The Encounter of the Modernity Project with the Historical Context

ZUHAL ULUSOY

ASUMAN TÜRKÜN ERENDIL

Bilkent University

PLANNING IN THE CONTEXT OF THE MODERNITY PROJECT

The contemporary idea of planning is rooted in the enlightenment tradition of modernity. It is believed that human beings freed from traditional hegemonies can come together to deal with their collective affairs and overturn the flow of history according to their common interests. By the use of reason and scientific knowledge in human affairs, it is expected that people will not only learn to control the natural forces but also achieve moral progress, the justice of institutions and the happiness through a better understanding of the world and the self. It centers on the challenge of finding ways in which citizens, through acting together, can bring together their collective concerns with respect to the sharing of space and time. Therefore, modernity is understood as the reflection of individual and collective reason in leading to the achievement of this great social project, which often requires a radical break from all preceding historical conditions and a continuous destruction to create something new. Modernity is experienced to have a dual character; besides being perceived as 'transitive', 'fugitive' and 'contingent' in daily life, it also entails searching for 'eternal' and 'immutable' elements in all this never ending process of change and fragmentation, which appears to be an unresolved dilemma (Baudelaire in Harvey, 1989). Reconciling what Marx has once said, "everything is pregnant with its contrary" and "all that is solid melts into air", it becomes clear that representing eternal truths becomes possible only through a process of destruction, which also opens the way to turn onto itself in the end (Berman, 1988).

Although the enlightenment thought is based on the individual and collective consciousness of free citizens in shaping their future, the emphasis on discovering the eternal and the immutable has directed route of this thought by giving a special heroic position to artists, writers, composers, poets, thinkers, philosophers, architects, or planners. They were expected to put a stamp on the chaotic by extracting the eternal and universal qualities of life in order to discover the means of realizing the goals of the Enlightenment. The quest for achieving order by the imposition of a single universal mode of representation has led to a positivist turn in modernism in time, especially after the second World War, when 'universal' or 'high' modernism became predominant. The modernism that resulted was 'positivistic, technocratic and rationalistic' and, in turn, was accepted to be dependent on 'the work of avant-garde of planners, artists, architects, critics and other guardians of high taste' (Harvey, 1989). The modern idea of planning, which reflects the process

of defining the goals so as to determine the means of achieving those according to a 'common interest' can be perceived as an intervention intended to change the existing course of events.

Comprehensive attitude in planning is criticized due to the operational difficulties in both conception and implementation. In addition, the assumption of a common public interest is questionable (Campbell and Fainstein, 1996). These concerns have led to different approaches to planning, such as incremental planning (Lindblom, 1959), advocacy planning (Davidoff, 1965), strategic planning (Swanstrom, 1967) and equity planning (Krumholz, 1982). After 1970s there was a challenge to the notion of planning through a critique of scientific reason itself and the scientifically constructed empirical knowledge which has achieved hegemonic power over other ways of being and knowing. In addition, it is claimed that modernist urban planning, coupled with the rent gaining objective of market forces have led to a loss in the diversity and identity in urban areas (Jacobs, 1961). This challenge, which can be very broadly labeled as postmodernist, is highly diverse with different lines of development; as some strands leave space for a form of planning, others dismiss planning as impossible, irrelevant and oppressive. On the other hand, planners have not abandoned the idea of serving the public interest, which can be summarized as "equal protection and equal opportunity, public space, and a sense of civic society and social responsibility" (Campbell and Fainstein, 1996). Consequently, as a reaction to the imposition of top-down rational planning and the idea of unitary public interest, some authors propose a middle way by means of communicative reasoning and intersubjective comprehension (Habermas, 1987; Healey, 1996). Another approach, originating from political economy, presents the just-city model as a reaction to the social and spatial inequality created by capitalism (Fainstein, 2000).

Considering the Turkish experience of planning, it is seen that with the Republican Period, a radical modernity project based on the enlightenment tradition started to be enacted. It was an attempt to create something new by legitimizing itself through a revolutionary break from the economic, political and cultural heritage of the Ottoman period. This project has four dimensions: first, approaching knowledge, ethics and arts from the point of view of the enlightenment tradition; second, establishing economy based on capitalist development, industrialization and institutionalization of private ownership; third, the institutionalization of the nation-state and representative democracy; and finally, the creation of free citizens who are aware of their rights

and social responsibilities in society. This was, in fact, an urbanization project and its success was dependent on the success of urban development (Tekeli, 1998).

