
“Early Republican Ankara”: Struggle over Historical Representation and the Politics of Urban Historiography

Journal of Urban History
37(5) 661–679

© 2011 SAGE Publications

Reprints and permission: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

DOI: 10.1177/0096144211407738

<http://juh.sagepub.com>



Bülent Batuman¹

Abstract

This article discusses the emergence of a particular historical representation: that of “early republican Ankara.” Becoming the capital of the newly born Turkish nation-state in 1923, Ankara was conceived as the symbolic locus of Turkish modernization. The old Ottoman town was rapidly transformed into a modern capital. However, “early republican Ankara” as a historiographic category is a product of the 1990s. In this period, two distinct representations of the city surfaced. One was the outcome of the incorporation of the postmodern critique of modernization into Turkish political history and was supported by the growing interest in urban studies. The other was a direct product of the nationalist call of the Turkish political establishment in the face of pressure from Kurdish nationalism and political Islam. Within this context, the notion of “early republican Ankara” emerged as a nostalgic image to promote national unity.

Keywords

early republican Ankara, politics of urban historiography, politics of nostalgia, Turkish modernization, Turkish urban studies

History as a scholarly practice has to take power relations seriously in at least two senses. First, to be able to grasp a set of events that took place in the past, the power struggles that shaped these events have to be studied. Second, it is also necessary to remember that the knowledge of a certain past brings about a particular representation of that historical moment, and as history writing is an act carried out in the present, such representation—although its referent is long gone—still means something today; it has significance within the context of current power relations. That is, historical knowledge carries with it the burden not only of past politics but also those of today. This is even more true when the object of historical concern is the city. The meanings and symbolisms attributed to cities and their spaces are components of the social practices that flourish in them. Obviously, such collectively shared meanings are shaped by the traces of past events, and history as a practice involves the reproduction of these meanings through the interpretation(s)

¹Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey

Corresponding Author:

Bülent Batuman, Department of Urban Design and Landscape Architecture,

Bilkent University, 06800 Ankara, Turkey.

Email: bbatuman@gmail.com

of these events. This article analyzes the contemporary political meanings of Ankara, the capital of modern Turkey, as an object of urban historiography.

After serving as the center of the national War of Independence between 1919 and 1922, Ankara was declared the capital in 1923, a few days prior to the proclamation of the republic. In the following years, it gradually became the symbol of modern Turkey in many senses: as a capital city designed after its European counterparts, as an example of modern city planning and urban development, and as the stage for the emergence of a modern lifestyle. That is, Ankara was to be simultaneously the symbol, the stage, and a major instrument of modernization. The instrumentality of Ankara for the republican project has come to determine not only the development of the city but also the popular perception of its image: the construction process that followed its declaration as the capital dramatically marked the history of Ankara, determining the future development of the urban environment but also affecting the image of the city as one “built from the scratch.” This mythical image that suppressed the city’s past has been influential throughout the republican history of Ankara. In fact, the history of modern Ankara can be read in terms of the rise and decline of this ideological construct, and this corresponds to the sequence of urban political clashes. In the eyes of the urban middle classes at times of social conflict, early republican Ankara, the idyllic setting of the emerging bourgeoisie, has been the signifier of an ideal environment that excluded the lower classes. This nostalgic representation is clearly political; it is a specific component of the urban political struggle over the social-political meaning of the city.

In what follows, I will argue that the final episode witnessing the rise of this particular image of early republican Ankara as an object of nostalgic longing took place in the late 1990s. In this period, the Turkish political establishment was overwhelmed by Kurdish separatism on the one hand and the rise of political Islam on the other. In response, the status quo was reinforced with a neo-nationalist discourse that borrowed its symbols from the early republican period, among which Ankara was the favorite. Nevertheless, the same period also witnessed the emergence of Ankara as a favored topic in urban studies, and researchers scrutinized the making of the modern capital of the newly born nation-state. Therefore, the late 1990s saw the appearance of two distinct historiographies regarding the city: there were the studies aiming to uncover the relations between the social dynamics of the early republican period and urban space, and there was also a growing literature that reproduced a nostalgic image of this period, especially of Ankara as its symbolic locus of this period.¹ As I will detail in the following, these two sets of literature represent opposing ideological stances regarding the interpretation of the early republican period within the political milieu of the late 1990s.

“Early Republican Ankara” as a Research Category

Although the founding years of the Turkish Republic have been a major topic of investigation, this period was not defined as “early republican” until the 1990s.² Previously, it had generally been defined with reference to its political characteristics and identified as either “the single-party period” or the “Atatürk period.” Most such studies were produced in political history and were primarily descriptive narratives avoiding critical engagement. Yet the early 1990s witnessed the emergence of analyses criticizing this foundational period. Finding an echo in daily politics with the concept of the “second republic,”³ this approach signaled the importation into Turkish scholarship of a postmodern critique.⁴ In this context, the authoritarian character of the nation-building process was seen as an intrinsic feature that marked the Turkish state, and state dominance throughout republican history had to be understood as a consequence of this constitutive moment.⁵ The founding principles of the republic—state control of the economy and a radical interpretation of nationalism and secularism—were the products of specific historical conditions that had long since become obsolete. It was time for radical reform to reshape the

Turkish political structure. This liberal call paved the way for a scholarship that critically engaged with various aspects of the social and cultural dimensions of nation-building.

The emergence of “early republican Ankara” as a historiographic category represents a new approach to the founding years of the republic, evaluating this era through a critique of modernity. The earliest study referring to the “early republican period” in its title was a dissertation completed in Boğaziçi University in 1992.⁶ In the following years, a number of theses that examined the “early republican period” were submitted to the Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences and the Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History of the same university. These studies also illustrated the diversified array of topics in the field of history in the 1990s. Ödül Bozkurt, for instance, investigated the making of women’s identity during the process of education, while Nurşen Gürboğa did the same through an analysis of the visual image of women disseminated in the popular magazines of the period.⁷ Ali Dikici analyzed the alphabet reform with reference to the dichotomy of the elite versus the people, while İnci Caner studied the planning and urban development of “the capital city of Ankara” in the “early republican period.”⁸ All of these studies applied the critique of modernity to the Turkish case through the analysis of cultural categories such as gender, language, and the built environment.

Caner’s study on Ankara and its urban transformation is particularly important for our discussion. In fact, there is a striking international interest in Ankara as an architectural expression of Turkish modernization, which is reflected in graduate studies pursued in various institutions in these years. Jean-François Pérouse, for instance, analyzed the transformation of “Angora” (as it was called during the Ottoman era) to “Ankara” between 1919 and 1950. Similarly, Margaret Anne Lynch related the urban development of Ankara to the making of Turkish national identity.⁹ In the meantime, Turkish researchers were also scrutinizing Ankara in institutions at home and abroad. Aysin Koçak’s master’s thesis, finished at METU, and Zeynep Kezer’s dissertation, pursued in the United States, both investigated the relationship between the building of Ankara as the modern capital and the politics of nation building with almost the same conceptual framework. Tarik Şengül, who finished his PhD study at the University of Kent in Canterbury, discussed the politics of urbanization using the case of Ankara.¹⁰ The common point in these studies is their approach to Ankara as an object serving as both a symbol and an instrument of republican modernization. In the following years, the city as well as the nation-building process would be subject to analyses with different themes and on various scales.

