powers are involved in these struggles since the complaints of the neighborhood residents are prioritized over protecting the working conditions, health and safety of the street-based sex workers (Krüsi et al., 2016). Simultaneously sex workers themselves also actively shape the spaces of sex work as they resist the interventions against them, negotiate the use of space and have private property rights (Laing and Cook, 2014).

POLICING OF SEXWORK

Sex workers and sex work spaces have been targeted by a wide variety of interventions and policies (Laing and Cook, 2014). Dominant policy approach to sex work has been criminalisation and police enforcement, which have increased the risks of violence (Krüsi et al., 2016), and stigmatization for sexworkers (Hubbard, 1997). Policies regarding sex work target repressing the spaces of street sex work

as techniques of governmentality and surveillance are used to contain, exclude or control sexworkers (Hubbard et al., 2008).

Boundary maintenance with regard to sex work and related social problems is seen as a task of the police as well as the courts. As policing controls the sexuality via surveillance and punishment, what public space is, how it should be, and when, where, how and by whom it can be used, is in a way determined by the police. Sexworkers from all segments and their clients have been targeted by police interventions (Laing and Cook, 2014). While the legal regulation of sexwork reinforces the exclusion of the sexworkers, repression and containment are the common strategies used in policing of sexwork which is a spatial process sustaining the marginalization of sexworkers (Hubbard, 1998). The police tolerates, though seldom encourages sexwork in “unofficially designated areas” therefore policing of sexwork determines the creation of sexwork zones by making it impossible for clients and sexworkers to meet somewhere else (Hubbard, 1997).

Stigmatisation, criminalisation, and labour conditions impinge the rights of sex workers for police protection and legal recourse. When sex workers seek police protection, they often face inaction of the police justified by the understanding that their experiences of violence are an inherent part of selling sex. Since sex work is viewed as inherently dangerous and sex workers are seen as victims, blame for sex work related violence is appropriated to sex workers as the police free themselves from the task of protecting sex workers. This process increases the structural vulnerability of sex workers since they are striped off the societal protections that other citizens normally have (Krüsi et al.,2016). Moreover, there are occasions when officials exploit and victimize sex workers by forcing them to sex acts, extorting bribes, and harrassing. Assaults, physical harrassment, being beaten, being arrested without evidence are common forms of police violence, and even incidents of group rape is reported. Furthermore, in fear of further arrests or fines, the negative experiences with the police also might hinder sexworkers from going to police when they are the victims of crime. Consequently, many incidents of harassment, assault, rape, and kidnapping among sexworkers are not reported to the police. Complaints of the sexworkers are often not registered, or when they are registered the perpetrators generally are not convicted (Nichols, 2010).

COMMUNITY RESPONSES TO SEXWORK

The assumed incompatibility of the sex work with the space of the neighborhood community has been used to justify exclusionary actions against sex workers. Media discourses stress that sex work harms the neighborhoods by restricting the accessibility of streets to residents at night. In some instances campaigns to remove sexwork from ‘their’ streets are initiated by the residents using street patrols or pickets (Hubbard, 1998). Often backed by the local press, such campaigns sometimes result in the displacement of sex work (Hubbard and Sanders, 2003). Community responses to street sexwork range from a state of no tolerance to empathy. Some levels of sympathy towards the sexworkers exist, but the tolerance to sexwork tends to be low. While views on sex work and sex workers are usually mixed, some residents stress the impossibility of coexistence and insist that only visible police activity could address the issue and result in their removal from residential spaces. However, moral protesters of sex work often do not represent the whole community. Opinions and attitudes of residents who are more tolerant about sexwork are often not voiced either in Tensions between sex workers and other residents in public spaces present issues related with balancing the needs and interests of different groups. Common complaints linked to street sex work include visible sex acts in public, traffic, noise, littering, clients' harassment of female residents, physical altercations, and the health risks presented by discarded condoms and needles (Hubbard, 1997; Weitzer, 2009). For the majority of the neighborhood residents sex work is an issue related with the overall quality of life. Street sex work in the neighborhood affect the use of public space negatively as some residents feel unsafe walking home especially at night. Many sex workers also indicate concerns about the perceived safety of some areas as they regard certain public spaces as dangerous (Pitcher, et al., 2006). The prevalence of nuisance, its impacts on the reputation of the area, lack of control of street sex workers by authorities, lack of control over public and private spaces, and the emotional impact of living in areas of street sex work are listed by residents as main concerns about the quality of life (O’Neill et al., 2008).