When the modernization attempts are investigated together with planning efforts, it is seen that it has developed in certain stages. The first period, identified as 'timid modernization', extends from the mid-19th century to the Republican Period, in which the Ottoman Empire started to get integrated into the world capitalism. The second period continues until the Second World War. During this period a legal and institutional structure was set up to legitimize urban development. In the third period between the Second World War and the 1960s, a populist kind of modernity project was experienced. The fourth period, between 1960 and 1980, is identified with rapid urbanization and planned development efforts. For the first time, urban planning was institutionalized as a separate discipline. After the 1980s, the initial principles of the modernity project started to be eroded under the influence of changing national policies and priorities related to the integration into the world economy in different terms. As a result, the expectations from urban planning have also changed (Tekeli, 1998).

The second period, between 1923 and the Second World War, represents a radical break from the past. During those years, the major goal was to establish a nation-state and create this consciousness; within this framework, spatial organization strategies gained an important role. The goal of forming unity among different regions within the national territory was reflected in the choice of Ankara, which is located at the center of Anatolia, as the capital city of the new Republic in 1923. Ankara, being relatively free from associations with the Ottoman period, was considered to be an appropriate location for a fresh start. In addition, it was believed that urban areas were the 'seedbeds' for creating modern citizens, conscious of their rights and responsibilities. Therefore, the modern city gained an instrumental function in this transformation and the planned development of Ankara was expected to constitute a model for other cities (Tekeli, 1998). This transformation was attempted to be accomplished within serious restrictions: inadequate economic resources, lack of urban experience, limited technical knowledge and know-how, as well as inadequate legal means for execution. Due to these restrictions, the trajectories of the transformation project were not clear in the first place and it proceeded in a manner of trial-and-error (Tankut, 1992).

The years after 1950 can be identified as a period of radical changes throughout the world owing to the concerns of the welfare state. Accordingly, after a short period of widespread populism in Turkey, the idea of planned development to achieve the objectives of welfare state through a rational use of resources gained importance in the years between 1960 and 1980. This concern was reflected in the form of a comprehensive, rationalist planning approach, based on large-scale, metropolitan-wide, technologically rational and efficient urban plans. However, these comprehensive plans based on detailed socio-economic analyses were too rigid to respond to the urgent needs of rapidly growing urban areas in Turkey (Tekeli, 1998). Within this period, modernization of agriculture, liberalization attempts and the growing importance of the private sector in industrialization have led to major transformations in urban areas, especially reflected in high levels of migration. The high population growth experienced in Ankara (6 percent a year) until 1950s started to be seen in other urban areas, especially depending on their industrial base. On the other hand, urban areas were not prepared for such a rapid transformation and various spontaneous solutions were found. One of the most important shortcomings in urban areas was the inadequate housing stock, especially for low income people, who tried to solve this problem individually by invading public land and building illegal housing. Simultaneously, new housing areas were developed according to the principles of modern planning and architecture, giving the cities a dual structure (Tekeli, 1998).

After 1980s, parallel to the changes in the organization of world economy, Turkey has experienced a big transformation through various strategic decisions: a shift from import substitution to export oriented industrialization policies, and the developments in telecommunication and transportation investments to accelerate integration into the world market. The geographical consequences of these transformations are the growing significance of big cities, such as Istanbul, Izmir and Ankara, and the emergence of various new nodes of industrial development throughout the country (Erendil, 1998, 2000; Eraydin, 1997), together with radical changes in their urban macroform. Despite the structural and comprehensive plans prepared in the 1970s, developments after 1980s represent an erosion and draw back. Parallel to the political and economic concerns of the period, planning started to be considered as an obstacle on the way of the projects of private investors. In the meantime, planning responsibility was transferred to greater city municipalities and small local municipalities were given the right to make development plans independently, leading to a chaotic state of institutions with various and sometimes overlapping responsibilities. All these were not tied to a proper critique of comprehensive planning, neither did they involve an attempt to modify the planning efforts with respect to egalitarian concerns or a communicative approach. This was partly a reflection of laissez faire policies and a belief in market mechanisms, which, contrary to the assumption of homogeneous or frictionless urban space, have resulted in the power conflicts and struggles among various economic and political interest groups over the arena of urban space.

