

THE PLACE OF THE CAPITAL'S MAIN SQUARE KIZILAY IN THE SOCIAL MEMORY OF THE CITIZENS

ÇİĞDEM VAROL¹, N. AYDAN SAT², SEVİNÇ BAHAR YENİGÜL³, Z. ASLI GÜREL ÜÇER⁴

ABSTRACT

A city's main square is the unique identity of that city. Squares form the focus of social integration and social learning processes via the spatial functions and architectural identity they created. Squares are the hearts of cities, where economic, social and cultural activities take place. As being one of the open public places in the city, squares have various symbols that form their identity and bring people together to exhibit their way of living. At these places, individual-society relationships are shaped and the opportunities of socializing by active and passive communication styles emerge.

Beginning with the 1950s in Turkey, cities have grown steadily with the increasing development, thus increasing population in cities. With this process, urban spaces have faced with the pressure of economic rationality in design. They have forgotten the traditional images of Anatolian cities like; square, atriums and human scale, and city culture like; urbanity, awareness of being urban, urban values, customs and traditions, and they have transformed into ordinary spaces without carrying an identity. This process has also affected public squares and from being the main focus of everyday life reflecting the personality and the identity of the city throughout the history, they have transformed into vehicle squares and parking places. Within this context, the aim of this study is to explore the changing meaning of Kızılay Square, which has an important place in the formation of the Capital Ankara's identity, in relation with the social, economic and spatial changes since the foundation of the Turkish Republic. To reach this aim, an oral history method is held to investigate the changing meaning of Kızılay Square in the memories of the citizens. In this context, face to face interviews have been realized with the inhabitants (academicians and specialists, shopkeepers and daily users) testified the transformation of Kızılay Square. By this oral history study, which integrates the ordinary people and everyday life to the field of urban history apart from the written historical documents, it is aimed to reach some findings related to the place of Capital's main square in the memories of the citizens.

Keywords: Public Spaces, Squares, Social Memory, Kızılay Square, Ankara

¹ Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gazi University, Department of City and Regional Planning, ANKARA

² Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gazi University, Department of City and Regional Planning, ANKARA

³ Instr. Dr. Gazi University, Department of City and Regional Planning, ANKARA

⁴ Instr. Dr. Gazi University, Department of City and Regional Planning, ANKARA

1. INTRODUCTION

Places are built in the memories of the societies and being one of the main parts of the public places, squares take an important place in social memories by embedding symbolic meanings. Squares give meaning to the city and emphasize the identity of the city, thus have important impacts on strengthening the image of the city. Squares can be defined as focal points that show the combination of historical and contemporary characteristics of urban life. In other words, squares respond to the social needs of the city and they act as the heart of the city. They have been regarded as centers which have witnessed important events in the history. When cities are examined in a historical perspective, there are places like agoras in Greek cities, or forums in Roman cities that had taken the role of gathering people for maintaining business, trade, social and political life, just like squares (Aydın, 2014). The word “square” was derived from the Latin word *platea*. In English and French *place*, coming from the word *platea*, means open space or extended street. In Spanish *plaza* and in Italian *piazza* words are also coming from the same root.

Forms and contents of cities change continuously due to social, economic, political and spatial experiences. The functions of squares also change within this transformation process. Previously while squares have been serving as open public spaces where social, cultural, religious, political and commercial functions taken place, due to the rapid urbanization and vehicle oriented life style improvement, they have begun to lose their pedestrian characteristics and transformed into transportation hubs. These conditions have resulted in the disappearance of public spaces and the movement of daily activities to private spaces such as shopping centers/malls. Today, the increase in the usage of interior semi-public spaces (such as shopping malls) adversely affects the position of open public spaces, thus squares, in urban life.

With the establishment of the new Turkish Republic in 1923, the capital city Ankara was entirely built with its boulevards, squares, parks, public and private buildings. Since 1923, Kızılay Square appeared as one of the most important places reflecting the history of the capital city. It has been witnessing the social, economic and spatial changes in the city and try to resist the reckless intervention of the administrators. In the early period of the Turkish Republic, the Square became a prestigious urban space reflecting the Republican ideology and became the scene of pioneering events of modern urban development i.e. the first skyscraper Emek Office Building, the first political demonstrations in 1960 and so on (Çağlar et. al, 2006; Şahin, 2015). However, with the changes in social, economic and spatial structure of the city, the identity of the Square has changed by time. Due to the transformations in the society, changes in the lifestyles, planning implications of central and local governments, Kızılay Square has lost its importance/functions and now it has become a vehicle traffic junction.

