



Power and culture : new perspectives on spatiality in european history / edited by Pieter François, Taina Syrjämaa, Henri Terho. - Pisa : Plus-Pisa university press, 2008. - (Thematic work group. 1, Power and culture ; 3)
110 (21.)

1. Spazio – Concetto 2. Europa – Cultura - Storia I. François, Pieter II. Syrjämaa, Taina III. Terho, Henri

CIP a cura del Sistema bibliotecario dell'Università di Pisa

This volume is published thanks to the support of the Directorate General for Research of the European Commission, by the Sixth Framework Network of Excellence CLIOHRES.net under the contract CIT3-CT-2005-006164. The volume is solely the responsibility of the Network and the authors; the European Community cannot be held responsible for its contents or for any use which may be made of it.

Cover: Alberto Papafava, *View of Piazza di Siena in Roma*, watercolour, Palazzo Papafava, Padua.
© 1990 Photo Scala, Florence

© 2008 by CLIOHRES.net

The materials published as part of the CLIOHRES Project are the property of the CLIOHRES.net Consortium. They are available for study and use, provided that the source is clearly acknowledged.
cliohres@cliohres.net - www.clioehres.net

Published by Edizioni Plus – Pisa University Press
Lungarno Pacinotti, 43
56126 Pisa
Tel. 050 2212056 – Fax 050 2212945
info.plus@adm.unipi.it
www.edizioniplus.it - Section "Biblioteca"

Member of



Association of American
University Presses

ISBN: 978-88-8492-553-4

Linguistic Revision
Rodney Dean

Informatic Editing
Răzvan Adrian Marinescu

The Lived Spatiality of Ankara (1935-1950) through the Memories of its Citizens¹

SERPİL ÖZALOĞLU
Middle East Technical University

ABSTRACT

As the capital of the young Turkish Republic, founded in 1923, Ankara was one of the few cities among its contemporaries that was constructed with a great deal of planning. It was the symbol of the nation-state and the modernisation of the city's culture and environment was one of the principal objectives in the Early Republican period. In this chapter, the transformation of urban culture is traced through the everyday life of the inhabitants and the lived spatiality through both the new and the old districts of the city. While discussing lived spatiality in order to analyse the transformation of urban culture, I refer to three aspects: everyday life, the history-memory relationship and bodily practices. The larger part of the research project is based on memory. Written documents, newspapers, literary constructions, memoirs and interviews with the elderly inhabitants of the city are the main sources. This chapter is based on the information obtained from interviews. It can be deduced from this study that Ankara was a fruitful medium for the creation of a modern urban culture between 1935 and 1950 and that the middle social groups were the main actors in this transformation process.

Ankara, planlanarak inşa edilmiş ender başkentlerden biridir. Başkent'in modernleşmesi Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi'nin hedeflerinden biriydi. Makalede kentsel kültürün dönüşümü, Ankaralıların günlük yaşamları ve mekansal pratikleri açılarından incelenmektedir. Adı geçen mekanlar ve binalar kentin hem yeni hem de eski veya geleneksel mahallelerinde yer almaktadır.

Mekansal pratikten anlaşılan, kentin kamusal alanlarında yer alan tüm mekansal deneyimler ve toplumsal ilişkilerdir. İlişkisiz ve önceden planlanmamış gibi görünen olayları birbirine toplumsal ve fiziksel olarak bağlayan şey dönemin baskın olan söylemidir. 1930ların ve 1940ların Ankara'sında baskın olan söylem modernleşmedir. Bu çalışmada kentsel kültürün dönüşümünü mekansal pratikler aracılığıyla incelerken üç önemli başlık, günlük yaşam, tarih-bellek ilişkisi ve bedensel pratiklerdir.

Kent kültürü, günlük yaşam ve mekansal pratikler aracılığıyla, kendini kentin kamusal alanlarında açıkça gösterir. Dönüşüm sürecindeki bir kentin analizi yalnızca mimarisi ve kentsel mekanlarının fiziksel özellikleriyle sınırlandırılmamalıdır. Bu mekanları kullananların yaşam biçimleriyle, mekansal ve bedensel pratikleriyle birlikte bir bütün olarak değerlendirilmelidir. Böylece kentsel mekanlara ve yerlere atfedilen anlam mekansal kullanım biçimlerini de kapsayacak, kentsel kültürün ve mekanın toplumsal olarak üretilmesiyle ilişkilendirilecektir.

Kent kültürünü dönüştürenler yalnızca elit bir kesim değil, mütevazı bir yaşam süren diğer toplumsal gruplardır da. Ankara'da modern yaşam biçiminin yavaş yavaş benimsenmesi yalnızca ulus devletinin kuruluş tarihinde yer alan mekanlar aracılığıyla olmaz. Kültürel mekanlar (Sergievi, tiyatrolar, sinemalar, halk evleri), eğlence/dinlenme yerleri (parklar, kahveler, restoranlar), çarşılar, "asfalt" ya da bulvarlar, mahalleler günlük yaşamın mekanlarıdır. Yeni mekansal ve bedensel pratikler buralarda yeşerir. Yeni/modern çevrelerin yanısıra, eski ve kendiliğinden gelişen bölgeler de dönüşüm sürecinde eşit derecede yer alır.

Dönüşüm, ne geleneksel ne de modern olarak sınıflanamayacak olan aradaki durumların analizini yapabilmek amacıyla kullanılan kaynaklarla doğrudan ilişkilidir. Araştırmada bellek temel alınmıştır. Yazılı belgelerin yanısıra, gazetelerden, edebi kaynaklardan, anılardan ve 1935-50 arasında Ankara'da yaşamış eski Ankaralılarla yapılan söyleşilerden yararlanılmıştır. Bu makale ise söyleşiler üzerinden yazılmıştır. Yapılan analize göre Ankara, seçilen dönemde modern kentsel bir kültürün yaratılabilmesine ya da var olanın modern bir kent kültürüne dönüştürülebilmesine olanak sağlayan bir ortam sunmaktadır. Bu kültürün yaratılmasında en büyük pay, orta sınıfa ait olduğunu söyleyebileceğimiz toplumsal gruplarıdır.

INTRODUCTION

Ankara was declared the capital of the country with the foundation of the Republic of Turkey in 1923. The Early Republican period was a nation-building period that aimed at making the country modern. Ankara became the symbol of this aim. Its physical environment was subject to a rapid transformation which continued almost until the end of the Second World War. This period was part of the grand narrative of nation building.

Urban culture clearly manifests itself in urban public spaces through everyday life and lived spatiality. All social groups are the main agents in the transformation of urban culture. In Ankara, the gradual appropriation of modern life styles took place in the urban public spaces but these spaces did not have to be part of the grand narrative of nation-building.

The theoretical framework of this study is based on the interaction of everyday life², the history-memory relationship³, and bodily practices⁴. These three subjects are referred to while discussing lived spatiality in the context of the transformation of urban culture in the 1930s, the 1940s and the beginning of the 1950s in Ankara.