When the modern city gains an instrumental function in achieving the goals of the modernity project, confrontation of the old urban fabric with these ideals becomes a problematic issue throughout the world. The following discussions on the Ankara Citadel stem from this concern. As will be discussed in detail in the following section, the citadel and its vicinity used to be the most important residential part of Ankara at the turn of the 20th century, and still make up one of the oldest and most traditional sections. The area under investigation has experienced a number of changes over decades related to various dynamics and major changes affecting different sections of the city in particular ways. Following its proclamation as the capital city, Ankara acquired the role of becoming the symbol of the new ideology and became the locus of all values and practices it represents. These practices include particularly the planning of the city according to the principles of urban planning as experienced in developed countries and the creation of architectural styles that are expected to inspire change also in other cities (Yavuz, 1992). In this framework, it becomes easier to legitimize modernist planning which is often not sensitive to the present urban structure, as experienced in the case of the citadel. In the beginning, the area was accepted to be the reference point for the planned city; however, its conceptualization and recognition in different periods demonstrate the ambiguity and neglect observed in the encounter between the modernity project and the historic urban context.

BUILDING A NEW CAPITAL BESIDE THE PAST

Ankara, which used to be one of the main trade centers of Anatolia, has a long history, which dates back to 8th century B.C. The citadel and its surroundings made up the town center which housed commercial and residential uses, as indicated by the ethnic neighborhoods as well as the inns for the tradesmen, built in the 15th and 16th centuries. However, the city experienced a sharp recession, losing the major sources of its economic base after the mid-19th century. Although the railroad construction at the end of 19th century started an upward swing, it was not sufficient to revitalize its 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 modest settlement consisting of houses within the citadel and along the slopes surrounding it (Altaban, 1987).

The fate of Ankara started to change drastically with its proclamation as the capital city of Turkey. This new role necessitated, in addition to various other amenities, the provision of buildings to house the institutions

for governmental use and the rapidly growing population owing to the new service functions. The enactment of Laws number 582 and 583 in 1925 were the major factors to shape the fate of Ankara. These laws included the principle decisions that the old town should be kept intact, and the new city built on vacant lands. There was already a dense debate on where the city should be located: whether to use the existing building stock or to find new areas for development. In conjunction with these, the concern was whether the modest conditions of the existing physical stock was appropriate to undertake the 'mission' of representing the modernist ideals the young republic set forth. These discussions did not only stem from the concern for choosing the 'right' place for development, but also from speculative interests of landowners. Hence, in the following years, at first some local plans were prepared. However, within a short period, it was acknowledged that the urgent problems of Ankara could and should not be solved partially and the great endeavor of building the capital necessitated holistic approach. Thus, 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 (*Ankara Kalesi Koruma, Gelistirme Imar Plani Projesi*, 1987).

Although Jansen acknowledged the significance of the Citadel, he did not show much concern for its integration with the whole city. Accordingly, the role found for the citadel was a 'frozen' one: being a monument of the past. The magnificent view of the citadel as the backdrop for the new city, and the focus of newly developing areas were the major emphases in his plan (1). This attitude does not include an operational and sustainable proposal for preservation. Furthermore, even the general principles of the competition project were substantially changed during its implementation. Being aware of the speculative pressures created by the location of the old and the new sections of the city side by side, Jansen suggested another set of plan decisions, which allowed new developments to house modern urban functions on the areas to the west of the citadel, keeping the other directions intact, by identifying them as the 'protocol area'. Despite such a sensitivity for historic sections of the city, it was the conceptual ambivalence towards the remains of the past and inadequate know-how in making them part of the modernist urban scenarios that led to unintentional but unavoidable neglect.

In the following years, there was a major population growth in Ankara, particularly due to the migration of low-income people from the surrounding settlements. What could not be accounted for in the Jansen Plan was this unexpected growth in population, which made it obsolete in a couple of decades (2). The resulting increase in low-income housing demand created a pressure on areas around the traditional center, leading to the emergence of illegal housing areas (*gecekondus*) on public lands which are topographically unsuitable (Senyapili, 1985). On the other hand, the increasing land prices within the planned areas forced settlements to expand into areas outside the boundaries of the plan (Turel, 1987; Tekeli, 1987). As a result, the initial area within the plan boundary had increased about five times by 1937 (Altaban, 1998). Parallel to these change, Ulus and the surrounding areas have lost their significance as the center of the city.