The aim of the study is to explore the changing meaning of Kızılay Square in relation with the social, economic and spatial changes in the city since the foundation of Turkish Republic. In order to reach this aim, primary and secondary sources were used to compile the related data. The primary sources were collected from in-depth interviews realized with 12 people chosen according to the aim of the study. The interviewees were grouped into three; i. specialists/academicians (urban planners, architects, etc.) who have professional experience about the subject (four interviewees), ii. Shopkeepers, who have witnessed the social economic transformation of the district (three interviewees), iii. local citizens, the users of the district (five interviewees). The changing meaning of Kızılay Square in the memories of the inhabitants was tried to be investigated by this oral history methodology. Secondary sources which were the written and visual documents collected from newspapers, journals, essays and academic literature, were also used in the evaluation of the process. According to the compiled

data, transformation of Kızılay Square was evaluated in four different periods: 1923-1950, 1950-1980, 1980-2000 and from 2000 to today. In the evaluation of transformation process; social, economic, political and spatial dynamics of the country and Ankara were taken into account as well since all these dynamics had direct effects on the transformation of Kızılay Square.

2. FORMATION OF THE CAPITAL CITY ANKARA AND THE PUBLIC SQUARES

Ankara is one of those capitals i.e. Islamabad, Brasilia and Canberra, which were established in the twentieth century. Tankut (1993) argues that capital cities are founded and constructed as a symbol of world-view of countries' governments and governors and they go through different construction phases in terms of physical environments, architectural style and lifestyle (Sarıkulak, 2013). Similarly Vale (1992: 44) states "capitals have been constructed in the result of an independence movement, through the symbolic of city building and nation building often do seem to be synchronized." In parallel to these arguments the establishment of Ankara as the capital city of Turkish Republic represents the spatial construction of the Republic and the national identity including significant representations of modern life (Koçak, 2008).

Tekeli (1994: 148), summarizes the aim of the new capital as "a city, symbolizing the successes of Republic, maintaining modern and contemporary way of lives and being a model for the whole country". The main aim behind creating a new capital city was to develop a model to other Turkish cities, with its boulevards, squares, parks, public and private buildings. Thus, the spaces of boulevards/streets, squares, parks, public and private buildings were designed to represent a model capital that would construct national identity, national and social unity and continuity of this unity.

For reaching the aim of creating a symbolic and a model city, the prevailing idea was constructing a new Ankara rather than transforming the old one (Şenyapılı, 2004: 37). According to Kılınç (2009: 123), the development of public spaces in Ankara was vital for the new republic ideology and its representation. Public places would be the urban spaces which would make Ankara a real modern city. One of the spatial representations of public places was public squares, where the society would come together, spend time together and socialize. Squares would serve as places for modernization and socialization of people and for ensuring the production of social identity and social memory. Many public squares were designed with the assistance of the new urban development plans where Kızılay Square appeared as one of the symbols of the new city. However, the Square and its environs have undergone social, economic and spatial changes and transformations with the help of the revisions of the spatial plans, transportation regulations and urban projects.

3. KIZILAY SQUARE: HISTORICAL EVALUATION OF CHANGE AND TRANSFORMATION

The bases of Kızılay Square go back to Lörcher Plan which was the first development plan for Ankara. The first name of the Square was Cumhuriyet (Republic), then got the name Kurtuluş (Independence) (Cengizkan, 2002). With the establishment of Turkish Kızılay (Red Crescent) Association Building at the plot of the Square in 1929, both the park, square and the district was called Kızılay. After 27 May 1960 coup d'état, the square was renamed as Hürriyet (Liberty) formally, but the popular use of Kızılay Square continued. Finally after the failed coup attempt on 15 July 2016, the square was renamed as 15 Temmuz Kızılay Milli İrade

Meydanı (15th of July Kızılay National Will Square). From the 1920s till today Kızılay Square and its environs has socially, economically and spatially changed. The change and transformation of Kızılay Square is examined in 4 periods in this study: 1923-1950 Spatial Repercussions of Modernization and Statism, 1950-1980 Rising Out as a Meeting Place and Central Business District (CBD), 1980-2000 Transforming from a Meeting Place to a Controlled Place, 2000s becoming a Chaotic Place.