URBAN PLANNING ON SEX, SEXUALITY AND SEXWORK

Sex and sexuality has been inquired geographically since it is accepted that space, fundamentally influenced by the dynamics of human sexuality, exposes how sex is represented, perceived and understood (Knopp, 1995, p.149). Intersections of sexuality with race, gender and class determine how certain populations are targeted for displacement in the neoliberal city. Therefore, city is not a neutral stage for sexual relations, but is an active actor in creating sexualities by promoting heterosexualities while repressing others (Seitz, 2015).

The decisive role of the city in determining sexualities and connected relations, locate issues of sex and sexuality in the field of the planning discipline. Planning has been conventionally viewed as a means for creating an "orderly urban environment" (Fainstein and Fainstein, 1971). On this commonplace objective ascribed to planning, Doan (2011) remarks that definition of the "orderliness" is made in a "narrowly heterosexist" sense, "favoring white, male and heterosexual conceptions of orderliness". Therefore, planning has a significant power to heterosexualize space (Hubbard, 2011). Urban spaces, weaved with moral values encourage and naturalize heteronormativity, in which particular acts and individuals are marginalized as immoral, while the mainstream is often defined on the ideals of family, with the assumed heterosexual orientation and a related gender. Heteronormativity of planning ensures that spaces of commercial sex representing sexual and moral disorder are monitored and controlled by the state and law. Therefore, different sites of commercial sex, including places of street sex work are causes of controversy in planning (Hubbard, 2001).

In theory, planning might be instrumental in mediating controversial views about the place of sexwork, whereas in practice, since sex-related businesses are not recognized as a land use category it is not the campaigns or in the press (O'Neill et al., 2008).

possible for planning to identify places for commercial sex. Nevertheless, the criminal laws along with the policing keep pushing away street sex work from the city. Zoning ordinances prohibit adult entertainment facilities and land uses related to commercial sex near residential areas, schools and religious facilities, confining sex consumption to the industrial districts. In some instances, local authorities designate a rather safe sex work zone away from residential areas, making sure that no annoyance was caused to the public. But these places, which are tolerated and not encouraged, are basically allowed in order to protect the social and economic value of certain land uses which might be effected by the negative impacts and externalities of sex work. Though often misleading, commercial sex in neighborhoods, is often associated with adverse effects such as increases in crime, decreased property values, and neighborhood deterioration (Hubbard, 2001). When planning and licencing bodies work to determine the location of sex work, planning resembles policing as both are instrumental in creating 'moral geographies' by deciding what is permitted where (Laing and Cook, 2014). Furthermore, current planning and licensing practice is inclined to favour the rights of residential property owners over the rights of sex workers, by locating commercial sex in places where it is not safe or profitable. In most situations, it is not clear if planning powers like zoning and licensing respond to the community concerns about sexwork or they serve the interests of profit seeking developers who want to take advantage of ran down areas of sexwork. Since street sexwork does not have a legitimate land use status in terms of planning, it can be subject to displacement by means of urban redevelopment (Hubbard, 2001; Hubbard and Whowell, 2008).

Policies intended to regulate or eradicate places of sexwork may have a negative impact on the livelihoods of the marginalized transgendered individuals, who have limited employment options (Doan, 2001). Though planning is instrumental in the urban governance of sexwork, its capacity to act in a rather 'socially and sexually liberatory manner' is controversial since it is expected to protect dominant, mostly heterosexual, moralities. Whereas, in order to make socially-just decisions, the views of those who are offended by sexwork should be balanced with the views of those who benefit from it. Therefore, the claims and rights of sex workers should be incorporated into the debates on sexwork and given prominence in the planning process (Hubbard, 2001) in order to understand the exclusionary spatial practices they go through as they face abuse, harassment and violence (Hubbard, 1997).