In this study, the two main concepts, everyday life and lived spatiality, are defined with reference to Henri Lefebvre's work. However, the definitions have to be adapted to the context of the research, because the modern society paradigm of industrially developed countries does not fit the preindustrial society of the young Republic of Turkey. All the inhabitants of the city, from all social groups, participated together in urban life and culture. "Everyday life is a conscious or unconscious revolt against the institutionalized way of living in the city, and it becomes an art of living. Then 'ambiguity' is an essential category of everyday life"⁵. Since it does not have a definite structure, it is difficult to analyze and classify things which take place in everyday life; but this is what transforms and makes modern urban culture.

Lived spatiality is defined as the totality of spatial practices and social relations which take place in urban public spaces. The "whole" also implies a "discourse" which binds the seemingly unrelated, unstructured social and physical environments or urban events⁶. In the context of the Ankara of the 1930s and the 1940s, the dominant discourse is modernisation. In this chapter, the everyday life of the inhabitants is combined with the spatial practices and is analyzed through practices in public or urban spaces. In this context, the signs of societal modernisation are obtained from the lived spatiality in the spaces of leisure, recreation, culture, and shopping, and in community life in the districts. The criteria for being a modern individual are hidden in the key words of familiarity, triviality, (the) mundane and (the) ordinary (things of everyday life), fragmented (identities, lives), ambiguity. The criteria for the modernisation of individuals' life styles with respect to lived spatiality are: being an individual in an urban environment without the constraints of a traditional social web; the practice of social urban/public spaces without being under the control of the family, neighbours or other traditional social relations; participation in urban entertainment, cultural places regardless of level of income which are manifestations of modern individual behaviour.

According to Lefebvre, lived experience is made up from the everyday relations between human beings⁷. The relationship between space and the formation of memories is defined when space is taken not only as a physical but also as a social space. A space offers the most favourable conditions for memories to be conserved; and for collective thought to be formed and represented. Social space is placed outside of *durée* [duration] by its social aspect⁸. Social space necessarily has a defined period of time. In the case of the absence of social space, a society will not find a base on which to found its identity⁹. Parallel to this assertion, "[...] is the concept of space as a practiced place"¹⁰. Simultaneous collective memories regarding urban life are founded in public urban spaces. The interaction of different social groups and strata takes place in public spaces.

Reference to oral and written memories makes it easier to clarify the effect of physical space on social transformation mechanisms.

According to Halbwachs, rituals and cults have two main components: space and bodily practices, which have been part of continuing traditions from the previous generations to the next¹¹. According to Tanyeli, in modern societies, architecture becomes a tool for new social programmes to become legitimate and gain approval. Both the definition of modernity by means of objects and the introduction of spaces and equipment for the modernisation of urban life are acts seen in the Early Republican period of Turkey. Public spaces are introduced with this objective during this period (for example, the train station, *Halkevi* [People's House]¹², exhibition buildings and parks)¹³. In this research, bodily practices are limited to the practice of public spaces and segregation or non-segregation according to gender differentiation.

In the case of Ankara, four types of documents are used in the research: oral and written memories, newspaper articles of the period 1935-1950, and three novels, the first and second being written just before and the third during that period. For collective, social and individual memories a series of interviews was realized with the elderly inhabitants who were witnesses of the period¹⁴. This chapter is based on the information obtained from these interviews.

Public spaces are analysed in relation to memory and lived spatiality. Memory - space relations are referred to, with the purpose of clarifying the theoretical basis of the method used in the study. Individual memories of the interviewees are part of their social frameworks and they expressed this, whilst they were talking about the past, either by referring to their family, friends or professional circles. The memories were told today, in 2005, 2006. However, some of the memoirs and newspaper articles are materials from the period 1935-1950.

Interviewees are from middle social groups¹⁵. The reason for their selection is that in current studies of the period between 1920s and 1950s, the middle social groups are absent. While conducting the interviews, a snowball sampling method was used. The interviews were face-to-face, in depth, semi-structured, with open-ended questions (See Appendix A). The interviews were tape recorded (with two exceptions) with the permission of the interviewees and the transcription has been made by the researcher. Gender balance was kept with the participation of 10 men and 8 women¹⁶.

In total 18 interviews were made. The number of interviews was not predetermined, however; spaces in the memories and the stories became recurrent despite the fact that interviewees were from various social circles. After consulting researchers who conduct studies by using interviews, the number of interviews was found to be sufficient for analysis based on "snowball sampling"¹⁷. The educational level of people ranged from secondary and high school students to university graduates. Every interview had its

own direction and rhythm. For each session, half a day (morning or afternoon) was needed. The order of the questions changed according to the course of the interviews.

The aim during each specific session was first to set a general frame (without details) to obtain general information in order to have a relation with other sessions, about urban spaces, spatial practices and the general approach to the individual's everyday life. Then specific questions were asked. During the sessions the interviewees said that they were pleased to be a part of the study, and that their opinions and memories were sought. The researcher always had visual material (a small collection of photographs of old Ankara) during the interviews. The collection was rarely used (just twice), when the sessions were not as fluent as they could have been, to solve the problem¹⁸. Except for two of the interviewees, no health related problems were experienced. One of them had difficulty in speaking (Parkinson's disease), the other got excited and had a heart problem. We stopped for a while, had our drinks and biscuits, and continued after he calmed down.

After transcribing the tapes of the interviews, the second step was to create texts from the material. Two texts were obtained by cut and paste technique, by juxtaposing some sections from the interviews for them to be used for the analysis of everyday life and public spaces. The first aimed to obtain the story of the recurring spaces, therefore descriptive narrations were chosen and juxtaposed. The second text was intended to get the story of everyday life. Then the texts were evaluated according to certain themes. In the interviewees' memories, reoccurring spaces were not only residential districts, shopping areas, picnic areas, or work places which have been (traditional) public places but also newly introduced public spaces and places which had been frequented by the interviewees at different stages of their lives (childhood, youth, adulthood). In general, these were restaurants, taverns, cinemas, theatres, pastry shops, boulevard cafes, parks and play grounds, squares, popular strolling routes, the location of which changed as the city transformed, changed or developed. In the research recurrent public places were examined under the themes/titles of spaces of entertainment and culture, commercial activity, recreation, gender relations, and strolling activity.

THE CASE: ANKARA

While studying the three main sources mentioned above, the following hypotheses were formulated:

- Gradual appropriation of a modern life style takes place in urban public spaces but these spaces do not have to be part of the grand narrative of nation-building, such as ministry and other government buildings, or other public buildings like the train station, stadium, etc.

- Cultural places (*Sergievi* [art galleries], theatres, cinemas, *Halkevi*), recreation places (parks, coffee shops, restaurants), shopping areas, the boulevard districts are all spaces of everyday life and new spatial and bodily practices flourish in these spaces.
- The routine modernising agent of urban life style is hours of work, in addition to new urban spaces. New urban spaces and the public realm are not the spaces of monumental representations of the Republic.
- The reality of the city shelters the new/modern, the old, and the spontaneously developing urban environments which were the setting of societal transformations.

