outside Istanbul, she had organised a women's group to set up a thirty-bed hospital for wounded soldiers. She was also a pioneer in fighting the Islamic law allowing men four wives, having experienced its ills at first hand, as noted previously. The historian Arnold Toynbee, one of her strongest admirers saluted her as follows: "In parting from her first husband, she had been fighting a battle for a vital human right in the teeth of the law that was then in force, and she had not been fighting simply for her own hand, it had been for all women in Turkey and indirectly for all the women of the Islamic world as well".

Conclusion

Viginia Woolf and Halide Edip had similar backgrounds, were members of a similar social class and received similar educations. Both rebelled against the social conditions of women and also against the accepted form of fiction at the time in their respective countries, becoming strikingly innovative writers in their individual ways. As reformers, Virginia Woolf, introverted and shy, effected change through her writing; Halide Edip, extroverted and actively involved in social and political situations, effected change through her actions as well as through her writing. The former devoted herself single-mindedly to fiction writing as soon as possible and is the more accomplished artist. The latter could always put her writing aside when there was a social or political cause she felt duty-bound to support. They both had severe traumatic experiences, but managed to surmount them, Virginia Woolf until she had written her many superb novels, before succumbing to her internal demons and committing suicide, Halide Edip persevering until a ripe old age contending against the external demons of social and political backwardness.

     Now the great Turkish and British empires are no more. But the two daughters emerging from the different cultures are alive through their works. They were not 'good' daughters in the traditional sense. They were not obedient; in fact, they rebelled. In their kindred refusal to live and write in accordance with the accepted norms of their time lies their greatness.

<div align="center">CCCCC</div>

THE CHANGING PATTERNS OF SEGREGATION AND EXCLUSION IN THE CITY:

THE CASE OF ANKARA

<div align="center">

by **Deniz Altay**
Bilkent University, Department of Landscape Architecture and Urban Design, Ankara
and **Asuman Türkün**
Bilkent University, Department of Political Science, Ankara

</div>

<div align="center">**Part 2: Spatial manifestations 1920-50, 1950-80 and after 1980**</div>

III. Changing urban macroform and spatial segregation and exclusion as an overdetermined process

Spatial manifestations in the period 1920-50

In this period we can talk about two forms of intervention in urban space. The first one is related to the decisions of cabinet members, representatives of state organizations, and army members, who moved to Ankara after its designation as the capital city. Their mission was to create a modern city that would represent the ideals of the young Turkish Republic; therefore, their urban vision affected by western models and housing preferences was effective in the formation of the urban macroform, which initiated the basic forms of segregation between the 'modern' and the 'traditional'. As

mentioned in the previous sections, the basic axes of urban development started to appear and the major buildings of the central state and civic functions started to become located on these axes, shaping the direction of further developments to the south. In addition, massive expropriations were made to provide planned housing areas for the 'newcomers' and areas necessary for the growing central and local government functions and services of the capital city. These initial interventions created the 'spatial fix' that led to the segregation of new and old sections of the city.

The second type of intervention was in fact related to the first and this was basically developed on the ideology of modernism and the creation of an independent nation-state composed of citizens with modern life-styles similar to those seen in western cities. Therefore, first of all houses with gardens following the concept of the 'beautiful city', and then apartment houses for nuclear families, started to be promoted as signs of modernity. In order to achieve this goal in a short time, the state took the responsibility for building the houses in the initial phases, and then in the following years housing cooperatives were supported and expropriated land was sold cheaply to those who were regarded as having the capacity for carrying out this mission.

With regard to the dynamics described above, it can be claimed that Ankara started to gain a dual structure together with the development of especially new housing areas away from the old city in the north (Ulus), towards the southern areas, and in fact the city started to become segmented as 'north' and 'south', this time the north representing the losers and the south the winners in terms of rent. On the other hand, in this period segmentation was not so acute because the buildings which housed the major city functions were located on the outskirts of the old city, but as noted above they were heading towards the south, where the residence of Atatürk was located. In the initial phases of this development, the city centre was in the traditional part of the city and all the people were bound to encounter each other at those common shopping areas, public parks, playgrounds for children, picnic areas and squares, and sports complexes, which were more or less accessible to the majority of people living in the city, owing to their location on the major transportation axis. In fact, in the first development plan great importance was given to these public spaces in bringing people together from different segments of population, and it was expected that especially the appearance of 'newcomers' would constitute a model for a modern way of urban life.