3 STUDY SITE AND METHODOLOGY

Alsancak is a neighborhood in İzmir, the third largest city in Turkey. İzmir is one of the most important metropolitan centers in Turkey with a rapidly increasing population and urban area (İmar ve Şehircilik

Daire Başkanlığı, 2015). The city has a cosmopolitan culture linked to being a port city historically (Gökçen Dündar, 2010; Kaya, 2010). İzmir today is known as the 'tolerant city', probably connected to the influence of its historic cosmopolitanism, which have generated a rather tolerant social environment and an alleviation of the conservative culture of Islam (Efe Güney and Ayhan Selçuk, 2016). Alsancak, situated right between the envisioned new center and the traditional center of the city, is part of a larger district which provisions major commercial and service functions in the city. It is a completely built up, lively center which contains more commercial uses than residential in its intertwined modern and old buildings (İmar ve Şehircilik Daire Başkanlığı, 2015).

Alsancak neighborhood differs from the other parts of the city with the social mix of its residents. Historically, it has been the 'Frank (European) quarter' (Zandi-Sayek, 2012) of the city, so eventhough most have moved out to 'better' neighborhoods, the neighborhood still has remaining local non-muslim residents who are very old. Some middle-class, and upper-middle class households who inhabit flats in better quality apartments still reside in the neighborhood, eventhough they complain about the degeneration and decline in the neighborhood. The neighborhood with its central location and its proximity to many commercial and service jobs as well as major art and culture facilities is a choice of residence for young professionals. It is almost impossible to see children on the streets which imply rare-existence of families with children. Alsancak is also notorious for housing some of the city's sex workers, most of whom are transgenders. As a result, certain inner streets of the neighborhood in certain hours (as the night sets in) are used for sex work mostly by transgender sex workers living in the neighborhood which is a nuisance for other residents.

These presumptions about Alsancak neighborhood are inferences from a pilot study conducted in the area in August-November 2016. This pilot study involved semi-structured indepth interviews directed to the key informants including the headperson of the neighborhood, directors and members of the LGBTI association Black Pink Triangle, and residents of the neighborhood. In addition, short interviews were made with the businesses which contribute to the daily life in the neighborhood. These interviews as well as personal observations and trials of mapping provided general information about the current state of the neighborhood. After the pilot study, media images and reports about the problems, safety concerns, existence of the transgenders and sex work in the neighborhood were searched online and documented. In April-May 2017, a second set of in-depth interviews were conducted. Five interviews were made with transwomen living and/or working in the neighborhood. One of them was an activist in the LGBTI association of Black Pink Triangle, and other four were sexworkers or former sexworkers. The directors of Black Pink Triangle and Alsancak Movement Association, and planners from the planning departments of the Konak District and İzmir Metropolitan Municipalities which are responsible for the spatial plans of the Alsancak neighborhood were also interviewed. The focus of the second set of interviews was the existence of the transgenders and sexwork in the neighborhood, interrogating community and group relations and safety concerns in the neighborhood and prospects of neighborhood change.

4 STUDY FINDINGS

Alsancak neighborhood is referred as 'mixed' as it contained families, singles, businesses, sex workers and transgenders. Despite being affordable, the area was chosen by sex workers due to its proximity to many entertainment facilities. There is a transgender community in the neighborhood, who know, support and watchover each other. They get together especially in cases of significant events like protests, deaths and suicides. Most of the transgenders are sexworkers and they are ghettoized with other social groups who can tolerate living with them (Demet and Erdem from Black Pink Triangle, October 2016).

The neighborhood is associated with sexwork in the local press and other media. The existence of sexwork is a common nuisance for most residents due to morality, safety and the quality of life concerns. Though, most residents have remarked that if sex work did not exist, the transgendered in the neighborhood would not be that much of a problem. The safety and quality of life concerns about the neighborhood were also stated by the trans women sex workers, but trans women sex workers face pressure and threats from the community of residents and the police besides the shared disturbances in the neighborhood. Some have moved out, or thinking about moving from the neighborhood due to the community and the police pressure. There have been numerous neighborhood campaigns voicing the complaints of the neighborhood residents about sex work which were reported in the local and national press.