OCCURRENCE OF DAILY LIFE IN ANKARA

The variety of public spaces was not rich in Ankara before or after the foundation of the Republic. The public places were coffee houses, restaurants, pastry shops, *muhallebici* [dairy shops], and one bar¹⁹. Hotels, in addition to accommodation, offer entertainment services both to the visitors and the inhabitants. Although the variety of public spaces does not seem to be rich and the use of spaces is based on gender differentiation, we find two contradictory news items on recreation and night-life in Ankara, in January 1923 and in January 1924, just after the foundation of the Republic²⁰. The one in 1923 was written by a French journalist and according to the news, at 7 p.m., Ankara was a dead city. On the contrary, in 1924, in the “Times”, it was described how a person could enjoy a night in Ankara: “There is a perfect restaurant in every way. In the evenings, dance and opera music are played. It even has an American bar with high chairs. One can enjoy time there and then go to the cinema afterwards.” This means that neither the first news item nor the second one was a general evaluation, because the impression changed according to the user’s experience of the public spaces in the city according to the rhythm of his/her daily life.

TRACING OUT THE TRANSFORMATION OF EVERYDAY LIFE FROM THE SOURCES OF THE PERIOD (1935-1950)

The “Ulus” newspaper gives basically two messages to the researcher. Until 1938, the city of Ankara was under the influence of the building of a nation-state and also subject to the physical construction of a new modern city. Within the framework of this study, the news pieces in the newspaper are categorized as:

- Urban and architectural constructions in the city;
- Modern life style in the city;
- Ongoing traditional life style in the city;
- Use of the new public spaces under the titles of formal ceremonies, institutional use of space (like educational places –faculties, departments, civil/social organizations).

By the Second World War and the death of Atatürk in 1938, news items on the city and urban life took less space in the newspapers. On the other hand, in the interviews with the older inhabitants, 1938 was not mentioned as a threshold or a rupture in their memories but there was continuity before and after 1938. The life styles and the physical environment did not change simultaneously. But people's daily life was gradually enriched by the use of new public spaces.

INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIAL MEMORIES: INTERVIEWS

Interviews with the older inhabitants of Ankara consisted of their individual and collective memories. Individual memories also have social frameworks²¹; social time and social space tie the individual memory to the physical space, and install the “timeless” physical space within a context which limits its existence²².

There were various social groups (professional groups, district groups – “*mahalleli*” –, cultural hobby groups, sport groups, etc.) in which the interviewees participated during the period of the study. It is notable that in different fields of life, like recreation, professional life, and intellectual life, the names of spaces and places recurred often in people's memories. These spaces are mnemonic places for the city. There are recurring types of behaviours and attitudes. These people are elderly people and what they remember is usually the positive part of their lives. They all claim that they had a happy life in Ankara until the end of the 1940s. Then they generally claim that their life style and the city itself changed by the time of the 1950 elections.

All the interviewees lived in the central districts of Ankara²³. Mostly they lived in the traditional type of house. But there were those who lived in newly built houses too. In terms of the physical environment of the residential areas (topography of memory), the interviewees did not remember shanty towns (*gecekondu*) near the central parts of the city in the 1940s – which contradicts the news items and the articles in the newspapers²⁴. However they did talk about the housing shortage.

Loci in memory can be classified into two parts, according to childhood and adult memories. Recurrent spaces in childhood memories were mostly playgrounds. Recurrent spaces in adult memories were varied and can be classified under a number of subtitles. These classified spaces are also in harmony with the theoretical framework of the study, because they contain activities which are mostly outside the routine of daily life. The boundaries between childhood and youth memories, and also youth and adult memories remain blurred. The childhood period can be classified either according to the activities that the interviewees remember or according to their statement which starts with “when I was a child...”

CHILDHOOD MEMORIES

In childhood memories, the activities were both spontaneous (hide and seek) and organized (bicycle races of which the routes were published in the newspaper). This shows that some public activities in the city were organized by a civic initiative, i.e. within the public sphere. The rhythm of activities was daily (feeding pigeons), seasonal (skating or flying a kite), yearly and in organized periods (theatre and music courses in the *Halkevi*, a parachute tower, riding a horse, using the rifle range). The urban spaces like playgrounds (streets, roads, fields) and for entertainment, were extended to almost all of *Yenişehir*, the new district of the city. The defined place, which is in today's city center, was the garden of *Himaye-i Etfal* (Turkish Red Cross). However it was still a district life and the city was a safe place for children both during the day and night time. The rhythm of the activities implies that urban spaces were part of children's everyday life all through the year.

In one of the traditional old districts of Ankara, for one interviewee the playground was the alley in front of the *mescit*, a small mosque. Her grandfather was also the *imam* of the mosque. She experienced a kind of rural life in the city because they had a place for the grandfather's donkey at home, and they used to go to the grandfather's vineyards (*Samanlık Bağları*) in the summer in *Cebeci*. She did not play on the road but in the garden which three other neighbours' houses looked onto. It was spatially more limited, and controllable by the parents when compared to the children's playground in *Yenişehir*. At home they had a radio and the sisters used to listen to radio sketches for entertainment. On weekends, they used to take the train from *Kurtuluş* to go to *Çiftlik* (the farm, *Atatürk Orman Çiftliği, AOÇ*).

The same lady remembered how she used to go to the theatre (*Üçüncü Tiyatro* or *Operet Sahnesi*) to watch puppets (*Hacivat'la Karagöz*) on Sundays with her three younger sisters and her friends and that they went by themselves. This was a form of urban entertainment. And with her mother and her friends, she used to go to *Şehir Bahçesi* (a park), although they were closer to *Hacettepe* Park. She remembered *Şehir* Park as a beautiful place. She also remembered the garden of the *Evkaf* Apartments as a very big garden with big trees and a lot of flowers; and the park of the National Assembly building (*Meclis Parki*) that they used to visit frequently. But she also found the road going to the traditional marketplace beautiful.

Other interviewees remembered their childhood playgrounds in the residential districts. Whether modern or traditional, spatially their everydaylife consisted of their physical environment which was close to their homes.

ADULT MEMORIES

LOCI IN MEMORY: PUBLIC PARKS AND OUTDOOR RECREATION SPACES

Women were given special importance in the Early Republican Period. Their images in the newspapers or periodicals and magazines were implicitly the images of modern Turkey²⁵. The institute for girls in Ankara was for educating the girls to be modern “housewives”²⁶. The changing position of women in a modernizing society has been the subject of studies about the Early Republican period. Therefore, to start with the women’s memories is appropriate in order to find out how they were part of urban life in the city.

For the interviewees who were housewives, social life was mostly between women. They remembered life in the district as a pleasant one. They described the relationship between neighbours with the words “unity”, “loyalty”, “affection”, “warmth”, “cordiality”. The traditional type of neighbourhood consisted of families from different income groups and social status. The poor were taken care of without intimidating them. There was solidarity between neighbours.

Urban spaces in the interviewees’ memory were parks, two routes and a boulevard²⁷ (Figs. 1-3). Esenpark, which is vividly present in childhood and adult memories, was a public place to go to, both for entertainment and, during the day, to have tea and see the view of Ankara. It was also a place to listen to traditional types of Turkish music, for men, women and children, both for families and single people. However, *Gar Gazinosu*²⁹, which is a modern entertainment place, was, as one woman interviewee said, a place for men. Every interviewee who had a memory concerning *Esenpark*, said that they were very sorry that the place had been demolished and that the municipality building had been constructed there.



Fig. 1
Strolling on the streets.
Source: “Ulus Gazetesi”, 10 June 1938



Fig. 2
Yenisehir.
Source: “Ulus Gazetesi”, 10 June 1938



Fig. 3
Hacettepe Parkı, 1951.
Source: photograph of the interviewees.