The second plan, Yucel-Uybadin Plan, enacted in 1957, intended to regulate the further development of Ankara, again with no particular consideration given to the integration of the traditional parts of the city. This plan also became obsolete because of the increases in density, especially in central locations, owing to the legal change enabling flat ownership after 1950s. The prevalent ideology at the time promoted living in apartment buildings as a symbol of modern way of life (3). The second major plan, similar to the first one, was not effective in establishing the well-controlled and ideal capital city, due to both the ad-hoc interventions and also to a distraction from grand moves of the modernist ideals by giving in to populist interests on part of the decision-makers (4).

The third plan period can be defined as the enhanced importance of planned development and central authority, which includes urban planning as a major component. Related to these concerns, Metropolitan Planning Bureaus were founded in major cities to guide comprehensive planning actions. In the third plan put into force in 1982, it is stated that, for a balanced development, housing should be decentralized on the western and southern axes, along the major transportation corridors. Parallel to these changes, Kizilay established its position as the new business center, attracting many of the urban functions of Ulus, the traditional city center. Thus, the identity of Ulus changed, transforming into a center of traditional production and trade as the area was gradually surrounded by squatter housing areas and the existing housing stock was left to low-income residents (Akcura, 1985). During this period, a new concern was pronounced, related to the preservation and integration of the traditional sections with the rest of the city. It is known that, since the beginning of the republic, the monumental buildings of the Ottoman period have been preserved and restored as items of heritage to attain a continuity with the past (Altinyildiz, 1998). However, the preservation of heritage was based on the laws from the Ottoman period, which concentrated on single monumental buildings. Only with the enactment of the Legislation for the Conservation of Cultural and Natural Properties in 1983, the consciousness of preserving a historic area as a whole, together with all its building stock, street patterns and open areas, was voiced. Therefore, the concept of 'cultural and natural heritage' started to replace the concept of 'historic monument'. In accordance with this approach, a project competition on Ulus historical center was announced in 1986, followed by another competition for the Ankara Citadel in 1987.

FACE-TO-FACE WITH THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT

At present, the Ankara Citadel is surrounded with markets for traditional crafts and various local products that give the area almost a countryside character. There are still a number of inns from the Ottoman times in the vicinity, and the Citadel as a whole was designated as a site of historic significance in the 1980s. The tight network of narrow streets open up to the main street and the whole area is densely built. With the exception of a number of old houses that are under strict preservation, the building stock consists of mostly modest residential buildings. During the last 15 years, the area has experienced some radical changes: properties are turned into restaurants, mostly catering tourists and higher income residents of the city. A number of antique stores, carpet stores and souvenir shops also opened, with the hope that the tourists who visit the nearby Museum of Anatolian Civilizations would also come to the citadel (Ulusoy and Erendil, 1999; Ulusoy, 1998).

The Ankara Citadel has experienced successive changes in its identity owing to the attitude towards the historic context in different planning periods as well as the effects of many other dynamics concerning the city as a whole (Erendil and Ulusoy, 2001). While the citadel was the reference point for the planned city in the 1930s, in the following plan periods, this emphasis lost its basis as the city developed in many different directions.

As it was summarized previously, the approach to the traditional center including Ankara Citadel since the early 1930s has been ambiguous. During the first decades of the republic, the predominant attitude to the citadel was an *unintended neglect*. The mission of creating a modern city following the principles of the modernity project was such a great endeavor that the limited financial resources of the state were distributed according to this priority. The modern planning practice assumed 'neat' areas; therefore, the localities of the past that house 'traditional' daily practices did not fit the sterile settings that would be manipulated according to the scenarios of the republic. It would follow that areas, which do not conform to this model should either be ignored or demolished. Thus, by labeling the remains of the past as 'heritage' and by freezing this image at the background of the city, it would be

possible to 'show respect to history and tradition' without really having to make any decisions. It may seem that leaving the citadel intact indicated a respect for history and the legacy of the past; however, the way this attitude was verbalized and later practiced did not clarify how this past would be sustained. The consequent attitude that is conveniently labeled as 'preservation' can only be disguising a neglect that eventually leaves the historic areas to erosion and disintegration due to being subject to short term and usually conflicting interests of various actors.

