

IX

Journey

Summer declines

limps

when the word wears thin what's
remembered is touch

North

Warmth fades

when your kiss is far away

White night

Your shimmer

I look for

Your

golden harvest

X

Garden sun on the magnolia

flower

awaits the coming of night

It's you I've been waiting for

O whitening moon

Images of summer

I pledge to you

golden

XI

Getting shorter and shorter
these long long days are spending
summer

The trails are marked
the walnut strips off
its green

Jellyfish

invade the beach

As summer ripens

the cocoon of a new season

picks up speed

a rain spears

august

from hidden autumn

XII

Deaf and dumb
summer
speaks in body language

When its sounds and colors
are decoded

its identity

fades

As for me, with a murmur

my portrait in a corner is joined
to summer

My love is a coquette

my love is golden grain

THE CHANGING PATTERNS OF SEGREGATION AND EXCLUSION IN THE CITY: THE CASE OF ANKARA

by **Deniz Altay**

Bilkent University, Department of Landscape Architecture and Urban Design, Ankara

and **Asuman Türkün**

Bilkent University, Department of Political Science, Ankara

Part 1: Chronological Background Survey

I. Introduction

Every city has some particular characteristics and unique patterns of evolution owing to its interaction with its previous history, its role within the national and international division of labour, as well as its social and political structures and processes. On the other hand, it is still possible to find some resemblances and general tendencies among cities throughout the world in particular periods of time. There have always been divisions within cities all over the world related to particular urban functions as well as their economic and cultural differentiations and capabilities. It is generally accepted by many authors from different countries that divisions within cities are increasing both quantitatively and qualitatively.

This article attempts to analyse the changes in the nature of these divisions in Ankara, the capital city of Turkey, especially after the 1980s, and to trace the basis of increasing segregation manifested in urban space. In addition to some general tendencies towards segregation observed in capital cities, we claim that the nature of segregation and the way it is manifested in urban space are shaped by some contextual and historical factors. The physical nature of the urban space, i.e. the lack of distinctive locational advantages, has led to the formation of favourable and high-rent areas according to the established meanings since the proclamation of the city as the capital city as well as the movements and preferences of prominent actors in different time periods. Consequently, the housing areas and the commercial and recreational facilities utilized by different segments of society have become so spatially, visually and symbolically differentiated that the lack of interaction and contact between those segments appears to occur automatically without the necessity of literal preventive and protective measures. It is observed that the grounds for crossing and getting across "the others' life worlds" are diminishing gradually everyday. The tendencies manifested in urban space after the 1980s have been reflected by using various indicators of segregation, such as rent distribution and capital polarization as well as the patterns of exchange of urban land and the type of developers and the quality of construction in different parts of the city.

II. Putting Ankara into context: the dynamics which have been influential in the changing patterns of segregation and exclusion in Ankara in different periods since the 1920s

Ankara, which used to be one of the main trade centres of Anatolia, has a long history, dating back to the 8th century B.C. Following Byzantine and Seljuk rule, during the Ottoman period the citadel and its surroundings made up the town centre 'which housed commercial and residential uses'. This was indicated by neighbourhoods accommodating homogeneous or sometimes mixed religion groups, as well as inns for the tradesmen, built in the 15th and 17th centuries.

The city experienced a sharp recession, losing the major sources of its economic base after the 1850s, because of changing trade routes and the influx and the competition of the products of developing industrial capitalism in the west, which led to a decline in the major products of the city, including the textile production from Angora wool. Although the railroad construction at the end of 19th century started an upward swing, it was not sufficient to revitalize Ankara's economy. In addition, the destruction of the great fire in 1917 contributed to the decline of the city. Consequently, in the early 1920s Ankara was a small settlement consisting of houses within the citadel and along the slopes surrounding it (Altaban, 1987).

The period 1920-1950: the development of Ankara as the instrument for establishing the modern nation state

After the establishment of the Republic, the goal behind the choice of Ankara as the capital city in 1920 reflected the desire to create an alternative to Istanbul, the capital city of the Ottoman Empire. Ankara was expected to be the symbol of an independent nation state and a model for a modern life style and consciousness. Its location in the middle of Anatolia was found to be advantageous owing to the opportunity of easy connection to all the other cities in Anatolia, which can be seen in the efforts of railway construction linking those cities to each other and in public industrial provision of basic goods in many of those cities as a first step.