Hacettepe Park, was a modern version of the traditional picnic areas (*mesire yeri*). It contained walkways, designed green areas, flower beds, sculptures and pools. People frequented the place either at weekends, or for eating their lunch if their working place was close to it or during the day or at summer nights with friends, with the family, women with children. These two parks, *Esenpark* and *Hacettepe* Park, were urban green areas. Both of them acted as places for traditional social practices. And here rules of segregation between men and women were not applied. These two parks, as repeated often in the interviewees' memories, were popular public places, but the park that was situated at the back of Turkish National Assembly was also mentioned without giving any description of it.

Wandering around for recreation in an urban environment, without any specific aim, may or may not have ended up with going in a park; or going to a park may have been the specific aim for the wanderer³⁰. Urban parks were one category of public space and

offered the inhabitant three different types of environment: a controlled area, with some natural environment; a social environment for various activities which might change during the day, afternoon and night times for both men and women and various age groups; an informal educational place in terms of bodily practices for both sexes in the city.

In the memories of the interviewees ceremonies of national events were not mentioned at all. In literature, there is little information about *Esenpark*, which had more functions than a normal urban park. In addition to frequently given traditional Turkish music concerts, public executions were carried out in front of the park at dawn. People who had been there for concerts had also been there to watch executions. “Criminals guilty of murder were hanged there,” are words of an interviewee which reflect his alienation from the idea and practice of capital punishment²⁸.

In the park, there were shops which were rented out to bring in income for the municipality. Those who could not go by themselves (whether very young children, teenagers or the very old) used to listen to the music which came from the park from their homes, even during the day. Concerts and recreation in the park enriched their lives. The music which was listened to from far away (at home) even helped them to feel at peace.

LOCI OF MEMORY: PLACES FOR COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY

The interviews draw a picture of a modern city with its boulevard cafés, sport and cultural facilities, cosy districts, green streets, public transport, *bazaars* [shopping places], eating places. Between 1930 and 1940, progress was evident in the physical urban development of the city.

The memories of the interviewees clarify that Ulus was the centre of commercial activity and its surroundings had various commercial characteristics during the period. Traditional craftsmen and tradesmen kept their workplaces and sold traditional consumer goods mostly in *Hamamönü*. However, Ulus was undergoing a transformation on both its *Anafartalar* Street and *Bankalar* Street with the arrival of new consumer products (according to the rules of supply and demand) (Figs. 4-6). All the activity was around Ulus towards *Samanpazarı* and towards the *Zincirli* Mosque. *Bankalar* Street, in the afternoon, after work was finished, was full of young women strolling and window shopping, as one of the women interviewees who worked at Ulus said. Another one described the location of a hat maker and said, “Women would not go out without hats”. *Hamamönü* was the traditional shopping area. Ulus had shops which also sold imported products from Europe. Ulus was mentioned by all the interviewees, one of them having been a tradesman there. He talked about the period between 1935 and 1945. He remembered the names of the shops and the tradesmen who were his friends. While describing the shops, he also provided the location of a national lottery kiosk, and the place of the Ulus cinema. Towards the *Zincirli* Mosque, he said,



Fig. 4
Modern commercial activity.
Source: "Ulus", 3 February 1935.



Fig. 5
Advertisements for women in the newspaper.
Source: "Ulus", 23 August 1944.



Fig. 6
Commercial activity in a shanty town; a pedlar in Telsiz District.
Source: "Ulus", 11 October 1938.

“there were two sportswear and equipment stores, *Florya* and *Kamehya*. There was a *han* (large commercial building) called *Mühendis Hanı*. The owners of the *han* were the *Koç* family.”³¹ From his account, Ulus was rich in terms of the variety of shops and stores. He mentioned *Samanpazarı* in detail, where traditional crafts were located (coppersmiths, *urgancılar* [ropemakers], *semerciler* [packsaddle makers], *kalaycılar* [tinsmiths], *çarıkcılar* [rawhide sandal makers]). Both craftsmen and tradesmen were from different ethnic groups and from different cities. (The drapery sector was in the hands of the Jews; carpet sellers were from Niğde, butchers were Turks, etc.).

Traditional and new consumer goods both met the needs of the clients. Therefore neither of the places lost popularity and neither lost out to the other. Both of the shopping and commercial areas formed part of the routine of the various social groups, either for shopping or for wandering around and window shopping.

LOCI IN MEMORY: PUBLIC PLACES FOR CULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND ENTERTAINMENT

A general classification for the ‘loci in memory’ can be made for places of entertainment and cultural activities. For cultural activities, *Halkevi*, theatres, cinemas, opera theatres were the dominant places in the memories of the interviewees. But activities in the universities and the radio station were also significant in influencing or introducing new concepts into people’s everyday lives. The radio was not limited to one specific place however but programmes were heard in many locations, including homes and places of work. Radio was an intruder in the lives of people from various cultural backgrounds and lifestyles. Entertainment places were cinemas, eating places, *gazinos*, bars, taverns, open air spaces like parks and streets, and *Halkevi*. At a certain point and at a certain level, entertainment and some of the cultural activities coincided. Traditional types of entertainment continued to form part of the lives of people from every social group.

The number of people from Istanbul employed in government positions and who were to promote culture and entertainment in addition to their own jobs, can not be stated precisely. They are called “lifestyle carriers” as well, because they had a mission of spreading modern/new social manners to the public³². However, to live in Ankara, was not their preference but an obligation, because of their responsibility in their job for the new government. On the other hand, four of the interviewees, an architect, two physicians and a photographer, who were all from Istanbul, preferred to live in Ankara. They found that the organization of the city with its professional, cultural and entertainment places and shopping areas, was a factor in making the routine of their individual life easier.

Halkevi was a very fruitful place for acculturation (Fig. 7)³³. People met with others, both men and women, who were from outside their familiar social circle (family, neighbourhood). Gender mixture occurred. New manners and bodily practices were experi-



Fig.7
Halkevleri: Places for acculturation (examples of modern architecture).
Source: "Ulus", 23 February 1936



Fig. 8
Poetry session at the Faculty of Law.
Source: "Ulus", 25 December 1948.

enced and these were taken to other social milieus where similar people attended. This was the role attributed to urban public spaces in modern societies or in societies that were "transforming to modern"³⁴.

University faculties contributed to the cultural environment in different places of the city, not only through education but also through other activities organized on their premises (Fig. 8)³⁵. Among the cultural facilities the *Sergievi* provided were interesting exhibitions, by which two interviewees were deeply influenced. They decided to become architects after visiting an exhibition of German Architecture.

Films (at the *Büyük* cinema) had *premières*, and large families, even young girls, used to go there dressed as if they were going to the opera. Cinemas were places where both men and women of various ages went for recreation and leisure. Going to the cinema was a popular entertainment activity in the adults' memories. It was a tool to expand their imagination, and for the transformation process in terms of consumer habits³⁶. The clothes they wore were influenced by this activity. Young working women carried the fashions into their social life. Tradesmen and artisans at Ulus (tailors, shoemakers, hat makers, textile shops, handbag makers...) benefitted economically. Going to the cinema can be categorised, according to Belge's definition, as entertainment in modern societies, because it is independent of domestic life³⁷.