These studies mark the emergence of Ankara as an object of inquiry within Turkish urban history. Until then, the most influential topic in Turkish urban history was the concept of the “Islamic city,” utilized to define non-Western cities. Following Janet Abu-Lughod’s criticism of the “myth of the Islamic city,” it gradually lost its influence.¹¹ Nevertheless, this approach has dominated Turkish urban history, whose previous most important problem was defining the Ottoman city.¹² After the 1990s, Turkish urban history followed the global trend of linking urban and social history.¹³ If one reason for Ankara’s emergence in the 1990s as a specific research topic connected to the founding years of the republic was the inevitable spread of these critical debates into urban history, another was the growing interest in the social sciences, of the concept of space. The consideration of space as a component of social relations has a history of, at least, more than three decades. This interest in space as a constituent of social phenomena can be traced back to the urban upheavals in Europe and the United States during the 1960s. Nevertheless, the emergence of a spatialized social theory is indebted to the encounter between Marxism and various academic disciplines, especially geography and urban sociology.¹⁴

According to Derek Gregory, the first decade of spatial studies was dominated by the political economy approach; however, this approach was soon to be influenced, if not taken over, first by developments in social theory and then cultural studies.¹⁵ For Edward Soja, this process of the “spatialization of critical social theory” represented a shift into “postmodern geographies”

beyond the borders of orthodox Marxist inquiry. The most important scholar cited in such studies in the 1990s was Henri Lefebvre, who, for Soja, demonstrated a path of spatialization leading beyond Marxism.¹⁶ The dispersion of issues in social theory and the rejection of a metanarrative in critical discourses resulted in a spatially informed array of studies addressing issues of race, gender, ethnicity, postcolonialism, and other factors. The same diversification was observed contemporaneously in the field of urban history.¹⁷

In this context, early republican Ankara became a favored topic for researchers scrutinizing the spatial dimensions of Turkish modernization. Among graduate theses finished in Turkish universities between 1990 and 2006, the number referring in their titles to the “early republican period” has gradually increased: two between 1990 and 1995, twelve for 1996-2000, and thirty-eight for 2001-2006.¹⁸ An examination of these theses reveals that “early republican Ankara” represents more than a mere category of periodization. As mentioned earlier, nation building and a commitment to modernization are seen to mark this era, and the identification of the “early republican period” signals an approach that refers to the critique of modernity.

The emergence of the *early* republican period as a category requires historiographic distance in two senses. First, there has to be a temporal distance to define a particular period as “early.” That is, there is the need for an afterlife that would allow this period to be identified as an earlier phase. Moreover, this label implies that the era under discussion is a finished phase of a longer period: an epoch within republican history, one with a beginning and an end. Second, the category of the early republican era implies a *critical* distance, since the quality of being “early” entails a certain degree of immaturity. In other words, the emergence of the “early republican period” as a historiographic category in the 1990s means that this moment began itself to be seen as a historical stage surpassing the one labeled *early*. These implications embedded within the label *early republican period* are in tune with the postmodern critique of modernity. While a modernist stance imagines itself as omnipresent, the postmodern critique historicizes modernity and its self-confident rationality. In this regard, the category “early republican period” defines the era as marked by a modernist will, one that has now come to an end.

Parallel to the increase in analyses of the “early republican period,” studies on the era’s built environment also began to increase. In 1996-2001, the number of studies on early republican architecture and urbanism was four, all of which analyzed Ankara. In 2002-2006, there were fourteen such theses, five of which focused directly on the capital. These figures include only theses whose titles refer to the “early republican period.” A significant number study the spaces of Ankara without referring to the city’s name in their titles.¹⁹ These figures are provided to give a general idea of the growing interest in early republican Ankara in the period under discussion.

It has to be mentioned that there had also been studies dealing with the urban development of republican Ankara that did not refer to a critique of modernity.²⁰ What differentiates the studies produced in the second half of the 1990s is that they have analyzed Ankara in its relation to the nation-building process through the critique of modernization. Themes of these studies included the production of space, the role of urban space in (national) identity formation, urban and architectural expressions of social and cultural processes, as well as the transmission of ideologies through the built environment. By this time, “early republican Ankara” had already emerged as a research category, but to detect the moment in which it first appeared, we must turn to the beginning of that decade.

A significant event marking the circulation of “early republican Ankara” as a historiographic category was a colloquium co-organized by the Ankara Section of the Chamber of Architects and the German Embassy in October 1993. This brought together scholars from Turkish and German institutions, who had been working on the built environment of early republican Ankara.²¹ Interestingly, the phrases “early republican period” and “early republican architecture” were used by almost all participants, although the title of the colloquium did not include them. While

some of the speakers referred to the “early republican period” in their titles, others used it throughout their presentations.²² Among the participants, an interesting case is that of Gönül Tankut, whose pioneering work on the planning of republican Ankara was published in 1990: although her book did not contain the phrase “early republican period,” the title of her presentation was “Urban Architecture in the Early Republican Period: Ankara.” Furthermore, if we examine an earlier lecture series organized by the Ankara Section of the Chamber in 1990-1991, the popularity of “early republican Ankara” as a discursive category becomes even more striking. Although the participants were mostly the same architectural history scholars, the 1990-1991 lectures that discussed the early republican era did not define it as such.²³ It seems that the phrase “early republican Ankara” entered circulation in 1992-1993 and was quickly accepted within the field of architectural history.²⁴ As mentioned earlier, this was a joint outcome of the emergence of the critique of modernity on the one hand and the increasing international interest in space within the social sciences on the other.

I have argued that the first wave of studies on the urban history of early republican Ankara that borrowed their conceptual tools from the critique of modernity grasped the city as a totality and simultaneously as a stage and instrument of Turkish modernization. Soon the research topics rapidly diversified, although the general framework prevailed. The social, cultural, and political structures of the early republic began to be analyzed through its spaces. For instance, while Kıvanç Kılınç analyzed the avant-garde in Turkish architecture on the scale of a single building, Ayşe Demet Erkan examined manifestations of republican ideology through the analysis of a specific neighborhood.²⁵ Focusing on larger urban spaces, Özlem Çağlar and Meltem Özten discussed the role of particular boulevards (Atatürk Boulevard and İstasyon Street, respectively) as tools of modernization.²⁶ Moreover, larger urban parks, as appropriate examples problematizing the human-nature relationship, did not escape scrutiny.²⁷ While the objects of analyses varied widely, the themes of the studies were also picked from a broad range, including political hegemony, gender, and ecology.²⁸ Predictably, the concepts of discourse and representation—and their instrumentality in modernization—were also among preferred conceptual tools. For instance, in their theses, Emel Dinçer and Didem Ertuğrul Aksamaoğlu examined the mutual relationship between literary representation and architectural expression, while Diler Özdemir and Zahide Korkmaz discussed particular grounds (the former the Hippodrome and the latter the National Stadium) as spaces of mass parades serving the dissemination of a republican discourse of modernization.²⁹

“Early Republican Ankara” as an Object of Nostalgic Yearning

While these scholarly works were expanding, the political atmosphere of the 1990s gave way to the emergence of a distinct urban historiography also focusing on early republican Ankara. In the 1990s, the two enduring anxieties of the Turkish political establishment intensified. The first of these was the Kurdish question, which assumed a new form with the Kurds achieving autonomy in northern Iraq after the first Gulf War. The second was the rise of political Islam with its successive election victories. The increasing influence of Islamism in the political arena generated a considerable discontent among the urban middle classes who had embraced the modernist and secular culture of the republic. The feeling of being under the threat of fundamentalist oppression found its expression in the form of nostalgia toward the golden age of the early republican period.

Nostalgia is a product of a transformative process; hence, it is an essential part of modernity.³⁰ The anxiety caused by change prompts yearning for an ideal(ized) past. That is, nostalgia is a matter of the present more than it is a matter of the past. The remembrance of the past from the viewpoint of the present serves for the reappropriation of the present.³¹ It is crucial to note that the past that is longed for is not only a recollection but a re-presentation; it is a constructed

situation that addresses the present condition. As the origin of the term reveals, what nostalgia longs for is home.³² And it is not a coincidence that the city of Ankara was a major instrument through which such nostalgia was fabricated; it was the home imagined as the untainted locus of Republican modernity.³³ Imagined as a *tabula rasa* for the republican project, Ankara of the 1930s was christened as “early Republican Ankara,” a fixed image to become the lost object of nostalgic yearning.