ALSANCAK NEIGHBORHOOD AS A QUEER SPACE

Many points from the interviews with the members of the LGBTI association Black Pink Triangle and trans women comply with the characters of the queer spaces defined in the literature. According to Yavuz, Erdem and Demet from the LGBTI association Black Pink Triangle (2016); Alsancak, popular for being the center of the city and for being a center of art, culture, entertainment and night life in the city, is a breathing place in İzmir. It is more democratic and more political compared to other districts of the city. Being easily accessible, it is a meeting point, convenient for being organized for political action and activism including LGBTI politics and activism. Alsancak is a place open for performance and presentation of the programmed behavior and exhibition of the existential situation regarding gender. It is an “acquired place” where transgenders have gained considerable visibility and acceptance. It is an entry point for transgenders who come to live in the city of İzmir. It is a “safezone”, a rebel zone for LGBTI individuals and a living space, a habitat, for the “others” of the society. It is a more humanistic, less religious and less conservative relative freedom zone in the city.

Inline with these comments, Alsancak has been identified as the “queer’ neighborhood in İzmir for being the preferred neighborhood of residence by LGBTI individuals where they feel comfortable (Efe Güney et al., 2014). ‘Queer’, once an epithet directed to the people who do not conform to the conventions about gender and sexuality such as gays, lesbians, bisexuals, transgendered people, and others, has been appropriated by these people in order to revise its potential to hurt and to reclaim their identities and to empower themselves (Bell and Valentine, 2008). Reports of the interviewed transwomen (May 2017) also picture Alsancak as a queer neighborhood as they state that their reason to choose Alsancak to live and work was that there was an established transgender community in the neighborhood. They refer to the neighborhood as an entry point to the city and state that there is a circulation of the transgendered individuals in the neighborhood, where newcomers are rented rooms and worked in the bawdyhouses of those who are already settled.

Alsancak has been appropriated by the transgender community for almost three decades. The neighborhood embodies a “transgender ghetto” on streets where bawdyhouses and street sexwork is concentrated. Eventhough it is embraced as a living space by the transgendered, they face continous discrimination, exclusion, harrassment and violence in the neighborhood reminding Doan’s (2007) remark on the controversies about the inclusiveness of the queer spaces when transgendered individuals are concerned. Incidences of transgender murders and suicides in the neighborhood are reported in the media. Transgendered sex workers live and work under surveillance, pressure and occasional threats from the police varying in frequency and intensity. They continously confront the neighborhood complaints and occasionally they become subject to neighborhood campaigns which intend to displace them from the neighborhood (Aylin, Rüya, Fulya, Sezin, personal communication, 2017). Police control is intensified on the occasions when these complaints and campaigns are reported in the local media. Also when the new responsible police chiefs are appointed in the city, police controls get more strict and frequent (Demet from Black Pink Triangle, personal communication, 2017). Media representations of the transgender existence in Alsancak, take sides with the neighborhood campaigns, meanwhile, the voices of the transgendered are only heard in the few publications belonging to the LGBTI associations which have limited followers.

It is also evident from the interviews that Alsancak is not safe either for the transgendered or for other residents especially at nights. While the residents mostly complain about sex work, the sight of sex workers, apparent scenes of bargaining, and noises of the kerb crawlers, both residents and the sex workers complain about the existence of pickpockets, hijackers, drug dealers and users, and gangs of outcasts in the neighborhood. These people, however, mostly target the lone trans women sex workers at night. Events of crime are not rare in the neighborhood, nevertheless residents state that the streets of sex work is unsafe, whereas trans women sex workers think the neighborhood is completely unsafe.