There was no considerable change in this general attitude in the following decades, despite the changes in the theories and practices of planning throughout the world, and also in Turkey. Although the concept of 'cultural and natural heritage' was recognized, this consciousness was not reflected in urban development plans. The preservation plans of historic areas were dealt separately without being integrated with the general trajectories of urban development (Aksoylu, 2000; Madran, 1982; Kangal, 1999). Although the major building activity in the early years was in Ulus, and the public buildings that represented the pride and power of the state and its ideology were all located at the skirts of the citadel, during all successive plan periods, housing development and major urban functions were directed away from that area, reducing its importance as the city center and leading to its abandonment by middle and high income people.

Studying the property transactions in the area since 1950s, we observe that the plots have continuously changed hands (Erendil and Ulusoy, 2001). Property owners who had the opportunity have moved out to newly developing prestigious modern housing areas. They either sold the houses or rented out by subdividing the house into separate units. In the meantime, the emergence of squatter houses around the citadel also contributed to the area's loss of prestige. Yet, the demand for the citadel has not ceased within the years but the characteristics of the groups moving in the area has changed leading to a substantial shift of population throughout the years. In fact, it is observed that the majority of the population are renters and they are in the low income category (*Ankara Kalesi Koruma, Gelistirme, Imar Projesi*, 1987; Erendil and Ulusoy, 2001). Therefore, the main reasons of their preference of the area are the affordability of the housing as well as its locational advantage of being close to workplaces.

In 1987, the local municipality, in collaboration with the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, announced a design competition for the conservation of Ankara Citadel. Based on a detailed study of the existing conditions, the objective of the project was summarized as "to find comprehensive solutions for social and physical problems of the Citadel" (*Ankara Kalesi Koruma, Gelistirme, Imar Projesi*, 1987, p. 10). Furthermore, it was aimed to propose economically feasible and implementable solutions for conservation, rehabilitation and renewal so as to integrate the citadel with the rest of the city. Preserving the historic and cultural values and the traditional set up, and balancing this with development was the challenge to be tackled with (Koc, 1992). This idea of integration was among the objectives of the third plan of Ankara, which is characterized by its comprehensiveness. Therefore, the premises of the competition reflect the same principles, representing a new era in the attitude towards the historic context and the second important encounter with the citadel.

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 the historic heritage and revitalizing the area. 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 and visitors of 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 pensions for tourists in the inner citadel. All these changes would translate into the dislocation of the people who are not able to adapt to this new identity.

In the 1930s, the citadel was accepted to form the backdrop of the modern city by restricting interventions without making decisions on how to guide its transformation. Consequently, the citadel was never the focus of attention and was neglected in favor of the priorities of the successive urban development plans. With the competition, the citadel has, after a long time of neglect, been acknowledged as a location to be dealt with seriously. However, as noted above, since the mid 1980s, when the competition was announced, there have been substantial changes in the administrative framework of planning in Turkey. The growing importance of local municipalities and a change in the ideology of planning practice has increased the number of actors involved in implementation and led to an ambiguity in their respective areas of responsibility. On the other hand, the approach of the winning project tends to assume a homogenous and frictionless urban space and ignores the power conflicts, which may emerge among different interest groups. It is apparent that its plan decisions for the citadel have not been given as a result of a careful analysis of everyday practices and particular dynamics in the area or the conditions of the existing building stock. As the findings of our research show there have been significant waves of population turnover within the area over the last 70 years, leading to more or less established practices and changes in the identity of the residential structure of the area. Moreover, considering the building stock, it is observed that there are a small number of buildings with high historic significance and they are the ones which have been restored to house new uses. However, the rest of the building stock that constitutes the overall pattern of the area are residential units with modest qualities, which have lost their original characteristics due to subdivisions and additions made to meet the emerging needs of the residents over years. Therefore, it can be claimed that the proposals of the winning project are not realistic in envisaging the tension that may arise due to the incompatibility between the proposed and existing uses. Due to disagreements among the members of the winning team, the contract could not be signed until 1990. Currently, the finalized version of the project is still being studied by various related institutions, leading to a legal ambiguity for interventions. Because of this ambiguity, the area has experienced substantial changes that invalidate at least some of the premises upon which the competition and the winning project was based; most of the conversions in due time were done without permission and their court cases still continue.