Esra Özyürek has discussed the nostalgia for the early republican period that emerged in the 1990s and defined this ideological stance as “nostalgic Kemalism.”³⁴ According to Özyürek, the major promoters of nostalgia were the bureaucratic elite and middle-class civil servants, who were negatively influenced by the economic liberalization of the 1980s. Political pressures from rising Islamism and Kurdish separatism and the increasing intervention of the IMF and the EU into the Turkish economy and politics (especially in regard to human rights violations) also created considerable discontent among these social groups.³⁵ In other words, nostalgia emerged as an ideological response to the declining material conditions of a particular social stratum in the 1990s. And “early republican Ankara” was to be a significant object to be deployed in the materialization of this nostalgic discourse. The highest peak of the use of Ankara as a nostalgic symbol was during 1997–1998, when the coalition government in power (in which the Islamist Welfare Party was the leading partner) was forced by the Armed Forces to resign and the WP was closed down by the Supreme Court.³⁶ Nevertheless, it is possible to detect the emergence of such political exploitation of Ankara in the early 1990s. In the following, I analyze a set of publications written about Ankara between early 1990s and early 2000s. I propose to examine these publications in three categories: personal narratives representing Ankara as a nostalgic object, historiographic narratives *framed* to fit into a nostalgic narrative, and finally, books that make extensive use of the photographs of early republican Ankara and comprising a significant body of work.

In the 1990s, a number of biographical works were published that attracted a significant readership. These were the accounts of individuals belonging to the first generation of the Republic and who had witnessed the early republican era as children or teenagers.³⁷ Within these narratives, the early republican period represents a lost utopia; it corresponds to a time when the state and its citizens united enthusiastically around the same ideals. In this regard, the individual members of this generation became the bodily symbols of that period; their lost youth was also the golden age of the republic (understood as being under the threat of Islamism).³⁸ Moreover, the “early” republican period literally signifies a childlike epoch within these narratives; observed from the 1990s, the innocence of (the nation’s) childhood days are gone forever. As discussed in detail by Özyürek, personal stories merge with the public history of the period, and within the accounts of these authors, each of these two is often substituted for the other. Thus, the individuals carve out personal spaces within republican history and the life stories are reconstructed with reference to official history. Nevertheless, what is significant for our discussion is the role of Ankara within these accounts. Early republican Ankara, in these narratives, appears as the “ideal home” that is longed for; it emerges as the peaceful shelter of early republican life:

We used to go to bed without locking our door. Ankara was such a safe place. It was a different city then. It had a very high-quality parliament. For example, the members of the Republican People’s Party were appointed [as opposed to being elected]. The people they chose for such offices were all educated, successful people. They brought in governors, judges and the best known people.³⁹

For the republican elite, the city was a large home; yet the borders of this home did not correspond to the actual boundaries of the town. The new elite that were to become the nucleus of the

bourgeois society ignored the prevailing social relations reproduced by the townspeople. They pretended that the urban life they experienced represented the social practices that dominated the whole city. The same thing was valid for the perception of the city as well; Ankara as the symbol of modern Turkey was the newly built environments occupied by the emerging bourgeoisie and the state elite. This territory excluded the old town and its inhabitants.⁴⁰

Another feature that made early republican Ankara the “ideal home” was the figure of the “father”.⁴¹ A quick look at the personal accounts on early republican Ankara reveals that a major aspect of Ankara was the possibility of a physical encounter with Atatürk himself.⁴² In the narratives of various authors, the excitement of the narrator (as a child or a teenager) is related as a metaphysical experience with which the reader should identify, since the city is “Mustafa Kemal’s Ankara,”⁴³ and “Atatürk and Ankara cannot be imagined one without the other.”⁴⁴ Within the nostalgic narrative, the relationship between Ankara and Atatürk is one between the home and the father. Remembered as a safe haven, early republican Ankara emerges as an amalgamation of private memories and official history.

It is striking to observe that the nostalgic narratives produced on Ankara in the 1990s constantly reproduced two main themes. The first one of these is the notion that the local people of Ankara were almost already republicans (even before the arrival of republican cadres) and supported the nationalist cause of Mustafa Kemal unconditionally. The second is the myth that Ankara was built from scratch in the middle of the Anatolian plain. In fact, these two propositions conflict with each other; while the first attributes a revolutionary social essence to Ankara, the second denies any significant social or physical milieu, since the new capital was to be created on a tabula rasa.

The first theme is generated through the account of Mustafa Kemal’s arrival in Ankara in late 1919 and his welcome by the locals. This moment is significant since it marks the convergence of the histories of the National War of Independence and that of the city. From then on, this moment would be remembered as the point zero of this joint history, rendering the previous history of Ankara irrelevant. The narration of the encounter between the republicans and the natives of Ankara is one in which facts and symbols merge into each other:

It is a cold, foggy and rainy day. A voice, a call breaks over the slothful city like a thunderbolt: “Mustafa Kemal is coming.”

The sleepy Ankara, or Ankara which was assumed sleepy, heard that voice, received that call, and instantly rose from its abandonment, from its loneliness.

Now, the whole city is in excitement. The whole city is on the streets to greet him. The city has recognized its Savior and believed in him.⁴⁵

From then on Atatürk and Ankara become inseparable; Ankara is always remembered through a reference to the leader. In other words, it becomes impossible to envision an Ankara other than the early republican Ankara. This is also true for the texts themselves; for instance, Mehmet Mehdi Mıhcıoğlu, who provides an ethnographic description of the daily life in the 1920s in Ankara, does not refer to Atatürk or mention the existence of the state elite in Ankara throughout his narrative. He, then, abruptly allocates some ten to fifteen pages to his childhood encounters with Atatürk, which stands inconsistent with the rest of the book.⁴⁶ Similarly, Şeref Erdoğan’s work on Ankara’s historical district names cannot avoid narrating anecdotes involving Atatürk.⁴⁷ In the aforementioned quotation, it is also significant that Ankara is personified with a revolutionary character. The best example of the essentialist identity attributed to early republican Ankara is found in the foreword written for Bilal Şimşir’s book on the moving of the capital to Ankara:

Ankara has historically been a city that knew the meaning of freedom and sacrificed for it. For the people of Ankara and its surroundings independence is a way of life. Ankara is the city of heroic, free and wise people. Ankara has followed the events during the emergence of the War of Independence, saw the facts rapidly and responded accordingly.⁴⁸

The significant point is that the foreword, written by the president of the Ankaralılar Foundation,⁴⁹ conflicts with the body of work. This is a common aspect of the books published (or republished) in the honor of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Republic. Şimşir, who is a retired diplomat and a historian, narrates the declaration of Ankara as the capital of the young nation-state based on his research in the archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Although his narrative has a nationalistic and state-oriented character (his main theme is the ill-mannered opposition of the Western representatives to the move from Istanbul to Ankara), the author has methodological concerns. The foreword, however, forces the text to fit into a different framework that imagines early republican Ankara as a mythical entity. Most of the books that were published during 1998-2001 share the same feature; especially the texts that do not reproduce a nostalgic narrative are framed to reproduce this image via forewords and prefaces. For instance, Nejat Akgün's monograph on Ankara transforms into the conveyor of a Kemalist message through the foreword penned by a member of the Executive Board of the Ankara Club, the publisher of the book.⁵⁰ A similar case is the new edition of Erdoğan's folkloric study, which was originally published in 1965. While the aim of the book was defined as "informing young people about this historical city" in the author's preface, the new edition published by the Ankaralılar Foundation includes two introductory notes (by the Minister of Culture and a member of the Foundation) that identify the book as "a major source on the heart of Turkey and the symbol of the Republic."⁵¹ Particularly the old books that were reprinted in this period are striking since they do not provide a nostalgic account when they narrate the early republican history of Ankara. For instance, Naşit Hakkı Uluğ's study (originally published in 1970) chronicles the beginning of the War of Independence in Ankara; yet, it neither generates a nostalgic idealization nor personifies Ankara. Nevertheless, this task would be accomplished by the foreword written by the Vice-President of the Ankara Club: "Ankara, today, is a great city holding its greatest citizen in its heart in Anıtkabir (Atatürk's Mausoleum) and providing him an eternal shelter."⁵²

The same thing is valid for a group of studies that did not have anything in common with the ideological content of the events for the seventy-fifth anniversary but were published by the Ministry of Culture in 1998-2002.⁵³ All these studies were published with forewords penned by the Minister of Culture, which resulted in the transformation of their object of analysis from a particular city (Ankara) into "the heroic capital."⁵⁴ Similarly, there are publications that stand atypical within their own style in order to fit into the ideological framework of this moment. An interesting example is a tourist guidebook that presents Ankara together with Atatürk.⁵⁵ This bilingual (Turkish and English) guidebook, which declared its intention to contribute to the events for the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Republic, has early republican Ankara photographs on its cover and includes an exclusive Atatürk section in the end. Even a straightforward content documenting tourist information on the city assumed an ideological form within this publication boom.