SEXWORK IN ALSANCAK

The situation of trans women sexwork in the Alsancak was reported by local newspapers as the ‘problem of transgenders’ reporting the complaints of the residents and the aggressive reaction they received from the trans women when they voiced their complaints. Residents blamed the use of alcohol and drugs by both transgenders and their clients for behaving aggressively. They stressed the anxiety they felt on the streets at nights and stated that they avoided the streets where sex work took place. Sexworkers are blamed to make disturbing offers to the “normal” citizens who were not interested in buying sex. The

residents added that it was not the existence of the transgendered in Alsancak, but witnessing them soliciting disturbed them. Stressing their frustration by the inaction of the local authorities and inviting them to take action, they complained about the association of 'their' neighborhood, which was once the most decent and the most beautiful neighborhood in the city with sexwork. Neighborhood residents were reported to demand to get back the old 'safe and peaceful' Alsancak. After the local press report about the transgender sex work in the neighborhood the police forces made strict controls on the streets where sexwork is concentrated. This intensified police surveillance and patrolling has also been reported in the same newspaper as "the police gave an end to the transgender occupation in the neighbourhood" (Yeni Asır, 31.10.2016).

In the local press, realtors' comments on the decreasing property values due to sexwork was also reported. They noted that some houses were rented to the transgendered at exorbitant prices to be used as bawdyhouses and some were rented on an hourly or daily basis. Stressing the "moral dimensions" of renting houses to the transgendered, realtors stated that decent residents of the neighborhood were constantly selling out their houses for lesser prices than they worth and moving out because of the "transgender terror".

FORMATION OF SOCIOSPATIAL BOUNDARIES IN ALSANCAK

Transgender community in Alsancak neighborhood can be viewed as a minority sexual subculture. Since majority of them are sex workers they are stigmatized both for their gender identity and for being engaged in sex work. They experience an othering due to the moral panics of the decent residents which are provoked by the media images. In this situation, diversity and difference seems to present a division, polarization, and further marginalization instead of an inclusiveness.

Social boundaries are constructed and maintained through geographical ones that signify distinct ways of life (Pratt and Hanson, 1994). The drawing of socio-spatial boundaries is a political act, it is a demarcation of difference that helps define and label what is 'same' and what is 'other'. The drawing of boundary lines can be either an act of control by the powerful or an act of resistance by the weak (Pratt, 1999). Similarities and distinctions, here gender identity, sexual orientation, and morality determine sameness and otherness precisely. This absolute distinction define social as well as spatial boundaries, where some parts of the neighborhood, particularly some streets are reserved mainly for different groups. But as mentioned by Jackson and Benson (2014), these spaces are not completely segregated enclosed zones but they intersect, traverse and overlap each other, especially at particular times of the day.

According to the local press and interviews, sexwork in Alsancak is concentrated mainly on the 2. Kordon, Şair Eşref Boulevard, Bornova (1469) Street but spreads to 1416, 1454, 1456, 1457, 1460, 1464, 1467, 1469, 1485 streets. These streets are monitored at night by the police with intensified controls especially after the neighborhood campaigns and media reports about the campaigns (Aylin, Rüya, Fulya, Sezin, personal communication, 2017). Neighborhood residents report feeling anxious and uneasy about using these streets at night because of the existence of sexworkers, their outrageous apperance and sights of bargaining. They are mostly concerned for women and children being on these streets (Ahmet from Alsancak Movement Association, personal communication, 2017). Not only these streets, but most other streets in the neighborhood, are viewed as unsafe by the trans women sex workers who face acts of harrassments and violence from the clients as well as from the strolling hijackers and outcasts. Added to this, trans women sex workers confront assaults, threats and pressure from the neighborhood residents and from the police. They report that, eventhough Alsancak is "their territory" they only feel comfortable and safe on the streets in the company of fellow trans women who they refer as "the gang" (Aylin, Rüya, Fulya, Sezin, personal communication, 2017).

Demet from the Black Pink Triangle (2017) reported that she and her trans women friends frequent cafes and bars owned or managed by women or LGBTI individuals, and they avoid cafes and bars owned by male chauvinists where they feel harrassed. A point that came out of the interviews with catering businesses is that the transgendered are not welcome in some cafes and bars on the drawbacks that they might cause trouble by behaving improperly. It is reported that they will only be welcome on the condition that they behave properly. Some residents speak of them in a tone of tolerance as they point out that they greet them, and they treat them kind "eventhough they are not like them" (Berna, personal communication, 2016) reminding Valentine (2008) as he interprets 'tolerance' as a signifier of an unequal relationship.