Gazinos, hotels, bars (Figs. 9, 10) and outdoor places of entertainment were part of popular culture. In the traditional sense, *cambazhane* [a kind of circus] (Fig. 11), picnic places like *Bentderesi*, *Hatip Çayı*, and public parks are the places remembered by the interviewees. People from various social groups made these places part of their everyday life.



Fig. 9
Bomonti Garden, Advertisement of a garden party.
Source: "Ulus", 25 June 1948.



Fig. 10
Hotels, bars and taverns.
Source: "Ulus", 9 May 1946.

CONCLUDING REMARKS ON LIVED SPATIALITY IN ANKARA

The recollections of the interviewees are reconstructions of the past from the standpoint of the present. 'Remembering' brings the recollections of the past together. The locating and the ordering of individuals' recollections was realized according to their social frameworks. Whether institutionalized or not, space was an inseparable part of their memories, hence lived spatiality was complementary to both the social and the physical organisation of the city.

This approach of analysing subjects with contrasting dualities does not permit an understanding of transformation processes that include 'in-between' situations, such as a family with a traditional life style and using traditional entertainment public places, where its members also go to cinema, an activity which was a new practice in the 1930s and 1940s. Going out to watch a film meant, for the members of the family, that they would be together with many people that they did not know, in the same place, for at least two hours a week, and often every two weeks. It was thus different from the traditional place of entertainment, where people came together with relatives and neighbours and where usually there was a gender segregation except for the children. This situation was also one of the starting points of acculturation which created 'in-between' situations which did not fit any kind of classification within the constructs based on contrasting duality, such as modern/traditional, new/old, rural/urban, peasant/bourgeois. The locus of acculturation here was the social space of the cinema. However, evaluations and analyses based on dualities highlight ruptures and changes that contrast with the continuities in urban life. 'In-between' situations are disregarded. Ruptures which seem to be the consequence of revolutions negate the process of gradual transformation. However, if change is evaluated in terms of the experience of space which is made up of the practice



Fig. 11
Cambazhane (a kind of circus).
Source: "Ulus", 1 October 1947.

of everyday life in public places, we still see the evidence of a gradual transformation process; in other words, breaks and ruptures can not happen immediately because of the persistence of the habitual attitudes of people which are nourished by collective and individual memory or memories.

Children's playgrounds, cultural and recreational activities also described as specific 'in-between' situations. Both the traditional and the modern environments were part of the children's everyday life: parks being part of the modern Ankara, and the residential environment part of traditional Ankara. Life oscillated in between. The mother did not allow the children to go out to play but allowed them to go to the theatre by themselves. In the home, traditional food was prepared throughout the year but one of the interviewees, when she was a little school girl, said that she ate her lunch outside in the restaurant at Ulus with her father who had his workplace there close to her school. It was an urban ritual for father and daughter to eat outside and together.

In this research, the specificity of the selected period 1935-1950 is related to the institutionalization of Republican reforms. The institutionalization of these reforms required a comparatively settled period after the turbulence of the first ten years of the Republic. In addition to the judicial innovations, new architectural spaces were needed

to reinforce its existence, and thus the public was to get used to its existence by practicing its space.

The reaction of the inhabitants in their life styles to the facilities provided by the state for their public and private lives created the transformation process. The type of reaction, taking position either for or against the changes, defined whether it was rapid or gradual. The resistance to the changes manifested itself according to the level of the needs and the awareness of the social groups. The most specific example was going to the gazinos as family, relatives and friends, in order to listen to classical Turkish music, which was not part of the cultural politics of the state.

Esenpark can be accepted as a place of resistance in this sense. If an analysis is made, on the one hand, a public execution, in the eyes of the public, was the representation of state authority and justice in its attempt to enforce social order. From the interviewees, there was no objection to this form of representation. On the other hand, to listen to classical Turkish music in an urban park might be considered either a conscious or unconscious resistance to the politics of the acculturation of the Republic, because classical/traditional Turkish music was neither on radio programmes nor in the programming of the conservatoire nor in *Halkevi*. As it was seen as a reminder of Ottoman culture, it was deliberately ignored in the state's cultural policies. In the *Şehir Bahçesi* and the National Assembly Park which were at Ulus, only classical western music or other types of western music were played. However, Esenpark filled a gap in this sense.

On the other hand, Esenpark was an appropriate physical environment for the new type of bodily practices. With its location and topography, Esenpark was a suitable place for contemplating the view looking towards the new city. Going to Esenpark with family and friends, with children and without any segregation for women was a new urban habit when compared to the traditional entertainments in the city (weddings, religious feasts, bayrams, etc.). Esenpark was still a very fresh and an important locus in many interviewees' memory.

Another example of resistance was the presence of intellectuals who decided to live in Ankara because it was the symbol of Republican values and the modern city. Their resistance was one agent that helped to accelerate the transformation of urban culture. They were ahead of their time and appropriating the changes and innovations, they evaluated contemporary reality with a critical mind.

The hours of work creating routine in everyday life also acted as a modernizing agent. The frequency rate of visits to taverns, restaurants, bars, gazinos and parks also show that such activities were a part of the routine for individuals, families and their friends. These visits were independent personal decisions. Both factors were influential in transforming the urban culture and the visits constituted the 'in-between' situations. However, the intellectuals' preference to live in Ankara arose out of their appreciation of the facilities provided there by the state. In this case, the routine set up by the state which

organized the societal sphere and the social milieu was accepted as something positive. It is not possible to classify how much of social life was in fact directed by the state, but the public spaces where the cultural activities took place were part of the new type of public spaces and buildings introduced by the Republic. Regardless of gender and the level of education, there were similar kinds of spatial practices in the same public spaces as well. These were: asphalt boulevards, which were called *asfalt* not only by the interviewees but also in the articles or news items in the “Ulus” newspaper; cinemas, parks, commercial areas in Ulus and *Hamamönü*, and traditional picnic areas. Going to these places was a routine in people’s everyday life which was, for the most part, a weekly activity: visits to picnic areas were obviously more seasonal.

Ulus Square after the foundation of the Republic was used by the state for national celebrations, speeches, and public announcements. But at the same time, inhabitants of the residential areas around Ulus used the same space for daily purposes, such as having a walk with the family in the afternoons, or as a space to pass through in order to go to the shops and the market place; or to sit in a coffee shop or in the park which defined its surroundings. So this latter social use displays behaviour patterns (and/or bodily practices) which are not at all like the ones evident when people went there for official ceremonies or for listening to national speeches. The square was represented by daily activities more than by the official ceremonies in the memories of the interviewees. The parks, the *çarşı*, the national buildings such as the buildings of the first and second National Assemblies, the banks on *Bankalar Caddesi*, etc. define the square physically. But in addition to these spaces, cinemas, coffee shops, bars, taverns and restaurants were all public spaces for the inhabitants. Interviewees had these spaces (loci) in their memory. As Lefebvre claims, such spaces have a meaning beyond their physical materiality in peoples’ minds. These spaces are spaces of representation³⁸. They can be reconstructed, as Halbwachs³⁹ claims, from the present into the past by means of collective memory and individual memories which are part of social frameworks and composed of multiple simultaneous times; memory as one of the parameters of the historical research of space helps the researcher to complete its meaning in terms of lived spatiality and bodily practices. In sum, Ulus showed the characteristics of both representational spaces and spaces of representation.