Another publication that stands out within its category is the two-volume literary anthology on Ankara compiled by Esat Bozyiğit.⁵⁶ Compared to similar anthologies published in the same period, this work clearly aims at building a nostalgic narrative via the literary pieces it gathers.⁵⁷ In the preface to the first volume in which the prose works are compiled, the author emphasizes that the significant aspect of "this city created from scratch" is "the relationship between Ankara and Atatürk."⁵⁸ The second volume collecting poems similarly opens with an introduction

entitled “Ankara and Atatürk.”⁵⁹ Even the titles of the volumes are significant; they refer to the lines of a folk song that originally had a melancholic tone over the losses of the wars that devastated Anatolia at the turn of the century.⁶⁰ The song was later modified to connote the mobilization of the national army under the republicans. Nevertheless, the verses frequently refer to the “stone of Ankara”⁶¹ for the sake of rhyme, which in turn provides an unintentional link between the melancholic tone of the song and the physical environment of Ankara. Due to this link, the lines of the song were frequently used metonymically in the nostalgic narratives on early republican Ankara. The covers of both of the volumes were designed using early republican Ankara photographs. As illustrated by these examples, the texts that did not generate a nostalgic image of early republican Ankara were framed to fit into this narrative via instruments such as forewords, titles, and cover design.

Another major theme of the nostalgic narrative on Ankara is the myth of Ankara being built from scratch. The inaccuracy of this claim and the historical background of Ankara have been thoroughly discussed.⁶² Nevertheless, this argument prevailed as an important component of the nostalgic version of early republican history of Ankara. Interestingly, within this narrative, there is an expression that was frequently used in the publications of the 1990s: “once upon a time Ankara.” This expression is simultaneously vague and melancholic enough to connote both the ruined town of Ottoman Ankara (preceding the arrival of the nationalists) and the Ankara of the 1930s as the object of nostalgic desire (the modern capital erected in the middle of nowhere). The same expression was used as the title of three different books and it was also used as the headings of the sections recounting the ruined conditions of old Ankara in two different pieces:⁶³

Then, . . . Ankara was a small, gloomy town, forgotten by almost everyone except for those living in it. . . .

Exhausted, abandoned and fallen. . . . As if crushed under the weight of the past, as if it has fallen out of time and space.

It is the year 1919. The narrow streets are dark. There is malaria and dust storms; there are no schools, theaters, museums or even music. In short, the town is deprived of any benefits of civilization. It is a small, gloomy, melancholic town.⁶⁴

This particular image of Ankara is found in almost all narratives; the more the pre-republican Ankara is rendered desperate, the more the achievements of the republic in building the new capital seem miraculous. It has to be noted that the deprived conditions of Ankara also stands for the crumbling Ottoman Empire. Yet, “once upon a time Ankara,” from the perspective of the 1990s, also signifies the lost home of nostalgia, the modern capital remembered with order and development:

As he created a republic out of a 500-year old empire, Mustafa Kemal was now after building a capital similar to its counterparts in the civilized world. This was his desire. A city of art and culture, with its National Assembly, its universities, conservatories, theaters, concert and exhibition halls. A green city with trees, flowers, parks and forests. . . . An example of modern urbanism; consciously planned and built with aesthetics and elegance. His Ankara would be such a miraculous city.⁶⁵

Hence, “once upon a time Ankara” refers to three different images that negate each other: the Ottoman town of the early 1920s that represents a destroyed urban setting, the modern capital of the 1930s, and the contemporary metropolis of the 1990s. It has to be remembered that within the nostalgic narrative, the contemporary metropolis is identified with the Islamist municipality. For

the educated urban middle classes of Ankara, the election of an Islamist mayor for consecutive terms represents an embarrassing betrayal to "Atatürk's Ankara," which was the symbol of a secular lifestyle. Therefore, both the ruined town of the 1920s and the contemporary city are negations of Ankara in the 1930s. And it is necessary to render these two images deprived and gloomy in order to support the nostalgic narrative centered on the 1930s. What "early republican Ankara" brings to mind is the orderly environment of the 1930s; but as this representation is instrumental to the politics of nostalgia, it implicitly contains references to the 1920s and the contemporary state of the city.

As I have suggested at the beginning of this section, the third group of publications on early republican Ankara that reproduced the nostalgic narrative in the 1990s was the ones that made extensive use of visual material. The earliest examples of this trend were published during a campaign organized by the social democrat municipality of Greater Ankara to raise consciousness among citizens (against the rising influence of political Islam) in the early 1990s. A number of events honoring the seventieth anniversary of Ankara's declaration as the capital were accompanied by a number of publications. An *Ankara City Bibliography* was first published in 1992 in an effort to gather written sources on Ankara. Aside from this, two publications that gave particular consideration to the use of early republican Ankara photographs attract attention. One was an album aiming to create a visual archive of early republican Ankara, gathering postcards of the period.⁶⁶ The other constructed a narrative on the foundation of the Republic, and was based on images of Ankara. This urban narrative also relied heavily on early Ankara photographs.⁶⁷ In addition to those of the Ankara Greater Municipality, the Ministry of Culture also published a volume on Ankara that contrasted contemporary photographs of the city with those taken during the early republican period.⁶⁸ Finally, another collection bringing together historical analyses, personal accounts, and literary pieces on Ankara was published by a private bank.⁶⁹

These four books, published almost simultaneously, share certain features that were functional in the resurfacing of early republican Ankara photographs. They have produced and put into circulation a particular visual representation of Ankara.⁷⁰ These oversized books made extensive use of Ankara photographs of the 1920s and 1930s and were printed on high-quality paper, as the images were their major feature. Ozan Sağdıç's *Bir Zamanlar Ankara* and Mehmet Özel's *Ankara* were specific attempts at creating visual narratives on the early republican city. These publications not only presented a linear history, but also offered a particular route to look at early republican Ankara. The structure of these two books is very similar: the pre-republican history of Ankara—from antiquity to the early twentieth century—is covered in twenty to twenty-five pages and is followed by a main section (of about one hundred pages) on the early republican city, and each includes photographs of contemporary Ankara (of the 1990s) in their final sections.⁷¹ The visual narrative, consistent with the idea of displaying the making of a new capital, begins with the old—wrecked—town of Ankara, moves on to the rebuilt city center (Station Street and Ulus), then to the newly built government center and the villas in Yenisehir. What is striking is the omission of the post-1950 history of Ankara in this narrative. The early republican Ankara becomes the only history of Ankara. However, it is also crucial here to consider the public circulation of this nostalgic image of the city. If the price of these four volumes (all oversized and printed on high-quality paper) is considered, it is clear that these books could only be purchased by the upper-middle-class citizens of Ankara, those who would be the promoters of nostalgic Kemalism throughout the 1990s.

New titles were added to these publications during and after the seventy-fifty anniversary celebrations. A photography album, originally published by the government in 1936 to be distributed abroad, was reprinted in 1998 and presented to the public with a ceremony in Ankara Palas.⁷² The location of the celebration is consistent with the material exhibited since Ankara Palas was a symbolic locale of early republican history.⁷³ In addition, another album containing early

republican Ankara postcards was published in 1998.⁷⁴ *20'li Yılların Bozkır Kasabası Ankara* (Ankara, the prairie town of the 20s), published in the same year, is very similar to the earlier work by Sağıdıç in its use of visuals to build an historical narrative.⁷⁵ The book focuses on the 1920s, that is, it depicts the transformation of the wrecked town into the new capital. The photographs generally used in half-page size (sometimes in full pages and even two pages) persuade the reader/observer about the *truth* of either the ruined town of the 1920s or the modern city of the 1930s. In the same year, Ankara Chamber of Commerce published a book in English.⁷⁶ Similar to the earlier ones, this volume also begins with a brief introduction on the pre-republican history of Ankara and then sets to narrate the republican Ankara with texts and visuals. While the study puts emphasis on the commercial history of the city, it allocates the last forty-five pages to photographs of contemporary Ankara.