Trans women sex workers face discrimination and social and spatial exclusion as they are often rejected as tenants. Even when they own flats in the neighborhood they report being unable to inhabit them due to the threats of the neighboring families. Aylin (personal communication, 2017) could only move to her first flat in the neighborhood five years after buying it. Now, as the owner of six flats in the neighborhood, she has a prerogative to choose who will live in her proximity. On occasions, discrimination against the trans women extends to the highest ranks of bureaucracy. As one of the governors of the city of İzmir called for the home owners in Alsancak, not to rent their properties to the trans women sex workers who are bad examples for the society spreading fear and disease (Vali Göksuya Ayrımcılık Uyarısı, 2004).

Urban planning has no involvement in management or regulation of sex work in Alsancak, since sex work is not recognized by any means in Turkish planning system. However, it might be indirectly influential on the transgender existence in Alsancak, as their first noticable visibility in the neighborhood coincided with the implementation of new spatial plans in the area in 1985 (İmar ve Şehircilik Daire Başkanlığı, 2015) which resulted in the degradation of the residential quality of the neighborhood. This implementation plan made it possible to have miscellaneous commercial uses in the neighborhood which led to the opening of many businesses which were not quite compatible with the residential uses. Some of these uses, related with night life and entertainment, attracted new residents to the neighborhood. Consequently, many better off households moved out of the neighborhood as the properties they left became accommodation options for the newcomers, some of whom were trans women (Former Director of the Department Of Development in İzmir, personal communication, October 2016).

5 CONCLUSION

Divisions in urban space marked by boundaries reflect patterns of social difference and inequality, as they reinforce existing social and structural divisions in society (Joseph, 2008). Difference signified by gender identity or sexual orientation is not regarded affirmatively in the masculine society. The otherness of the trans women sex workers in Alsancak, as gendervariant individuals engaged in prostitution, produces a polarization, division and further marginalization instead of an inclusion.

The appropriation of a part of Alsancak Neighborhood and labelling it as ‘Transgender Ghetto’ can be viewed in terms of challenging the straight space as Hubbard (2000) asserts. Nevertheless, Doan’s (2007) remark about queer spaces that they offer only partial protection for gender variant people seems to be true for Alsancak. Though queer spaces are considered as safe spaces for sexual dissidents, they are not free from harassment and violence because of their gendered nature. The inclusiveness of the queer spaces are questionable particularly when transgendered individuals are considered.

The coxistence of the transgendered and others in Alsancak mostly presents a ‘parallel lives’ situation which does not promote any sincere interchange (Valentine, 2008). In Alsancak, spatial proximity has caused defensiveness and the bounding of identities and communities as Young (1990) suggests. In line with Valentine (2008) the close proximity of the transgendered and other residents in Alsancak bears the potential of “reactions out of intolerance” ranging from rudeness, to discrimination, violence and even to hate crimes. Even behaving in a civil or decent way in public does not testify being free from prejudices and judgements, therefore does not lead to respect for the other. Tolerating the other, stresses an unequal relationship, in which a dominant, or more legitimate group may choose whether or not use tolerance (Valentine, 2008). Processes of exclusion, “by which those who claim belonging to the place define themselves against what they are not” (Butler and Robson, 2003) work in the making of Alsancak neighborhood.

After a long period of neglect concerning the needs of the minorities, there has been an acknowledgement that inclusion and diversity should be the among the main concerns of the planning (Healey, 1997; Sandercock, 1998). This is not yet the case for Turkish planning practice which neglects sexual minorities along with the other disadvantaged. Hence, spatial plans in Alsancak are made without any social analysis of the area. On the other hand, the need for voicing the claims and rights of sexworkers (Hubbard, 2001a), as well as LGBTI communities (Doan, 2001b) is stressed in the decisison making for planning in order to have a true understanding of their circumstances in the city, for socially-just, inclusive and safer cities for all.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

Bell, D., and Valentine, G. (1995). Mapping Desire geographies of sexualities. London and Newyork: Routledge.