There are some ‘absences’ which become evident through the analysis of these interviews. These ‘absences’ are related to the grand historical narrative about the Early Republican Period. The first is the absence in the interviewees’ memories of monumental public rituals, such as national celebrations on the Ulus Square or in other public spaces. The ceremonies in the public realm are things that we learn about either from books, films or from other official sources throughout our education. Secondly, there was no mention of individual rituals which form part of a modern individual’s everyday life. The third absence was Atatürk himself as an authority, both in the recollections of the interviewees and also in the newspapers and the memoirs. Fourthly, none of the

interviewees spoke about Istanbul, where the modern urban manners and the Western life styles were believed to have originated. These absences are indicators that there may be other narratives than the grand narrative of the Early Republican Period.

After the mid-1980s, and all through the 1990s, a liberal pluralist discourse became dominant in architecture and history writing. In history writing, it is claimed that the Early Republican period has always been narrated in Turkey as part of the dominant “modernist nation building discourse”. In this discourse the intellectuals in general and the bureaucrats in particular are considered as being social engineers with the mission of transforming society into a modern and monistic entity. It is claimed that as it is not possible to transform a society from above downwards, this history is a constructed myth.

This criticism towards the practice of Early Republican period created a dichotomy between the pluralist liberal discourse and the nation building discourse in 1990s. Both discourses are insufficient to explain the transformation of the urban environment and the urban culture in the period being studied. There has to be another discourse to explain the transformation without taking either the first or the second as the absolutely correct explanation. Everyday life and lived spatiality help us here to understand the transformation of urban culture. Everyday life and lived spatiality make both the inhabitants and the administrative bodies of the state effective factors in the transformation process.

Historiographical narratives usually put the emphasis on the new and modern built environment, as it is the symbol of modernisation architecturally and spatially. The buildings are almost perceived as sculptures and architecture itself becomes the criterion of modernism. Activities which take place in the newly built environment are organized activities like celebrations, sporting events, nationally organized exhibitions, official openings, like the opening of new departments at faculties in the university, for example. In short, things which are the sources of national pride and collective memory are emphasized. Less important events and activities are not given any place. Individual memories, popular sources like newspapers and other literary constructions, give the researcher an opportunity to narrate the same period from the point of view of those at the lower echelons of society.

According to the information obtained from individual memories, Ankara, with its designed or spontaneously developed public spaces offered an appropriate milieu for the transformation of the life style of the inhabitants. Traditional social frameworks, (like those concerning fellow countrymen, city dwellers, those from the same religious groups, etc.) had gradually given way to modern social frameworks that individuals deliberately chose in the city. Gender mixture occurred, new bodily practices flourished, interest or hobby groups emerged and a lively public realm was created in the city.

To sum up, any physically pre-planned city which is in a transformation period should be analyzed not only within the limits of its architectural production but has to be taken as a whole with the life styles, the experiences of spaces and places and the bodily practices of the users which occur in the created environments. Then the meaning attributed to urban spaces and places will not fail to include the contribution provided by lived spatiality, which is related to both the social production of space and urban culture.

NOTES

- ¹ The research material for the chapter is part of a Ph.D. research project: Serpil Özaloglu, *Transformation of Ankara Between 1935-1950 in Relation with Everyday Life and Lived Spatiality*, Middle East Technical University, Ankara 2006.
- ² H. Lefebvre, *La Vie quotidienne dans le monde moderne*, Paris 1968; Id., *Critique of Everyday Life*, New York - London 1991
- ³ M. Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, Chicago - London 1992; M. Halbwachs, *La mémoire collective*, Paris 1997; M. De Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, Berkeley - Los Angeles 1984, 1988; J. Le Goff, *Histoire et mémoire*, Paris 1988.
- ⁴ P. H. Hutton, *History as an Art of Memory*, Hanover - London 1993; Lefebvre, *La Vie Quotidienne* cit.; Lefebvre, *Critique* cit.; Halbwachs, *La mémoire* cit., De Certeau, *The Practice* cit.
- ⁵ Lefebvre, *Critique* cit., p. 18.
- ⁶ Lefebvre, *La Vie Quotidienne* cit., and Lefebvre, *Critique* cit.; De Certeau, *The Practice* cit.
- ⁷ "(...) the new society, the new life can only be defined concretely on the level of everyday life, as a system of changes in what can be called lived experience. Now, half a century of historical upheavals has taught us that everyday relations between men – 'lived experience' – change more slowly than the structure of the State, and in a different way, at a different rate. Thus in the history of societies modifications in the different sectors take place unevenly, some ahead of their times, others lagging behind. The fact that one sector is ahead does not mean that there is immediate progress in another, and *vice versa*. According to the productive and technical forces, certain social needs arise in bourgeois society which capitalism is unable to satisfy; they modify everyday life in a positive way, while at the same time introducing negative elements such as dissatisfaction, disappointment, alienation," Lefebvre, *Critique* cit. p. 49.
- ⁸ J. Chevalier, *Henri Bergson*, New York 1969.
- ⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 273.
- ¹⁰ "Thus the street geometrically defined by urban planning is transformed into space by walkers. In the same way, an act of reading is the space produced by the practice of a particular place. Every story is a travel story – a spatial practice. For this reason, spatial practices concern everyday tactics which are part of them. From the alphabet of spatial indication ('It's to the right,' 'Take the left'), which is the beginning of a story, and the the rest of it is written by footsteps, to the daily "news" ('Guess who I met at the bakery?'), television news reports ('Teheran: Khomeini is becoming increasingly isolated ...'), legends (Cinderellas living in hovels), and stories that are told (memories and fiction of adventures, simultaneously producing geographies of action and drifting into the common places of an order, do not merely constitute a 'supplement to pedestrian enunciations and rhetorics'. De Certeau, *The Practice* cit., p. 115-117.
- ¹¹ Halbwachs, *On Collective* cit., p. 93-94.