The crucial question here is the meaning produced by the Ankara photographs of late 1990s within a narrative framework dominated by the image of early republican Ankara. The answer to this question can be found in the catalogue of an exhibition displaying the Ankara photographs of the 1990s taken by photographer Ozan Sağıdıç. On display during January 2001, this was cosponsored by the Central Bank of Turkey and the Ministry of Culture. Sağıdıç's colored photographs display the contemporary state of the trademark buildings that we are accustomed to seeing in early republican photographs. Their meanings, therefore, are framed by early republican Ankara. According to Dinçer, who wrote a preface to the catalogue, "Ankara is faced with isolation, abandonment and the destruction of identity in recent years" and the city is "on the defensive via the works of Ozan Sağıdıç et al."⁷⁷ The destruction, here, implies the rule of Islamist mayor of Ankara, and the identity being destroyed is that of "republican Ankara." Kaya Özsezgin, in his introductory essay to the catalogue titled "Ankara's Stone and Ozan Sağıdıç," defines the relationship between the black-and-white photographs of early republican Ankara and contemporary photographs of the same spaces as seen in the exhibit:

The buildings photographed by Ozan Sağıdıç . . . emphasize the time gap between the construction of these structures and today. The surroundings of the buildings might have changed, but the time that has elapsed could not loosen the stone that keeps the structure erect.⁷⁸ It is the stone of Ankara, once we wipe the tears of our eyes and look at that stone, or once these photographs take us before these buildings through a mysterious push, we relive the history that the photographs mediate. This is what we want after all.⁷⁹

The quote is striking in that it illustrates the nostalgic link maintained between text and image through the built environment. The city as a piece of architecture is at the same time the proof of the republican will in construction (both literally the construction of the city and the nation-building process) and the signifier of the corrosion of time.⁸⁰ Neither the buildings nor what they represent—that is, the nation-state as the unifier of the people—could resist such corrosion. What we are expected to see and identify with in the early republican Ankara photographs is the ideal environment of the new regime. Yet, it is not merely the quality of the clean physical environments that make this image ideal; it is rather what we *do not see* in the pictures but *know* that exists. This ideal city is the stage of the undisturbed togetherness of the nation-state and its citizens. And this is clearly what is lacking in the 1990s. Therefore, early republican Ankara as a nostalgic historical representation—whether it is constructed with text or image—is filled with the meanings that are attributed to it today. The moment that necessitates the people to unite around the state is precisely the moment of the late 1990s, where this narrative is produced. Early republican Ankara, here, simultaneously serves as the "proof" that such unity is historically possible and calls the city (and its inhabitants) for a return to its origins.

“Early Republican Ankara” as a Terrain of Ideological Struggle

I have shown how the 1990s produced two distinct narratives on early republican Ankara, which were in stark contrast in terms of their methodologies as well as their ideological assumptions. The first narrative rests on the modernity critique and scrutinizes the modernization project of nation-building in the Turkish context. Within this framework, the built environment of early republican Ankara became a fruitful subject as it was conceived as a symbol of modernization by the republicans. The second narrative flourished within the political climate of the 1990s and was marked by a nationalist reaction to the increasing influence of Kurdish nationalism and also political Islam. Within this narrative, early republican Ankara was exploited as a nostalgic sign of the early years of the republic. It was reimagined and re-presented as the idyllic home of republican modernity, allegedly characterized by the unity of the state and its citizens. It is crucial here to consider the interaction between these two narratives and the representations they embody.

As mentioned earlier, these two representations shared the same label of “early republican Ankara.” While that analytical category defined it as a phase of radical modernization, the nostalgic image of early republican Ankara presented it as an ideal social milieu. Both of them agreed on the implication of the term *early* as connoting a period that has ended. Yet, while the critical studies conceived “earliness” as signifying immaturity (especially in terms of democratic social conventions), the nostalgic narrative imagined it as an era of childhood, safely protected by the father figure at home. Another crucial difference between the two representations lay in their self-defined historiographic status. As the former acknowledges that the image (of early republican Ankara) it constructs is a historical representation, the latter presents itself as reality. While treating a historical representation as the re-presentation of reality is a methodological error, it also has political consequences since the popular imagination of the city as reflected in collective memory has a political character.

Moreover, the coexistence of these two representations contains the risk of subordinating the analyses on “early republican Ankara” to the nostalgic narrative. The more the term *early republican Ankara* enters circulation, the more it serves as the evidence of the truth of this representation in public perception. A major component of the historical analyses that yields to this outcome is a number of frequently used sources, produced by the republican elite during the early republican period. One of the most famous examples of these sources is the memoirs of the journalist Falih Rıfkı Atay, a passionate advocate of the republican reforms who also served as a member of parliament.⁸¹ Atay served as the head of the Reconstruction Commission of Ankara and took part in the planning of the city. Hence, his memoirs were widely cited by researchers throughout the 1990s. Some of the oft-quoted passages in Atay’s *Çankaya* include a depiction of the miserable conditions of pre-republican Ankara (pp. 351-55) and a famous anecdote involving an argument between Atatürk and Hermann Jansen (the planner of Ankara) on land speculation (pp. 422-23). Another source is a novel by Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, also a prominent intellectual of the early republican period.⁸² Written in 1934 and titled *Ankara*, the novel is composed of three sections; the first depicting the enthusiasm of the War of Independence, the second portraying the Ankara of the 1930s in which the revolutionary cadres began to mutate into corrupt politicians, and the final section imagining a utopian Ankara in the 1950s. Especially the second part critiquing the Ankara-in-the-making is also a text often quoted by researchers. Some of the favorite sections are the depiction of a scene in front of Ankara Palas where the local people watched the republican elite attending a ball (pp. 115-17) and the appearance of modernist architecture in the city for the first time (pp. 133-34).

The frequent use of these sources is significant in two senses. First, while they are quoted in order to provide details of everyday life in Ankara during the 1920s and 1930s, they reproduce

the viewpoint of the republican elite. In other words, they revitalize the republicans' stance, whose relation to the state is invoked by the neo-nationalist call in the 1990s. Second, these passages were quickly imported into the nostalgic narrative since they illustrated the daily life of the period. In other words, they provided details for the nostalgic image that is aimed to be constructed. Especially those passages depicting the miserable conditions of the Ankara of the early 1920s and anecdotes involving Atatürk were eagerly used in the nostalgic works.

Aside from the surplus political effects of the discursive circulation of "early republican Ankara," it is crucial to consider the producers of these historical studies in relation to the nationalist call of the state against political Islam. It is interesting to note that the celebrations for the seventy-fifth anniversary of the republic were for the first time assigned to a nongovernmental organization, the History Foundation. The intention was to turn the events into a popular festival that would narrow the gap between the state and the citizens against the threat of political Islam. In this regard, the celebrations were a significant incident in which the state interpellated the scholars to serve as intellectuals conveying the state's nationalist call. Significantly, the History Foundation was founded by scholars and intellectuals who had a critical stance against the state and its official history writing.⁸³ In other words, the employment of the History Foundation for the events is significant in that it represents the pledge of the (especially left-wing) intellectuals and scholars to the neo-nationalism of the state as well as the deployment of history writing to this end.

The collaboration between the state bureaucracy and the intellectuals (who have traditionally been a major oppositional power against the state and have suffered especially during the periods of military rule) gradually improved after the JDP's coming to power in 2002. An important reason for this was the controversy around the banning of the headscarf in public institutions, especially universities. As the issue became a major public debate concerning the role of Islam in the public sphere, the effective implementation of the ban in universities made academics a major party within the controversy. Since the use of the headscarf was not seen as an issue of individual freedoms but the demonstration of a political symbol undermining the secularist foundations of the republic, academics turned into the agents of the state overseeing the execution of the ban.