As is well known, the idea of progress was the characteristic narrative of modernity, which encouraged the transformation of cities parallel to the efforts of nation building, industrial development and the accompanying spatial needs. In this project, space was seen to be something shaped according to a grand social project, which was reflected as a desire to organize, control and give a focus to the unstructured urban space. This necessitated the clearance of the old urban fabric, especially in the core, and the reconstruction of the urban space as a whole. It can be observed that the sense of space was reflected in the city morphology, which was focused on particular features, such as large squares, circles, monuments and impressive public buildings as

symbols of newly developing nation states and the institutions of expanding capitalism (Cooke, 1990; Harvey, 1989). In this respect, the modern idea of planning, and in turn the creation of modern cities according to particular functional and operational principles, gained importance. Here, the city itself became both the tool and the arena of modernization.

After the Republican Period in Turkey, a radical modernization project based on the Enlightenment tradition was attempted. This project had four dimensions; the first involved approaching knowledge, ethics and the arts from the point of view of the Enlightenment tradition. The second dimension was economic; this included capitalist development, industrialization and the institutionalisation of private ownership. The third dimension was the institutionalisation of the nation state and representative democracy. Apart from building a nation state accompanied by increasing rationality, institutionalisation, bureaucratisation, and organizational efficiency, establishing an economy based on capitalist development, industrialization and the institutionalisation of private ownership were other important priorities on the way to modernization. Finally, the fourth dimension was the creation of free citizens who would be aware of their rights and social responsibilities in society. This type of modernization project is, in fact, an urbanization project and the success of the modernization project is dependent on the success of urban development. It was expected that through urbanization a cultural transformation would result in the consciousness of citizenship (Tekeli, 1998). However, during the early Republican period, when major reforms were made, the conditions under which Western modernism flourished, especially the industrial city, capitalist production, and the autonomous bourgeois subject, were not, in fact, present. Therefore, these reforms were implemented by the bureaucratic and professional elites of the nation state as 'a form of visible politics or civilizing mission' mostly giving priority to modern architecture and urban planning as experienced in many non-Western contexts (Bozdoğan, 2001; Bozdoğan and Kasaba, 1997).

In this period, the most important debate was whether to restructure the historical part of the city and use the existing building stock or to lead urban development in new directions which would open new venues for sprawl. In conjunction with these, the basic argument was related to the modest conditions of the old town, which was considered to be inappropriate to carry out the 'mission' of representing the modernist ideals the young republic set forth. Naturally, here the hierarchical powers of important actors in this period were more influential in giving decisions on the development of Ankara. Following a design competition, the plan prepared by Jansen was enacted in 1932. It was based on the general principle of locating the new city beside the old one to decrease the pressure of land speculation on the traditional sections of the city (Altındağ Belediyesi ve Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 1987; Cengizkan, 2002). Although Jansen acknowledged the significance of the Citadel and emphasized the need for its conservation, he did not show much concern for its integration with the whole city. Accordingly, the role found for the Citadel was a 'frozen' one as a monument of the past. Thus the Citadel was celebrated as the 'crown' of the new capital, which would constitute a reference point for the new developments on the west and south. The Citadel and its vicinity were designated as the 'protocol area' for controlling possible speculative pressures. On the other hand, this proposal did not include operational and sustainable support for preservation that attempted to integrate the old town with the new. Moreover, the suggested conservation and restoration of the physical stock in this area could not be realized owing to the priority given to spending the limited financial resources on new developments (Erendil and Ulusoy, 2002).

Later, the increasing need for service functions, particularly for unskilled labour, resulted in the migration of low-income people from the surrounding settlements, greatly increasing the population in Ankara. What could not be taken into account in the Jansen Plan was this unexpected growth, which made the plan obsolete in a couple of decades. The resulting increase in low-income housing demand created a pressure on areas around the traditional centre, leading to the emergence of squatter housing areas (gecekondus) on public land areas, which were topographically

unsuitable (Şenyapılı, 1985). The increase in the number of squatter houses around the Citadel contributed to the area's loss of prestige for middle- and high-income people.

The period 1950-1980:

The second period, between the years 1950 and 1980, can be identified as a period of radical changes throughout the world with respect to the concerns of Keynesian policies and the welfare state as a response to the crisis-creating tendency of capitalism, especially in the developed part of the world. On the part of underdeveloped economies, including the ex-colonies, this period was marked by many different dynamics and the most important decision was the adoption of protectionist import-substitution policies as a strategy for industrial development. In Turkey, this was coupled with a shift from single-party republic and state-based development to multi-party democracy followed by the success of the Democrat Party owing to the increasing votes from the private sector representatives, powerful landowners and dependent peasants, especially in areas where the feudal structure of economic, social and cultural traits was still predominant. This went hand in hand with efforts to create a national bourgeoisie, this time not from the educated élite groups but from the groups who accumulated capital through big land ownership, land speculation, trade or industry. This period can also be characterized by an increasing dependency on the USA, followed by the Marshall Plan, which was especially effective in the mechanization of agriculture and, in turn by a rapid increase of migration from rural to urban areas of industrial development. Another important feature of this period was the abandonment of railways in favour of road transport, thus increasing the dependency on petroleum consumption.