- ¹² *Halkevi* (s.), *halkevleri* (pl.) (People's house), was a community center (NGO) established in 14 city centers in 1932 by a group of intellectuals from the period of the leadership of Atatürk. The number of *halkevleri* increased rapidly afterwards. The *halkevleri* were however closed in 1951, as the single party period under the CHP (Social Democratic Party) had ended in 1946, which is the year of foundation of the Democratic Party (DP), and the DP had won the 1950 elections in Turkey. *Halkevleri* were reopened in 1961, after the DP was abolished following a coup d'état in 1960. Halkevi centers were social and cultural centers. They were meant to spread the new Republican ideology and the principles of the CHP within the nation. In order to educate and entertain people activities were organized in different fields: language and literature, fine arts, theater, sports, social aid, library and publishing, history and museum, and peasantry. Courses on a wide range of subjects were offered. See A. Çeçen, *Atatürk'ün Kültür Kurumu Halkevleri*, Istanbul, 2000, here translated and paraphrased by S. Özalöglü.
- ¹³ U. Tanyeli, *Mekanlar, Projeler, Anlamları*, in *Üç Kuşak Cumhuriyet*, Istanbul 1998, pp. 101-107.
- ¹⁴ Özalöglü, *Transformation* cit.
- ¹⁵ "Social groups in Ankara Between 1935-1950: It is convenient to use the term middle social groups who participate in urban spatial practices instead of middle class in this chapter. The middle class in Ankara (and in general in Turkey during the chosen period) is an amorphous one. The dispersion of the limited data is within a large scale concerning income levels and professional groups for Ankara. That is why it will be more convenient to call the examined section of the society as middle social groups instead of middle class. As the investigation of socio-economic structure of middle social strata is subject to another research, this will not be defined in relation to their income level and to their participation in the production process; the interviewees will be taken as the representatives of their professional/social groups (civil servants, artisans, artists, journalists, religious leaders (*imam*), tradesmen (*esnaf*), teachers). The above mentioned points are completed to draw a general picture of the inhabitants from middle income groups while examining their daily life (their habits regarding entertainment, personal relations, family relations, education, their jobs, education levels, cultural inputs related with their family roots, etc.) in relation with lived spatiality." S.Özalöglü, *Transformation* cit., pp. 49-74.
- ¹⁶ L. J. McIntyre, *Need to Know: Social Science Research Methods*, Oxford 2005.
- ¹⁷ McIntyre, *Need* cit.; N. F. Kennedy, *The Ethos of Architectural Practice in Turkey*, Ph.D. thesis Middle East Technical University, Ankara, 2005; S. Kalaycıoğlu, *Türkiye İçin Bir Sosyoekonomik Statü Ölçütü Geliştirme Yönünde Yaklaşım in Toplum ve Hekim*, vol. 13, no. 2, Ankara 1998; B. Altay, *Professional Value Systems of Turkish Architects with respect to Clients and Users in Contemporary Residential Design Practice*, Ph.D. thesis, Bilkent University, Ankara 2000.
- ¹⁸ S. Caunce, *Sözlü Tarih ve Yerel Tarihçi*, Istanbul 2001; E. Ü. Selamoğlu, *Bir Sözlü Tarih Çalışması: Hereke'de Değişim in Toplumsal Tarih Dergisi*, Istanbul 1997.
- ¹⁹ *Kemal's Restaurant (Kemal'in lokantası)* near the National Assembly, *Merkez Restaurant (Merkez Lokantası)* near Ministry of the Interior; *Kuyulu Coffee House (Kuyulu Kahve)* and *Merkez Coffee House (Merkez Kırnaathanesi)*, across the street from each other at Anafartalar Street; and *Zeybekler Coffee House (Zeybekler Kahvesi)*; *Hafız Bey's Pastry shop (Hafız Bey'in Pastanesi)* at *Taşhan Square*; Dairy bar (*Muhallebici dükkanı*) of which the proprietaires are *Selanikli Talat* and *Hüseyin Bey* at Anafartalar Street; and *Fresko's Bar*." N. Akgün, *Burası Ankara*, Ankara Kulübü Derneği Yayınları, Ankara, 1996, cit., pp. 221, 222-229.
- ²⁰ B. N. Şimşir, *Ankara... Ankara: Bir Başkent'in Doğuşu*, Ankara, 1988, cit., p. 221.
- ²¹ Halbwachs, *La Mémoire* cit.
- ²² Lefebvre, *Critique* cit.
- ²³ The districts are: Hacettepe, Cebeci, İsmet Paşa Mah., Hamamönü-Medrese, on the road which leads to Kazıkıçı Bostanları, Hacı Musa Mah., İzmir Cad. On the downhill road from Hisar to Ulucanlar, near Ser Sinan Mescit, Boşnak Mah, Cebeci. Özalöglü, *Transformation* cit., pp. 242-391.