It is not surprising, then, to see the interaction between the two representations of early republican Ankara to be in favor of the nostalgic narrative. Even the scholars who aimed at a critical engagement with the early republican period became supports for the politics of nostalgia. Identified as scholars of early republican Ankara, these academics and intellectuals were invited to give talks in various events aiming to raise consciousness regarding republican values. Hence, although they did not compromise in terms of their scholarship, they semi-consciously allowed their critical analyses to be appropriated by the politics of nostalgia.

Today, both urban studies and nostalgic narratives on early republican Ankara are still in production.⁸⁴ The material on early republican Ankara has not been exhausted by the historiographic studies, nor has the political function of nostalgic representation of early republican Ankara become obsolete. It is crucial to emphasize that both of these narratives are political; if the nostalgic narrative imagines the early days of the republic as an ideal socio-political environment, the researches critiquing the process of Turkish modernization inevitably troubles the ideological presumptions of the Turkish state. Yet, as I have shown previously, regardless of their critical edge, the historical studies on early republican Ankara maintain the risk of being caught up within the politics of nostalgia. As Michel de Certeau has written, there is always a secondary production of a representation that stems from its utilization, and which is not necessarily determined by the intentions of its producers.⁸⁵ That is, since it is impossible to consider history as immune from power relations and history as a practice is always caught up in the politics of its own age, the producers of historical representations have always to be attentive to the political utilization of the representations they produce.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author declared no potential conflicts of interests with respect to the authorship and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author received no financial support for the research and/or authorship of this article.

Notes

1. "Early republican period" refers to the establishment of the Turkish nation-state in 1923 and the consequent implementation of a set of modernizing reforms. It is generally defined with reference to the single-party rule of the Republican People's Party, which lasted until 1950. Sometimes the end of the period is defined by the death of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk in 1938.
2. The only exception to this was İnci Aslanoğlu's study on the architectural history of the period. Nonetheless, this study, which analyzes the 1923-1950 period, does not attribute a particular significance to the label *early republican Ankara*. See İnci Aslanoğlu, *Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Mimarlığı* [The Architecture of the Early Republican Period] (Ankara: METU Faculty of Architecture Pres, 1980).
3. The concept of "second republic" suggested the need for a comprehensive reform that would liberalize the Turkish state.
4. Birkan Uysal Sezer, "Postmodernizm ve İkinci Cumhuriyet" [Postmodernism and the Second Republic], *Amme İdaresi Dergisi* 26 (March 1993): 27-42.
5. Metin Sever and C. Dizdar, eds., *İkinci Cumhuriyet Tartışmaları* [Debates on Second Republic], (Istanbul: Başak Yayınevi, 1993); Mehmet Altan, "İkinci Cumhuriyet Nedir, Ne Değildir?" [Second Republic; What it Is and What it Is not], *Türkiye Günlüğü* 20 (Fall 1992): 10-4.
6. Nuray Mert, "Early Republican Secularism in Turkey: A Theoretical Approach" (Ph.D. dissertation, İstanbul: Boğaziçi University, 1992).
7. Ödül Bozkurt, "The Making of Young Women at an American Missionary School in Early Republican Turkey" (Master's thesis, İstanbul: Boğaziçi University, 1995); Nurşen Gürboğa, "Images of Women Visual Depiction of Women by the Popular Periodicals of Early Republican Turkey: 1920-1940" (Master's thesis, İstanbul: Boğaziçi University, 1996).
8. Ali Dikici, "Early Republican Reforms from the Perspective of Elite vs. the People, with Particular Reference to the Alphabet and Language Reforms" (Master's thesis, İstanbul: Boğaziçi University, 1996); Dilek İnci Caner, "Ankara as the Capital of Turkey: Its Planning and Development in the Early Republican Period" (Master's thesis, İstanbul: Boğaziçi University, 1996).
9. Jean-François Pérouse, "D'Angora à Ankara (1919-1950): la naissance d'une capitale" (Ph.D. dissertation, Université de Reims Champagne-Ardenne, 1994); Margaret Anne Lynch, "The Space between: Turkish National Identity and the Urban Landscape of Ankara" (Master's thesis, University of Texas at Austin, 1996).
10. Zeynep Kezer, "The Making of a National Capital: Ideology and Socio-Spatial Practices in Early Republican Ankara" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1999); Aysin Koçak, "Nation State and Architecture in Early Republican Turkey: The Building Process of Ankara as the National Capital" (Master's thesis, Ankara: METU, 1998); Tarık Şengül, "Hegemony and Urban Space: The Case of the Turkish Capital Ankara" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kent at Canterbury, 1998).
11. Janet Abu-Lughod, "The Islamic City-Historic Myth, Islamic Essence and Contemporary Relevance," *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 19 (1987): 155-76; Zeynep Çelik, "New Approaches to the 'Non-Western' City," *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 58 (1999): 374-81.
12. For a study reviewing urban history in Turkey, see Yunus Uğur, "Şehir tarihi ve Türkiye'de Şehir Tarihciliği: Yaklaşımlar, Konular, ve Kaynaklar" [Urban History and Urban Historiography in Turkey: Approaches, Topics and Sources], *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi* Cilt 3, Sayı 6 (2005): 9-26.

13. Charles Tilly, "What Good Is Urban History," *Journal of Urban History* 22 (1996): 702-10.
14. Edward Soja, *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory* (London: Verso, 1989).
15. Derek Gregory, *Geographical Imaginations* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1994).
16. Although a number of scholars had referred to his writings during the 1980s, the growing interest in Lefebvre in the English-speaking world occurred through the translation of *The Production of Space* into English in 1991. Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1991).
17. Nancy Stieber, "Microhistory of the Modern City: Urban Space, Its Use and Representation," *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 58 (September 1999): 382-91.
18. These figures are gathered through a survey in the database of the National Thesis Center of the Higher Education Council of Turkey.
19. For instance, Uludağ investigates Gençlik Parkı (Youth Park), while Batuman and Yalım analyze different public squares of Ankara that were important spaces of early republican Ankara. Zeynep Sökmen Uludağ, "The Social Construction of Meaning in Landscape Architecture: A Case Study of Gençlik Parkı in Ankara" (Ph.D. dissertation, Ankara: Middle East Technical University, 1998); Bülent Batuman, "Hegemonic Struggle within the Reproduction of Public Space: Domination and Appropriation in and of Kızılay Square" (Master's thesis, Ankara: Middle East Technical University, 2000); İnci Yalım, "Ulus Square as a Representational Form of Collective Memory" (Master's thesis, Ankara: Middle East Technical University, 2001).
20. For example, Sare Sahil, "Cumhuriyet sonrası Türk toplumsal yapı değişimlerinin Ankara Atatürk Bulvarı mekansal yapısında örneklenmesi" [Social transformation of Republican Turkey as illustrated in Ankara Atatürk Boulevard] (Ph.D. dissertation, Ankara: Gazi University, 1986); and the pioneering work of Gönül Tankut, *Bir Başkent'in İmarı: Ankara (1929-1939)* [The construction of a capital: Ankara (1929-1939)] (Ankara: Anahtar Kitaplar Yayınevi, 1990), which has been a major source for the later studies.
21. Chamber of Architects Ankara Section, *Bir Başkent'in Oluşumu: Ankara 1923-1950* [The Making of a Capital: Ankara 1923-1950] (Ankara: Chamber of Architects Ankara Section, 1994).
22. Gönül Tankut, "Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Şehir Mimarisi: Ankara" [Urban Architecture in Early Republican Period], in *Bir Başkent'in Oluşumu: Ankara 1923-1950* (Ankara: Chamber of Architects Ankara Section, 1994), 23-5; Hasan Özbay, "Günümüz Gözüyle Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Yapıları" [Early Republican Buildings as Seen Today], in *Bir Başkent'in Oluşumu: Ankara 1923-1950* (Ankara: Chamber of Architects Ankara Section, 1994), 71-8; İnci Aslanoğlu, "1923-1950 Döneminde Yabancı Mimarların Geleneksel Türk Mimarlığı Üzerine Düşünce ve Uygulamaları" [The Thoughts and Practices of Foreign Architects on Traditional Turkish Architecture in the 1923-1950 Period], in *Bir Başkent'in Oluşumu: Ankara 1923-1950* (Ankara: Chamber of Architects Ankara Section, 1994), 41-5; Leyla Baydar, "1923-1950 Cumhuriyet Dönemi Konut Yapıları" [Residential Buildings in 1923-1950 Republican Period], in *Bir Başkent'in Oluşumu: Ankara 1923-1950* (Ankara: Chamber of Architects Ankara Section, 1994), 46-51.
23. Chamber of Architects Ankara Section, *Ankara Konuşmaları* [Talks on Ankara], (Ankara: Chamber of Architects Ankara Section, 1992).
24. Almost a year earlier, Bozdoğan had discussed architecture and cultural politics in the "early republican era" in a congress in Berlin. See Sibel Bozdoğan, "Modern Architecture and Cultural Politics of Nationalism in Early Republican Turkey" (28 Internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte, Berlin, July 15-20, 1992).
25. Kıvanç Kılınc, "Searching for the Avant-Garde in the Turkish Context: Bacteriology and Chemistry Building of Hıfzısıhha Institute" (Master's thesis, Ankara: Middle East Technical University, 2001); Ayşe Demet Erkan, "A Confrontation between Tradition and Modernity: Republican Ideology, Saraçoğlu Quarter and Paul Bonatz" (Master's thesis, Ankara: Middle East Technical University, 1996).