This was a period of a complex form of state and private investments, with new welfare state implementations on the part of the state, similar to the rationale in western capitalist countries in many respects. This meant the development of the private sector through state support so as to increase income levels indirectly without putting a burden on private investors. The aim was to balance production and consumption in the era of Fordist mass production. On the other hand, the 1968 upheavals against the modernist and standardizing attitude of consumptionist ideology in developed capitalist countries and the middle-class ethics of the isolated nuclear family were reflected in the countries similar to Turkey as a reaction to the capitalist system in general. This period is characterized by students' and workers' upheavals and fights between leftists and rightists as well as boycotts in universities and strikes in workplaces. This period again ended with a military coup in the early 1970s, which was followed by the success of the Justice Party, which came to power as a representative of landlords in the agricultural sector, large groups of peasants and private investors, coupled with intense populist policies in favour of those groups.

In the years between 1960 and 1980, the idea of planned development intent on achieving the aims of the welfare state through a rational use of national resources gained importance. Within this framework, the attitude towards urban planning also changed, resulting in a comprehensive rationalist planning approach, which is based on large-scale, metropolitan-wide, technologically rational and efficient urban plans which are usually complemented by functionalist and international style architecture (Harvey, 1989). In accordance with this view, urban plans started to be considered as a part of social and economic development rather than a practice of physical planning. On the other hand, the comprehensive plans prepared on the basis of detailed socio-economic analysis of the urban areas were too rigid to respond to the urgent needs of rapidly growing urban areas (Tekeli, 1998).

The period after the 1980s

By the mid-1980s, neoliberalism had become the dominant political and ideological form of capitalist globalisation throughout the world. The global imposition of neoliberalism was uneven and it had different institutional forms and sociospatial manifestations in different spatial scales. As is well known, neoliberal economics is the belief that open, competitive, and unregulated

markets, liberated from all forms of state interference, represent the optimal mechanism for economic development as expressed in the “utopia of unlimited exploitation” (Bourdieu, 1998). Neoliberalism first gained widespread predominance during the late 1970s and early 1980s as a response to the crisis of a Fordist accumulation regime. National and local states tried to secure sustainable accumulation again through the deregulation of state control over major industries, assaults on organized labour, reduction of corporate taxes, privatisation of public services, disappearance of welfare programs, enhancement of international capital mobility, trade liberalization and intensification of competition among cities or regions. This was the period when big urban projects started replacing comprehensive planning and the abandonment of the notion of ‘public interest’ to a great extent (Brenner and Theodore, 2002; Swyngedouw, et al., 2002).

After the military coup in 1980 and the following election period in 1982, Turkey witnessed a turning point in economic policy, from the protectionist strategies that dominated between the 1960s and the 1970s to export-oriented industrialization policies parallel to the implementation of liberalization and privatisation. As seen in other parts of the world, this was done together with various measures to decrease the power of organized labour and, in turn, to lower the costs of labour. The growing internationalisation of the Turkish economy in the 1980s created some economic growth, but it also made Turkey vulnerable in new, unexpected ways. After 1990, Turkey experienced a shortening cycle of successive crises, tied to events in global financial markets. The 1994 crisis was followed by a severe crisis in 1997 and 1998 related to the Asian and Russian crises and finally Turkey experienced the successive financial crises in November 2000 and February 2001. They all had important negative impacts on the economy. Unemployment levels reached 7.7 per cent in 1998 and rose further to 8.5 per cent in 2001 (Eraydın and Türkün, forthcoming). These changes had substantial spatial manifestations; some cities with strong global connections were faced with a second migration flow, also as a result of the decrease of subventions to the agricultural sector and increasing unemployment in this sector.