In conclusion, the recent approach to the citadel reflects another kind of neglect, this time characterized by an intentional act of changing the character of the area, which disregards the particularities of the citadel and the surrounding areas, the present social structure and the conditions of the building stock. Although in the first plan no role has been given to the citadel except for forming a frozen image at the background of the new city, in the current project, a role, which is itself debatable, has been attributed to the citadel: staging it according to the interests of well-off local or foreign visitors. This approach assumes that preservation can be achieved only by functional changes to encourage a widespread use of the newly created activities staged in a neat and controlled environment. Although this appears to be a respect to the preservation of heritage, it is again manifested in a top-down manner, neglecting the existing potentialites of the area itself, which, in fact, forms one of the most important criticisms of the rationalist and technocratic planning attitude as opposed to a communicative one.

The competition project proposal and the current changes are the easiest solutions found for the citadel but it is most likely that they will destroy the authenticity of layers seen both in the social structure and building stock, which, in fact, makes the area attractive. As observed in the citadel, there is a primacy of mainly two groups; low-income residents and owners of new establishments both of whom act with short-term interests. Therefore, it may be necessary to weaken this primacy by encouraging the location of some other groups who will act more consciously in preserving the heritage while at the same time retaining their privacy and livelihood in a real life environment, contrary

to a museum-like setting. This is possible only by enabling new settlers and the existing residents economically and assisting them in their efforts of restoration or rehabilitation. Empowering those people through subsidies and participatory programs not only leads to a heightened level of consciousness and a strengthened sense of belonging among them, but also to a viable transformation of the area in which the built heritage is voluntarily preserved, not through enforcements and within restrictions.

NOTES

[1] As the plan notes indicate, Jansen presented a conservationist attitude to the traditional center. Here, not only the citadel but also the areas surrounding it were also considered. In his words, "the extraordinary view of the citadel and its timber framed houses" should be preserved and "the new sections of the town should be carefully separated from the old. Theoretically, the old town should be covered by a bell jar" (from Nalbantoglu, 1998, p.195).

[2] In fact, the population increase in Ankara was 286 percent between 1927 and 1950 as the increase in other important cities such as Istanbul and Izmir were 42 percent and 48 percent, respectively.

[3] This ideology was prevalent until the 1990s when the new ideology of especially high-income people was reflected in an escape from the city center into suburban housing districts comprising houses with gardens. However, for the low-income people in squatter housing areas, living in an apartment building is still a symbol of modern life.

[4] Buildings in this period were pulled down and reconstructed in especially central locations, reducing the useable lives of buildings to 15 years. In fact, 1960 housing census shows that 98 percent of housing permits were issued to units in apartment blocks, replacing the one-storey houses or filling in vacant areas within the city (Altaban, 1998).

[5] In all ten-year periods after 1950, the rate of sales was high: about one fifth or one sixth of the properties changed hands. The highest rate of sales was seen between the years 1950 and 1970.

REFERENCES

Akcura, Necva. "Ulus - Tarihi Ticaret Merkezi Planlama Calismalari Kapsaminda 'Koruma' Sorunlari - Konut Dokusu Konusunda Bazi Gorusler", *Ulus Tarihi Kent Merkezi Cevre Duzenleme Yarismasi*. Ankara Buyuksehir Belediyesi, Imar Dairesi Baskanligi, 1985, 51-58.

Altaban, Ozcan. "Kamu Yapilari Yer Secimi Surecleri", *Ankara: 1985'den 2000'e*, Ankara: Buyuksehir Belediyesi, EGO Genel Mudurlugu, 1987, 31-48.

Altinyildiz, Nur. "Varligi Korumak / Yoklugu Ortmek," *Mimarlik* 284 (1998): 6-7.

Ankara Kalesi Koruma Gelistirme Imar Plani Projesi. Kultur ve Turizm Bakanligi ve Altindag Belediyesi, 1987.

Berman, Marshall. *All That Is Solid Melts into Air*. New York: Penguin Books, 1988.

Campbell, Scott and Fainstein, Susan S. "Introduction: The Structure and Debates of Planning Theory," in Campbell, S. and Fainstein, S. (Eds) *Readings in Planning Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996, 1-14.