It is most probable that the families representing modern western life styles and consumption habits complained about being so close to the 'peasants', whose life styles they were trying to escape from, and were waiting for more apparent spatial segregation so as to 'protect' their children from this growing peasant population, their shacks and their traditional life styles, which were completely contrary to the ways of life that were promoted as western and modern. In the initial phases of urban sprawl, those who were segregated spatially and socially were low-income single young male migrants, who posed a threat to family life, regardless of their incomes and status. However, this cannot be called 'exclusion' according to the definition given in Part 1; they still had the opportunity for upward social mobility by becoming civil servants, building illegal houses (gecekondus), forming families and educating their children, even at university level. This type of segregation was quite different from the exclusion that we are faced with in urban areas today.

Spatial manifestations in the period 1950-80

In the previous period, the governor and the mayor were the same person and appointed by the central government, but in this period the mayor started to be selected by the local people, so local concerns started to be more prominent, reflecting the interests of different groups. When we consider the changing macroform of the city, it can be seen that the dual structure of the city continued to be intensified as the prestigious housing areas became established in the southern and western parts of the city. The law which permitted ownership fragmentation through flat ownership in 1954, and also new legislation, which allowed increases in density by allowing an increase in the number of floors, led to dramatic changes in the urban landscape. This resulted in continuous 'pull

down and build' processes facilitated by different types of production processes and investors. These activities were especially intensified during and after election times, owing to the promises given to potential voters.

Another factor that strengthened this dual structure was the increasing density of workplaces, small industrial production areas, and wholesale trade around the traditional centre in the north, as cleaner service and commercial functions shifted to the south, creating in time a new centre near the new housing areas. Starting from the late 1970s, this new business centre, Kızılay, emerged almost at the centre of the north-south axis away from the old city centre, Ulus, in the north. This centre gained importance with the growing importance of this axis for the location of the new buildings of state institutions and ministries as well as office blocks and commercial areas. In time, the apartment blocks in the vicinity of this central district have also been pulled down and converted into office and shopping centres as the central functions increased and diversified. Thus, as Kızılay gained importance as the major business district, the identity of the old centre in the vicinity of the citadel was transformed into an area of production and wholesale trade (Akçura, 1971) and became segregated from the modern parts of the city almost completely.

In short, it can be claimed that parallel to the diversification arising from urban interest groups with differing powers, the spatial segmentation patterns also became diversified, and varying niches started to be established for different income and status groups. However, the very basic dual structure of the city as 'north' and 'south' did not change much, although different strata emerged within these major groups. The meaning of the 'south' as a prestigious area has persisted since the 1930s, and the developments in those contrasting areas followed these meanings without much change. We will analyse the crystallization of this process, especially after the 1980s, in the next section.

Spatial manifestations after the 1980s
In Ankara, after 1980s, the principles of the modernity project, together with the importance of long-term comprehensive planning, began to be eroded under the influence of the liberal ideology of privatisation and entrepreneurship. Ironically, the third plan of 1982 was characterized by an enhanced importance of planned development and central authority. This was based on a comprehensive planning approach, reflected in large-scale urban plans, prepared by the Metropolitan Planning Bureaux founded in major cities in the 1970s.

Another important characteristic of housing supply in the 1975-85 period is the emergence of mass housing initiatives. The creation of individual houses by housing cooperatives started to increase after 1977. Cooperative housing on the fringes of the city since the 1970s may be considered as a sign of suburban development. Large scale housing ventures realized by big construction companies are likely to contribute to the westward planned development of the city. Different dynamics can be encountered after the 1980s related to a mix of both public policies and private profit-based investments, according to the highest return principle. As for public investments in this period, we observe that the government has considerably revised its policy regarding the housing of public employees, and undertook the construction of a great number of housing units especially for military personnel. This was an important policy change, because since the 1940s, no such large scale employee housing project had been realized, and the location of these projects strengthened the decentralization of housing on the southern and western axes, retaining the prestigious position of those areas.