26. Özlem Çağlar, "Atatürk Boulevard as a Locus of the Modernization Project of the Turkish Republic" (Master's thesis, Ankara: Middle East Technical University, 2001); Meltem Özten, "Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Anadolu Kentinde bir Modernleşme Aracı Olarak 'İstasyon Caddesi' nin İncelenmesi: Ankara Örneği" [Investigation of "Station Street" as a Modernizing Instrument in an Anatolian Town in Early Republican Period: The Case of Ankara] (Master's thesis, Ankara: Middle East Technical University, 2001).
27. Z. S. Uludağ, "The Social Construction of Meaning;" Göksun Akyürek, Modernization and Spatial Practice in Early Republican Ankara: The Gazi Farm and the Atatürk Boulevard" (Master's thesis, Ankara: Middle East Technical University, 2000).
28. Pelin Gürol, "Building for Women's Education During the Early Republican Period in Turkey: İsmet Paşa Girl's Institute in Ankara in the 1930s" (Master's thesis, Ankara: Middle East Technical University, 2003); Güvenç Karamustafa, "Re-reading 'The Jansen Plan': The Early Republican Project of Modernity within Man-Nature Relationship" (Master's thesis, Ankara: Middle East Technical University, 2003).
29. Emel Dinçer, "An Architectural and Literary Overview of Ankara between 1923-1950" (Master's thesis, Ankara: Middle East Technical University, 2000); Didem Ertuğrul Aksamaoğlu, "Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi'nde Ankara kenti mekansal dönüşümlerinin Ankara Romanı üzerinden değerlendirilmesi" [The Evaluation of the Residential Transformation of the City Ankara in the Early Republican Era through the Novel *Ankara*] (Master's thesis, İzmir: Dokuz Eylül University, 2003); Diler Özdemir, "Ankara Hippodrome: The National Celebrations of Early Republican Turkey, 1923-1938" (Master's thesis, Ankara: Middle East Technical University, 2004); Zahide Korkmaz, "Ankara 19 Mayıs Stadyumu'nu (Ankara Milli Stadı'nı) Okumak: Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi'nde Mekân, Toplumsal Yaşantı ve İdeoloji İlişkisi" [Reading the Ankara 19 May Stadium (Ankara National Stadium): Space, Social Life and Ideology Relations] (Master's thesis, Ankara: Gazi University, 2007).
30. Svetlana Boym, *The Future of Nostalgia* (New York: Basic Books, 2001).
31. Sallie Westwood and J. Williams, "Imagining Cities," in S. Westwood and J. Williams, eds., *Imagining Cities: Scripts, Signs, Memories* (London: Routledge, 1997), 1-16, 12.
32. Fred Davis, *Yearning for Yesterday: A Sociology of Nostalgia* (New York: Free Press, 1979). Etymologically nostalgia comes from the Greek for "a painful longing" (algia) to return home (nostos). The original use of the term referred to the symptoms of homesick Swiss soldiers in the seventeenth century. See Boym, *The Future of Nostalgia*, 3.
33. The constructedness of the image of early Republican Ankara in the 1930s has also been analyzed to an extent. A major instrument for such image construction was monuments built in various locations across city. For the making of the Republican imaginary through monuments in Ankara, see Güven Arif Sargın, "Displaced Memories, or the Architecture of Forgetting and Remembrance," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 22 (2004): 659-80; and Bülent Batuman, "Identity, Monumentality, Security: Building a Monument in Early Republican Ankara," *Journal of Architectural Education* 59, no. 1 (September 2005): 34-45.
34. Esra Özyürek, *Nostalgia for the Modern: State Secularism and Everyday Politics in Turkey* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2006).
35. *Ibid.*, 16-7.
36. The WP won the local elections in all the major cities (including Ankara) in 1994. The party also won the general elections in 1995 and came to power with a coalition in 1996. Following the resignation of the Islamist Prime Minister Erbakan in 1997, a coalition government was established among secularist parties. The celebrations for the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Republic in 1998 were widely utilized to disseminate nationalistic enthusiasm among citizens. The 1999 elections witnessed a drop in the votes of Islamist parties; however, the new coalition government had to call for early elections after the severe economic crisis in 2000. The 2002 elections resulted in the victory of the newly established (moderate Islamist) Justice and Development Party (JDP). The following five years witnessed tension