Ankara was not among the cities which attracted capital and population in this period; in fact, the city lost the dominant place it acquired in the previous periods owing to its mission. On the other hand, it was affected by the radical changes taking place related to the neoliberal ideology of privatisation, competition, and consumption habits together with the dramatic effects of crises which led to job losses and decrease in purchasing power. The credits given especially to various sectors, including textiles and construction, favouring especially big firms, resulted in a growing polarization in almost all sectors. Especially throughout the 1980s, investments by big construction firms had a major impact on the spatial configuration of cities, increasing the number of housing estates, office blocks and shopping centres, and urban land started to bring higher profits than any kind of industrial production. The foundation of the Directorate for Mass Housing in order to find a solution to the housing problem, and the long-term, cheap credits given to big construction firms and members of housing cooperatives, led to an increase in the number of housing units in the peripheral suburban areas as well as new shopping centres in the vicinity of those areas. However, decreasing purchasing power has made these houses unaffordable for low-income groups and this project has failed to fulfil its initial purpose of solving the problem of housing for the urban poor.

Part 2 of this article will appear in the next issue.

REFERENCES

- Akçura, T. (1971). Ankara, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin Başkenti Hakkında Monografik Bir Araştırma, Ankara: Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Mimarlık Fakültesi Yayını, n° 16.
- Altaban, O. (1987). Kentte yapılaşmayı belirleyen süreçler. *Ankara: 1985'den 2000'e*, Greater Ankara Municipality, EGO Directorate, Ajans İletim.
- Altındağ Municipality, Ministry of Culture (1987). *Ankara Kalesi Koruma Geliştirme İmar Planı Projesi*. Ankara: Ajans-Türk Matbaası.
- Bozdoğan, S. and Kasaba, R. (Eds.) (1997). *Rethinking Modernity and the National*

- Identity in Turkey*. Seattle, London: University of Washington Press.
- Bozdoğan, S. (2001). *Modernism and Nation Building*. Seattle and London: The University of Washington Press.
- Brenner, N. and Theodore, N. (2002). Cities and Geographies of Actually Existing Neoliberalism. *Antipode*, 34(3), 349-379.
- Cengizkan, A. (2002). Ankara 1924-1925, Lorcher Planı: Bir Başkenti Tasarlamak ve Sonrası. *Arredamento Mimarlık*, 10, 116-132.
- Cooke, P. (1990). *Back to the Future*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Erendil, A. T. and Ulusoy, Z. (2002). The Re-invention of Tradition as an Urban Image. *Environment and Planning B – Planning and Design*, 29, 655-672.
- Eraydın, A. and Türkün-Erendil, A. (forthcoming) The Changing Roles of Female Labour in Economic Prosperity and Decline: The Case of Istanbul Clothing Industry. In J. Seager and L. Nelson. *A Companion to Feminist Geography*.
- Fainstein, S. S., 1994, *The City Builders*, Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (1989). *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Jacobs, J. (1961). *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Şenyapılı, T. (1985). *Ankara Kentinde Gecekondu Gelişimi*. Ankara: Kent-Koop.
- Tekeli, İ. (1998). Türkiye’de Cumhuriyet döneminde kentsel gelişme ve kent planlaması. *75 Yılda Değişen Kent ve Mimarlık*, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.
- Swyngedouw, E., Moulaert, F. and Rodrigues, A. (2002). Neoliberal Urbanization in Europe: Large-Scale Urban Development Projects and the New Urban Policy. *Antipode*, 34(3), 542-577.



THE LEVANTINE DONİZETTİ



by Dr Emre Aracı

Part II

Constantinople in the 1820’s was an Eastern city, rapidly developing on Western lines under the determined leadership of Mahmud II, which appropriately won him the title of “Peter the Great of the Ottoman Empire”.¹ Modern buildings in the style of European architecture were beginning to dominate the skyline of the city, while new military schools of medicine, science and music were being formed. For the first time, in 1827, a batch of Turkish students were sent to Paris for education.² The first Ottoman official newspaper, *Takvim-i Vekayi*, started circulation in 1831 and a new postal system was inaugurated in 1834. Mahmud’s keen regeneration programme also covered the forms of official dress and as a result a new headgear, the crimson fez, was adopted for all civil servants and all military personnel, as well as new tight frock coats and trousers as opposed to the turban and baggy *shalvar*. But most importantly in the bloody uprising of 1826, known as the *Vaka-i Hayriye* (the Auspicious Incident), Mahmud succeeded in extinguishing the corrupt

¹ Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, Oxford 1961, p. 76

² It seems among students educated in Paris some even received musical training according to a report published in the *The Musical World* in London: “The gods have made his Sublimity, Mahmoud, musical and in return he has determined to infuse his tastes into his harem. With this view he has recently given a concert to the fair ones, at which a young Turk, who had acquired his education at Paris, played among other pieces one of Beethoven’s sonatas with variations, which enraptured the assembly and drew down thunders of applause”; *The Musical World*, 6 June 1839, p. 91