Bockting, W. O., Robinson, B. E., and Rosser, B. R. (1998). Transgender HIV prevention: A qualitative needs assessment. AIDS Care, 505-525.

Brooks-Gordon, B. (2008). State Violence Towards Sex Workers. BMJ: British Medical Journal, 527-528.

Butler, T., and Robson, G. (2003). London Calling The Middle Classes and the Re-making of Inner London. Oxford. New York: Berg.

Cochran, B. N., Stewart, A. J., Ginzler, J. A., and Cauce, A. M. (2002). Challenges Faced by Homeless Sexual Minorities: Comparison of Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Homeless Adolescents With Their Heterosexual Counterparts. American Journal of Public Health, 773–777.

Cohen, A. P. (1985). The symbolic construction. London: Routledge.

Doan, P. (2009). Safety and Urban Environnnents Transgendered Experiences of the City. Women and Environments , 22-25.

Doan, P. L. (2001a). Are the Transgendered the Mine Shaft Canaries of Urban Areas? Planners Network Newsletter, 8-10.

Doan, P. L. (2001b). Why Question Planning Assumptions and Practices about Queer Spaces. P. L. Doan içinde, Queerying Planning Challenging Heteronormative Assumptions and Reframing Planning Practice (s. 1-20). Cornwall: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Doan, P. L. (2007). Queers in the American City: Transgendered perceptions of urban space. Gender, Place and Culture, 57-74.

Doan, P. L. (2010). The tyranny of gendered spaces – reflections from beyond the gender dichotomy. Gender, Place and Culture, 635-654.

Doan, P. L. (2011). Why Question Planning Assumptions and Practices About Queer Spaces. P. L. Doan içinde, Queerying Planning: Challenging Heteronormative Assumptions and Reframing Planning Practice (s. 1-20). Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Ltd. .

Eade, J., and Mele, C. (2002). Understanding the City. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Efe Güney, M., and Ayhan Selçuk, İ. (2016). LGBTTs of Turkey between the east and the west– the city and the world through their eyes in the case of Izmir. Gender, Place and Culture.

Efe Güney, M., Ergin, Ş., and Ayhan Selçuk, İ. (2014). Cinsel Alanda Öteki Olarak Tanımlanan Nüfusun Kentsel Alan Kullanımı. İzmir: Bilim Ofset Basım Yayım ve Tic. Ltd. Şti.

Efe-Güney, M., and Demircioğlu, F. (2015). Lgbtt Bireylerin Buluşma Noktası Olarak KullandıklarıMekânların Şehir Planlama Kapsamında İncelenmesi. Planlama, 147–157.

Fainstein, S. S., and Fainstein, N. I. (1971). City Planning and Political Values . Urban Affairs Review , 341 - 362.

Gotham, K. F. (2003). Toward an understanding of the spatiality of urban poverty: the urban poor as spatial actors. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 723–737.

Gökçen Dündar, Ş. (2010). Rise of Culture and Fall of Planning in İzmir, Turkey. Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural, 51-66.

Harcourt, C., van Beek, I., Heslop, J., McMahon, M., and Donovan, B. (2001). The health and welfare needs of female and transgender street sex workers in New South Wales. Health and Work, 84-89.

Healey, P. (1997). Collaborative Planning. Basingstoke: Mac Millan.

Hubbard, P. (1997). Red-light districts and Toleration Zones: geographies of female street prostitution in England and Wales. Area, 129-140.

Hubbard, P. (2000). Desire/disgust: mapping the moral contours of heterosexuality. Progress in Human Geography, 191-217.

Hubbard, P. (2001a). Planning for Sex/Work. P. L. Doan içinde, Queerying Planning Challenging Heteronormative a ssumptions and r eframing Planning Practice (s. 169-184). Cornwall: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Hubbard, P. (2001b). Sex Zones: Intimacy, Citizenship and Public Space. Sexualities, 51-71.

Hubbard, P. (2011). Planning for Sex/Work. P. L. Doan içinde, Queerying Planning: Challenging Heteronormative Assumptions and Reframing Planning Practice (s. 169-184). Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

Hubbard, P., and Sanders, T. (2003). Making space for sex work: female street prostitution and the production of urban space. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 75–89.