Apart from these processes which strengthened the north/south divide, in the 1990s a new concern, related to the preservation and the integration of traditional sections with the rest of the city, started to be evident. This transformation coincided with the widespread discourse referring to 'placelessness', 'loss of identity', and 'standardization', related to the modernist ideology of planning (Jacobs, 1961) and the interest in the historic urban fabric as a new urban image. The historic areas serve to arouse the feeling of nostalgia and curiosity for citizens who have left behind

the city centre for suburban housing or for people who are in search of novelty and excitement in 'authentic' environments in different parts of the world (Erendil and Ulusoy, 2002). In accordance with this approach to historic heritage, a project competition on the Ulus historic centre was announced in 1986. Following this, in 1987 the local municipality, in collaboration with the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, announced a design competition for the conservation of the Ankara Citadel. With this competition, the citadel has, after a long time of neglect, been acknowledged as a location to be dealt with seriously. It was aimed at economically feasible and implementable solutions for conservation, rehabilitation and renewal, so as to integrate the citadel with the rest of the city. The results of the competition were announced in 1988. The aim of integrating the citadel with the rest of the city was interpreted by the winning team as a complete transformation of the area into a tourist site as a means of preserving this historic heritage and revitalizing the area. This interpretation was in accordance with the prevalent trend throughout the world in the 1980s, which was based on the regeneration of deteriorated historic urban areas by turning them into income generating and marketable assets. Although this interpretation appeared to be based on the principle of public interest, it was in fact 'the public interest of privileged groups', including the well-off residents of and visitors to Ankara. The spatial implication of this project would be a major clearance of unsound buildings, pulling down the illegal additions, and changing the functions of buildings into restaurants, bars, art galleries, antique shops in the outer citadel and mostly guest houses for tourists in the inner citadel. All these changes would translate into the exclusion of the people who are not able to adapt to this new identity. It is now observed that the citadel area and the surrounding historic centre inhabited by low-income people, which had been left behind, now gained a new meaning, and people started to return to this area, for recreational purposes.

The division of the city as old/new or traditional/modern since the 1930s, owing to the preferences of the powerful groups in those days, has left its imprint on the city as an established meaning in Ankara. This meaning is hard to change, being a kind of vicious circle, owing to the attraction of these areas not only as offering prestigious housing but also as presenting shopping and recreational options which fit the demands and expectations of the consumers nearby. Therefore, high-quality urban services and facilities have also become clustered in those areas in time. New shopping malls, office buildings or recreational areas attract consumer groups who are the 'users/buyers' or just the 'observers' of those places. They are usually located according to the transportation means of targeted consumer groups. They sometimes require private automobiles or mass transportation to attract larger numbers of people, according, again, to a cost/benefit rationale. The sign system, the images which represent a kind of life style, discourage many groups from entering those places, even sometimes without being enclosed. And in fact there are usually guardians at the gates who prevent some groups from entering, or police inside who punish the ones who do not obey the regulations put into effect by owners or managers.

We see 'enclaves in enclaves' reflected in the form of differentiation and proliferation of those within the urban space. Although there are now different segregation and exclusion patterns, we say that a neo-liberal economy tends to bring people together basically in a way related to the amount of money earned and how you want to present yourself according to values that will bring prestige in this system. This can be observed in the tendency of similar income groups to get clustered in time, attracting similar groups to the vicinity, as can be observed in almost all the cities in the world in this type of evolution in a world of global economy coupled with neo-liberalism. The exceptions are the radical groups who want to stay separate from this prevalent tendency until their sons or daughters prefer something else. Therefore, it is time to think about communal solutions involving 'public space' and 'public interest' before we too, are isolated in our gated communities.

(Map and bibliography accompany Part 1 in TAS *Review* No 5)

CCCCC