- ²⁴ K. Z. Gençosman, *Evlere yalnız oda oda kiraya verilen mahalle! TELSİZ*, “Ulus Gazetesi”, Ankara, 11 October 1935
- ²⁵ S. Bozdoğan, *Modernism and Nation Building: Turkish Architectural Culture in the Early Republic*, Seattle 2001; M. Belge, *Türkiye’de Günlük Hayat*, in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, İstanbul 1983.
- ²⁶ “Ulus Gazetesi”, 8 March 1938.
- ²⁷ Parks: Şehir Bahçesi, park at the back of National Assembly; Hacettepe Park (an urban picnic area too); Esenpark; routes: Hamamönü to Cebeci, the route from Cebeci to Samanpazarı; Cebeci “asfalt” and Atatürk Boulevard or the *asfalt*. Özaloglu, *Transformation* cit., pp. 242-391.
- ²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 245.
- ²⁹ *Gazino* is neither a tavern, nor a casino. A *gazino* may or may not be licenced to sell liquor. It may be located in an urban park or it may be a place by itself in the city. The most important determining factor for its definition is the traditional Turkish music programme. These programmes may be in the evening and at week ends. Concerts can also be in the afternoon, or at places where men and women entertain themselves separately. Concerts for women can be even at midday and in the afternoon. Clients of a *gazino* change according to the culture of the place where it is located. It may be only for families, or have special programmes which are only for women or only for men.
- ³⁰ “Benjamin’s physiognomy of the cityscape is concerned with deciphering urban objects and structures, with making them legible as signs and rebuses. Under this gaze the city is transformed into a ‘semiotic universe’, a text to be read. In doing so, Benjamin not only prefigures concerns with legibility of urban space, but also introduces one of the most suggestive and frequently invoked figures in discussions of urban culture and experience, the flaneur. (...) [The flaneur] is the ultimate figure of fragmentation and limitation. As a wanderer in the city, it is the flaneur who lacks an overview of the metropolitan whole, who is afforded no panoramic or bird’s-eye perspective. The flaneur is not a privileged spectator in this sense, but granted only an ant’s eye view, a limited witness of complexity which eludes his vision and understanding, a melancholy, ‘heroic’ actor buffeted by forces but dimly perceived. Indeed a flaneur is a part of that which he observes – he watches the crowd and is a member (however reluctantly) of that crowd. Spectator and spectacle are one and the same.(...) [He is the] collapsing subject and object, [that is] partial in scope, situated yet shifting,” G. Gilloch, *Walter Benjamin* in A. Elliott, B. S. Turner (eds), *Profiles in Contemporary Social Theory*, London 2001, p. 79.
- ³¹ S.Özaloglu, *Transformation*, cit. p. 281, 282.
- ³² Ü. Nalbantoğlu, *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Ankara’sında Yükselen “Orta Sınıf” Üzerine* in *Tarih İçinde Ankara*, Ankara 1984, 2000; F.Ş. Cantek, *Yabanlar ve Yerliler, Başkent Olma Sürecinde Ankara*, İstanbul 2003.
- ³³ N. Bayraktar, *Halkevlerinin ülke kültürüne, insanın gelişimi ve dönüşümü açısından katkıları ve önerileri*, Ankara 1999; “Ulus Gazetesi”, *Halkevlerinin yıldönümü ve otuzüç evin açılışı Ankara Halkevinde eşsiz bir törenle kutlandı*, 24 February 1936.
- ³⁴ Tanyeli, *Mekanlar* cit.
- ³⁵ *Şiir Günü*, “Ulus Gazetesi”, 25 December 1948.
- ³⁶ A. E. Bozyiğit, *Eski Ankara Sinemaları*, in *Kebikeç*, Ankara 1999, no. 9.
- ³⁷ M. Belge, *Türkiye’de* cit., pp. 857-858
- ³⁸ Lefebvre, *Critique* cit.; Id., *Writings on Cities*, Oxford - Cambridge, Mass. 1996, H. Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, Oxford - Cambridge, 1991.
- ³⁹ Halbwachs, *La Mémoire* cit.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Altay B., *Professional Value Systems of Turkish Architects with respect to Clients and Users in Contemporary Residential Design Practice*, Ph.D. thesis, Bilkent University, Ankara 2000.
- Bayraktar N., *Halkevlerinin ülke kültürüne, insanın gelişimi ve dönüşümü açısından katkıları ve önerileri*, Ankara 1999.
- Belge M., *Türkiye’de günlük Hayat*, in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Istanbul 1983.
- Bozdoğan S., *Modernism and Nation Building: Turkish Architectural Culture in the Early Republic*, Seattle 2001.
- Id., *Modernizm ve Ulusun İnşası, Erken Cumhuriyet Türkiye’sinde Mimari Kültür*, Istanbul 2002.
- Bozyiğit Ali Esat, *Eski Ankara Sinemaları*, in “Kebikeç”, Ankara, 1999, no. 9.
- Cantek F. Ş., *Yabanlar ve Yerliler, Başkent Olma Sürecinde Ankara*, Istanbul 2003.
- Caunce S. *Sözlü Tarih ve Yerel Tarihçi*, 2001.
- Chevalier J., *Henri Bergson*, orig. ed. 1928, New York 1969.
- Çeçen A., *Atatürk’ün Kültür Kurumu Halkevleri*, Istanbul 2000.
- De Certeau M., *The Practice of Everyday Life*, Berkeley - Los Angeles 1984, 1988.
- Gençosman K. Z., *Evlere yalnız oda oda kiraya verilen mahalle! TELSİZ*, in “Şehir Mektupları”, Ulus Gazetesi, Ankara, 11 October 1935.
- Gilloch G., *Walter Benjamin* in Elliott A., Turner B. S., (eds), *Profiles in Contemporary Social Theory*, London 2001.
- Gunn J., *Bergson and his Philosophy*, Ann Arbor 1997.
- Günver S., *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yıllarında Ankara’da Diplomasi*, in “Başkent Söyleşileri”, Ankara 1979, pp. 65-80.
- Halbwachs M., *On Collective Memory*, Chicago - London 1992.
- Halbwachs M., *La mémoire collective*, Paris 1997.
- Hutton P. H., *History as an Art of Memory*, Hanover - London 1993.
- Interviews with the inhabitants of Ankara* in Özaloğlu S., *Transformation of Ankara Between 1935-1950 in Relation with Everyday Life and Lived Spatiality*, Ph.D., Middle East Technical University, Ankara 2006, pp. 242-391.
- Kalaycıoğlu S., Kardam F., Tüzün S., Ulusoy M., *Türkiye İçin Bir Sosyoekonomik Statü Ölçütü Geliştirme Yönünde Yaklaşım*, in “Toplum ve Hekim”, vol.13, no. 2, Ankara 1998.
- Kennedy N. F., *The Ethos of Architectural Practice in Turkey*, Ph.D. thesis Middle East Technical University, Ankara 2005.
- Le Goff J., *Histoire et mémoire*, Paris 1988.
- Lefebvre H., *Critique of Everyday Life*, New York - London 1991.
- Id., *The Production of Space*, Oxford - Cambridge, Mass. 1991.
- Id., *La Vie quotidienne dans le monde moderne*, Paris 1968 (Turkish translation, *Modern Dünyada Gündelik Hayat*, Istanbul 1998).
- Id., *Writings on Cities*, Oxford – Cambridge, 1996.
- McIntyre L. J. *Need to Know: Social Science Research Methods*, Oxford, 2005.
- Nalbantoğlu Ü., *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Ankara’sında Yükselen “Orta Sınıf” Üzerine in Tarih İçinde Ankara*, Ankara 1984, 2000.

Özaloglu S., *Transformation of Ankara Between 1935-1950 in Relation with Everyday Life and Lived Spatiality*, Ph.D., Middle East Technical University, Ankara 2006.

Selamoğlu E. Ü., *Bir Sözlü Tarih Çalışması: Hereke'de Değişim*, in *Toplumsal Tarih Dergisi*, Istanbul 1997.

Şimşir B. N., *Ankara... Ankara: Bir Başkent'in Doğuşu*, Ankara 1988.

Tanyeli U., *Mekanlar, Projeler, Anlamları*, in *Üç Kuşak Cumhuriyet*, pp. 101-107, Istanbul 1998.

Tekeli İ., *Tarih Yazımı Üzerine Düşünmek*, Ankara 1998.

"Ulus Gazetesi" [Ulus Newspaper], 1935-1951, Ankara.

Halkevlerinin yıldönümü ve otuzüç evin açılışı Ankara Halkevinde eşsiz bir törenle kutlandı, Ankara, "Ulus Gazetesi", 24 February 1936.

APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE

Personal information:

1. Age, date of birth, place of birth;
2. Education level;
3. Profession;
4. Profession of the father of the interviewee;
5. Year of settlement in Ankara (if the interviewee is not native).
6. Where did he/she come from to settle in Ankara (if the interviewee is not native)?

Questions concerning childhood memories:

1. Where did he/she live in Ankara? (Description of the district and his/her house).
2. For the non-natives: If he/she visited the city before the settlement, his/her first impression about the city.
3. For the non-natives: The first impressions when they first came to the city.
4. (If he/she has been living since his/her childhood in the city), where did he/she used to play?
5. If there are specific places he/she remembers, description of the place.
6. With whom he/she used to go and play there?
7. What are the childhood boundaries of the city?
8. The place of the school?
9. How did he/she used to go to school – on foot, by bus?
10. What and where did the family used to do for recreation and entertainment?
11. What and where did the children used to do for recreation and entertainment?
12. Were there specific activities he/she participated in outside the family and neighbourhood circle? Where?

Questions concerning adult memories:

1. Where did he/she live in Ankara? Description of the district.
2. Did he/she used to pass the time in the district, how and where?
3. Where did he/she used to go/stroll/pass the time most frequently in Ankara?
4. How does he/she remember this place?
5. With whom did he/she used to go there?

6. Recreation places and entertainment activities and places? Description of the activities and places.
7. With whom did he/she used to go there?
8. Were there any cultural activities he/she participated in and where? Description of the activities and places.
9. With whom did he/she used to go there?
10. Where did he/she used to go for shopping?
11. Working hours? What did he/she used to do between working hours during the day (lunch break, if there is a regular lunchhour break, after work in the afternoon)?
12. Did he/she have a notion of a week-end? How did he/she used to spend the week-ends?
13. If the interviewee did not work outside: How did she (it is the women who did not work outside) how did she pass her day?
14. Did she spend time outside the house? If she did, where did she used to go?
15. With whom did she used to go there?

Note: The questions asked above are generally formulated questions. During the interviews, detailed questions about places, spaces, habits, everyday relations, family and friendship relations, everyday spaces and places, rhythm of use of specific places indicated by the interviewee were asked during the course of the interview.