Hubbard, P., and Whowel, M. (2008). Revisiting the red light district: Still neglected, immoral and marginal? Geoforum, 1743–1755.

Hubbard, P., Matthews, R., and Scoular, J. (2008). Regulating sex work in the EU: prostitute women and the new spaces of exclusion. Gender, Place and Culture, 137-152.

İmar ve Şehircilik Daire Başkanlığı, N. P. (2015). Konak 1. Etap (Alsancak-Kahramanlar Bölgesi) Nazım İmar Planı Raporu 1/5000. İzmir: İzmir Büyükşehir Belediyesi.

Jackson, E., and Benson, M. (2014). Neither 'Deepest, Darkest Peckham' nor 'Run-of-the-Mill' East Dulwich: The Middle Classes and their 'Others' in an Inner-London Neighbourhood. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 1195–1210.

Joseph, L. (2008). Finding Space Beyond Variables: An Analytical Review of Urban Space and Social Inequalities. Spaces for Difference: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 29-50.

Kaya, A. Y. (2010). 19. Yüzyıldan 21. Yüzyıla İzmir Ekonomisinde Süreklilik ve Kırılmalar. D. Yıldırım, and E. Hasanpolat içinde, Değişen İzmir'i Anlamak (s. 3-5). Ankara: Phoenix Yayınları.

Knopp, L. (1995). Sexuality and urban space: a framework for analysis. G. Valentine, and D. Bell içinde, Mapping desire: geographies of sexualities (s. 146-160). London: Routledge.

Krüsi, A., Kerr, T., Taylor, C., Rhodes, T., and Shannon, K. (2016). 'They won't change it back in their heads that we're trash': the intersection of sex work-related stigma and evolving policing strategies. Sociology of Health and Illness, 1137–1150.

Laing, M., and Cook, I. R. (2014). Governing Sex Work in the City. Geography Compass, 505-515.

Massey, D. (1994). Space, Place, and Gender. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Namaste, K. (1996). Genderbashing: sexuality, gender, and the regulation of public space. Environment and Planning D; Society and Space, 221-240.

Nichols, A. (2010). Dance Ponnaya, Dance! Police Abuses Against Transgender Sex Workers in Sri Lanka. Feminist Criminology, 195-222.

O'Neill, M., Campbell, R., Hubbard, P., Pitcher, J., and Scoular, J. (2008). Living with the Other: Street sex work, contingent communities and degrees of tolerance. CRIME MEDIA CULTURE, 73-93.

Pitcher, J., Campbell, R., Hubbard, P., O'Neill, M., and Scoular, J. (2006). Living and working in areas of street sex work. From conflict to coexistence. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Pratt, G. (1999). Geographies of identity and difference: marking boundaries. D. Massey, J. Allen, and P. Sarre içinde, Human geography today (s. 151-168). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Pratt, G., and Hanson, S. (1994). Geography and the Construction of Difference. Genderi Place and Culture, 5-29.

Salisbury, M. E., and Michael, D. (2016). An exploratory study examining needs, access, and competent social services for the transgender community in Phoenix, Arizona. Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 119-136.

Sandercock, L. (1998). Making the Invisible Visible A Multicultural Planning History. California: University of California Press.

Seitz, D. K. (2015). The Trouble with Flag Wars: Rethinking Sexuality in Critical Urban Theory. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 251-264.

Valentine, D. (2003). The calculus of pain: Violence, anthropological ethics, and the category transgender. Ethnos, 27-48.

Valentine, G. (2008). Living with difference reflections on geographies of encounter. Progress in Human Geography, 323-37. Vali Göksuya Ayrımcılık Uyarısı. (2004, October 21). Retrieved from https://bianet.org/bianet/insan-haklari/45597).

Weitzer, R. (2009). Sociology of Sex Work. Annual Review of Sociology, 213-234.

Young, I. M. (1990). Justice and Politics of Difference. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Zandi-Sayek, S. (2012). Ottoman Izmir. The Rise of a Cosmopolitan Port (1840-1880). Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press.