- between the government and the Armed Forces, which was managed well until the presidential elections in 2007. Since it was clear that the JDP was going to elect the president singlehandedly due to its majority in the parliament, the Armed Forces attempted to intervene with a memorandum. The early elections in summer 2007 resulted in a new victory for the JDP, which was followed by the election of the second man of the party as the new president. Yet, the tension between the JDP and the secularist establishment prevails as of late 2008.
37. Cahit Uçuk, *Bir İmparatorluk Çökerken* [While an Empire Was Crumbling] (Istanbul: YKY, 1995); Mina Urgan, *Bir Dinozorun Anıları* [The Memories of a Dinosaur] (Istanbul: YKY, 1998); İbrahim Denктаş, *Başöğretmenli Yıllar* [The Years with the Headmaster] (İstanbul: İnkılâp, 1998); Fırdevs Gümüšoğlu, *Cumhuriyet'te İz Birakanlar: 10. Yıl Kuşağı* [The One who Left Their Imprints: The 10th Anniversary Generation of the Republic] (Istanbul: Kaynak, 2001).
 38. Özyürek, *Nostalgia for the Modern*, 26.
 39. Ibid., 54.
 40. For an analysis of the interactions between the newcomers and the locals, see Funda Şenol Cantek, *Yabancılar ve Yerliler: Başkent Olma Sürecinde Ankara* [Aliens and Natives: Ankara in the Process of Becoming the Capital] (İstanbul: İletişim, 2003).
 41. The representation of Atatürk as the father of his people was also a major component of the republican discourse in the 1930s. See Cantek, *Yabancılar ve Yerliler*, 181-216.
 42. Mehmet Mehdi Mihciöğlu, *Gazi Mustafa Kemal ve Hafızamdaki Ankara* [Mustafa Kemal and the Ankara I Remember] (Ankara, 1998); Orhan Karaveli, *Bir Ankara Ailesinin Öyküsü* [The Story of an Ankara Family] (Istanbul: Pergamon, 1997).
 43. Nezihe Araz, *Mustafa Kemal'in Ankarası* [Mustafa Kemal's Ankara] (Istanbul: Dünya, 1998).
 44. Remzi Uydum, *Atatürk, Ankara ve Seymenler* [Atatürk, Ankara and the Seymens] (Ankara, 1992), 4.
 45. Araz, *Mustafa Kemal'in Ankarası*, 31-2.
 46. Mihciöğlu, *Gazi Mustafa Kemal*.
 47. Şeref Erdoğan, *Ankara'nın Tarihi Semt İsimleri ve Öyküleri* [Ankara's Historical District Names and their Stories] (Ankara: Ministry of Culture, 1999).
 48. Bilal Şimşir, *Ankara'nın Başkent Oluşu* [The Declaration of Ankara as the Capital] (Ankara: Ankaralılar Vakfı, 2001), 7.
 49. The foundation was established in 1996 by the prominent citizens of Ankara. It published a number of books in 1998-2002 that contributed to the making of a nostalgic narrative on early republican Ankara.
 50. Nejat Akgün, *Burası Ankara* [Here is Ankara] (Ankara: Ankara Club, 1996).
 51. Şeref Erdoğan, *Ankaram* [My Ankara] (Ankara: Ministry of Culture, 1999), x.
 52. Naşit Hakkı Uluğ, *Hemşehrimiz Atatürk* [Our Citizen Atatürk] (Istanbul: İş Bank, 1997), vi.
 53. Mehmet Sarioğlu, *Ankara: Bir Modernleşme Öyküsü (1919-1945)* [Ankara: A Story in Modernization (1919-1945)] (Ankara: Ministry of Culture, 2001); Mehmet Tunçer, *Ankara (Angora) Şehri Merkez Gelişimi (14.-20. yy)* [Development of the City Center in Ankara (Angora) (14th to 20th Centuries)] (Ankara: Ministry of Culture, 2001).
 54. Erdoğan, *Ankara'nın Tarihi Semt İsimleri ve Öyküleri*, v.
 55. Murat Koçoğlu, *Başkent Ankara & Atatürk Şehir Rehberi '98* [Capital Ankara & Atatürk City Guide '98] (Istanbul: ProLink, 1998).
 56. Esat Bozyiğit, *Ankara'nın Taşına Bak: Türk Yazınında Ankara Seçki* [See the Stone of Ankara: Ankara in Turkish Literature, A Collection] (Ankara: Ministry of Culture, 2000); Esat Bozyiğit, *Ankara'nın Taştur Yolu: Türk Yazınında Ankara Seçki II* [Ankara's Streets Are Stone-paved: Ankara in Turkish Literature, A Collection II] (Ankara: Ministry of Culture, 2001).
 57. See Enis Batur, ed., *Ankara Ankara* (İstanbul: YKY, 1994) for a collection of essays that also includes literary works. For an anthology of poetry on Ankara, see Hüseyin Atabaş and A. Cengizkan, eds. *Ankara Rüzgarı* [The Wind of Ankara] (Ankara: Ministry of Culture, 1998).
 58. Bozyiğit, *Ankara'nın Taşına Bak*, xiii.

59. Ibid., 1-13.
60. Ankara'nın taşına bak/Gözlerimin yaşına bak/Biz düşmanı esir aldık/Şu feleğin işine bak/Ankara'nın taştır yolu/Düşman aldı sağı solu/Yetiş artık Gazi Kemal/ an ağlıyor Anadolu. [See the stone of Ankara/ See the tears in my eyes/We have defeated the enemy/See the twist of fate for us/Ankara's streets are stone-paved/We are under enemy raid/Come and save us Kemal Pasha/Anatolia is drenched in blood.]
61. Andesite is also known as "Ankara Stone" in Turkey, since it is abundant in the region.
62. In fact, Ankara was a significant Roman settlement as well as a major trade city during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. For the repressed pre-republican history of Ankara, see Suavi Aydın, "Ankara, Ankara, Güzel Ankara . . . ," *Kebikeç* 9 (2000): 65-75.
63. Nezih Başgelen, *Bir Zamanlar Ankara* [Once upon a Time Ankara] (Istanbul: Arkeoloji ve Sanat, 1998); Cüneyt Arcayürek, *Bir Zamanlar Ankara* (Ankara: Bilgi, 2005); Ozan Sağdıç, *Bir Zamanlar Ankara* (Ankara: Ankara Greater Municipality, 1993); Burçak Evren, *20'li Yılların Bozkır Kasabası* [Ankara, the Prairie Town of the 20s] (Istanbul: AD Kitapçılık, 1998), 9-84; Araz, *Mustafa Kemal'in Ankarası*, 25-38.
64. Araz, *Mustafa Kemal'in Ankarası*, 25.
65. Ibid., 36.
66. BELKO, *Ankara Posta Kartları ve Belge Fotoğrafları Arşivi* [Ankara Postcards and Documentary Photographs Archive] (Ankara: Belko, 1994).
67. Sağdıç, *Bir Zamanlar Ankara*.
68. Mehmet Özel, *Ankara* (Ankara: Ministry of Culture, 1992).
69. Enis Batur, *Ankara Ankara*.
70. For a discussion of the nostalgic use of early republican Ankara photographs, see Bülent Batuman, "Photography at Arms: 'Early Republican Ankara' from Nation-Building to Politics of Nostalgia," *METU Journal of the Faculty of Architecture* 25, no. 2 (December 2008): 99-117.
71. Batur's *Ankara Ankara* is not only fairer in allocating space to different periods but also includes photographs of the different periods of the twentieth-century Ankara.
72. Zeynep Orhan Targaç, "Othmar Pferschy" *Fotoğraf* (April-May 2000): 84-8, 86.
73. Ankara Palas was a hotel housing state receptions, and especially balls honoring the anniversaries of the Republic. It was located across the National Assembly building and was a significant milieu of early republican Ankara.
74. Başgelen, *Bir Zamanlar Ankara*.
75. Evren, *20'li Yılların Bozkır Kasabası Ankara*; Sağdıç, *Bir Zamanlar Ankara*.
76. İskender Elverdi, *Ankara, From Past to Present* (Ankara: Ankara Chamber of Commerce, 1998).
77. Ozan Sağdıç, *Geçmişten Yansımalarla Ankara* [Ankara through Reflections from the Past] (Ankara: Ankaralılar Foundation, 2001), 4.
78. The allegorical use of Ankara's stone here is a reference to the folk song mentioned earlier, see footnote 60.
79. Sağdıç, *Geçmişten Yansımalarla Ankara*, 7-8.
80. We can remember here Walter Benjamin's remark on stone as one of the forgotten symbols of melancholy. See Walter Benjamin, *The Origin of German Tragic Drama*, translated by John Osborne (London: Verso, 2003): 154.
81. Falih Rıfki Atay, *Çankaya* (İstanbul: Doğan, 1984 [1961]).
82. Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, *Ankara* (İstanbul: İletişim, 1999 [1934]).
83. Özyürek, *Nostalgia for the Modern*, 134.
84. For a few international examples of the recent studies on early republican Ankara, see Berndt Nicolai, *Moderne und Exil: Deutschsprachige Architekten in der Türkei 1925-1955* (Berlin: Verlag für Bauwesen, 1998); Sibel Bozdoğan, *Modernism and Nation Building: Turkish Architectural Culture in the Early Republic* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2001); Ali Cengizkan, *Ankara'nın ilk planı: 1924-25 Lörcher planı, kentsel mekan özellikleri, 1932 Jansen Planı'na ve bugüne katkıları, etki*

ve kalıntıları [The First Plan of Ankara: 1924-25 Lörcher Plan, its Urban Design Aspects, its Influence on 1932 Jansen Plan and Today] (Ankara: Ankara Enstitüsü Vakfı, 2004).

85. Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1984), xiii.

Bio

Bülent Batuman is assistant professor in the Department of Urban Design and Landscape Architecture at Bilkent University, Turkey. He received his B. Arch and M. Arch degrees in architecture from the Middle East Technical University and his Ph.D. in history and theory of art and architecture from State University of New York–Binghamton.