Davidoff, Paul. "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 31: 4 (1965): 331-338.

Eraydin, Ayda. "Industrial Districts: The Challenge of the Periphery," in I. Knut (Ed) *Western Cross Border Cooperation and Strategies for Development in Peripheral Regions*. Oslo: Nord-Trondelags- Forskning, 1997.

Erendil, Asuman. Using Critical Realist Approach in Geographical Research: An Attempt to Analyze the Transforming Nature of Production and Reproduction in Denizli, Unpublished PhD thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey, 1998.

Erendil, Asuman. "Export-oriented Transformation in a Textile Town in Turkey: A Success Story or a Failure?" paper presented at the 30th Annual Meeting of Urban Affairs Association - Cities in the New Millennium: Separate Realities-or Shared Fates?, in Los Angeles, California, May 3-6, 2000.

Erendil, Asuman and Ulusoy, Zuhal. "The Re-invention of Tradition as an Urban Image," paper to be presented at the International Sociological Association Conference: Social Inequality, Redistributive Justice and the City, in Amsterdam, June 15-17, 2001.

Fainstein, Susan S. "New Directions in Planning Theory," *Urban Affairs Review* 35: 4 (2000): 451-478.

Habermas, Jurgen. *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1987.

Harvey, David "On Planning the Ideology of Planning," in Campbell, S. and Fainstein, S. (Eds) *Readings in Planning Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996, 176-197.

Harvey, David. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989.

Healey, Patsy. "Planning through Debate," in Campbell, S. and Fainstein, S. (Eds) *Readings in Planning Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996, 234-257.

Jacobs, Jane. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, New York: Vintage Books, 1961.

Koc, Ali R. "Ankara Kalesi ve Koruma Imar Plani Uygulamalari", *Koruyucu Kent Yenilemesi ve Yerel Yonetimler*. Ankara: Mimarlar Odasi, 1991, 37-40.

Krumholz, Norman. "A Retrospective View of Equity Planning: Cleveland, 1969-1979," *Journal of American Planning Association* 48 (1982): 163-83.

Lindblom, C. E. "The Science of Muddling through," *Public Administration Review* 19 (1959): 79-88.

Nalbantoglu, Gulsum. "Silent Interrruptions: Urban Encounters with Rural Turkey," in S. Bozdogan, R. Kasaba (Eds) *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1998, 192-211.

Swanstrom, Todd. "The Limits of Strategic Planning for Cities," *Journal of Urban Affairs* 9:2 (1987):139-57.

Senyapili, Tansi. *Ankara Kentinde Gecekondu Gelisimi*, Ankara: Kent-Koop, 1985.

Tanyeli, Ugur. "Turk Modernlesmesinin Kentsel Sahnesini Yeniden Dusunmek," *Arredamento Mimarlik* 3 (1997): 81-82.

Tekeli, Ilhan. "Turkiye'de Cumhuriyet Doneminde Kentsel Gelisme ve Kent Planlamasi," *75 Yilda Degisen Kent ve Mimarlik*. Istanbul: Tarih Vakfi Yayinlari, 1998, 1-24.

Tekeli, Ilhan. "Kent Topraginda Mulkiyet Dagilimi ve El Degistirme Surecleri," *Ankara 1985'den 2015'e*. Ankara: Buyuksehir Belediyesi, EGO Genel Mudurlugu, 1987, 87-104.

Turel, Ali. "Ankara'da Konut Yapim Surecleri," *Ankara 1985'den 2015'e*. Ankara: Buyuksehir Belediyesi, EGO Genel Mudurlugu, 1987, 55-64.

Ulusoy, Zuhal and Erendil, Asuman. "The Inhabitants and Consumers of the Ankara Citadel," paper presented at the MESA Conference, in Washington, D.C., Nov. 17-20, 1999.

Ulusoy, Zuhal. "Conflicting Interests in Revitalization: Changing Character of the Ankara Citadel," paper presented at the Shelter and Revitalization of Old and Historic Urban Centers International Conference, in Havana, Cuba, March 30-April 3, 1998.

Yavuz, Yildirim. "Ankara'da Cumhuriyet Donemi Mimarisi," *Ankara Konusmalari*. Ankara: Mimarlar Odasi Yayinlari, 1992: 96-107.