3.1. 1923-1950 Spatial Repercussions of Modernization and Statism

At the beginning of the 1920s, Ankara was a small and compact Middle Anatolian city with a population of 20.000-25.000. After the declaration of Ankara as the capital city in 13 October 1923, a master plan for the spatial organization of Ankara became urgent due to the steep increase in the population and housing needs. In 1924 and 1925, two plans for the old and the new city of Ankara was prepared by Lörcher (Cengizkan, 2006). The second Lörcher Plan which contributed to the formation of the new city proposed a new settlement at the south part of Ankara. This new city, which was consciously isolated from the old city, was the new “administrative district” symbolizing the newly-formed state and its government. Although not implemented properly, Lörcher Plan guided the future spatial development of Ankara, since it set the basic planning principles for “old” and “new” cities (Özbilen, 2013). Lörcher Plan, by creating the main north-south axis (Atatürk Boulevard) formed the basis of Kızılay Square (Sargin, 2009). The plan provided the construction of major public spaces in the old city and the new city (Cengizkan, 2002). Kızılay Square, which had the name of Cumhuriyet and Kurtuluş sequentially during that time, was one of a series of squares namely; Sıhhiye, Zafer, Millet (Ulus), Lozan, Cebeci and Tandoğan. The main element of Kızılay Square was the public park called Havuzbaşı which represented the new way of life in Ankara. During 1925-1930, as Büyükyıldız (2009: 97) mentioned “Havuzbaşı created a culture of socialization and entertaining” and “The evening concerts performed by the City Band at the square had been the subject of the news and the photographs in the daily newspapers of that period” (Çağlar et al, 2006). Along with apartments, garden houses were started to be built along Atatürk Boulevard due to the north-south route proposed in Lörcher Plan. The square was being used intensely by people living in garden houses and it was the place where the evening walks of people along Atatürk Boulevard ends.

In 1927, only four years after the declaration of Republic, population of Ankara had reached to 74.000 and an urgent need for a new development plan appeared. In 1928, an international competition was arranged for the urban development plan of Ankara by “Directorate of Urban Development of Ankara” (Ankara İmar Müdürlüğü) and three planners were invited for the competition. Prof. Hermann Jansen from Berlin won the competition and his plan began to be implemented in 1932. The crucial point of Jansen’s Plan was keeping the main ideas of Lörcher’s Plan. The city should have reflect its appearance of a capital city with new administrative areas, large boulevards and squares (Tankut, 1993). Jansen’s Plan determined general zoning areas, vehicle and pedestrian circulation as a main backbone of the city, and indicated Ankara’s main development direction towards the south. Due to Jansen’s urbanism approach, public spaces such as squares, large open areas were important elements in the planning of Ankara.

In 1929, when the Building of Turkish Kızılay Association was erected at Havuzbaşı Park, the park, the square and the neighborhood got the name of Kızılay (Figure 1). The building gave a new identity to the area and Kızılay Park became the meeting point of people. The square was surrounded by Kızılay Building, its park and across them Güvenpark (Figure 2). Güvenpark, which was a part of the open green system of Jansen Plan, was designed by Clemens Holzmeister,

an Austrian architect, between the years of 1932-1936 (Çağlar et al, 2006). It became a symbol with its Güven Monument, which was conceived as a public space symbolizing the power of the nation state in Kızılay Square. Kızılay neighborhood characterized a spatial representation of bourgeois identity and its leisurely activities (Sargın, 2009; Koçak, 2008). Kızılay Square has characteristics of public space as a component of a modern capital city. The square and parks symbolize the modern life-style producing spatial and social practices.

During the 1940s, Atatürk Boulevard, which had acacia trees locating in the middle of wide refuge and horse chestnuts in both sidewalks were a place called “piyasa” (*promenade*) where walking along the Boulevard became a tradition for the residents (Çağlar et al, 2006). During these years, it was unusual to see a man walking along Atatürk Boulevard without wearing a tie (Batuman, 2009). Kızılay Square, with Kızılay Park and Güvenpark, was mostly visited by families and bureaucrats. “Just across Güvenpark, there was Kızılay Building, which was like a bibelot. There was a small pool and a sandpit in front of the building, and children were used to play there” (Ayhan Sümer, from the interview 16 December 2013) (cited in Türkyılmaz, 2015).



Figure 1. Building of Turkish Kızılay Assc. (1930s) (<http://ankaraarsivi.atilim.edu.tr>)



Figure 2. Kızılay Park and Güvenpark (1940s) (<http://ankaraarsivi.atilim.edu.tr>)

In the 1940s and 1950s, social life was nourished in cinemas, theaters, music facilities, book shops, art and sport clubs, patisseries, kiosks, restaurants, nightclubs and culture clubs. With these facilities and activities, representing the new modern life style, Kızılay and Atatürk Boulevard became a place of highbrows, bureaucrats and students who met each other, had fun, and relaxed that created the cultural identity of Ankara in that period (Sarıkulak, 2013). Ulus Cinema, opened at Soysal Apartment at Kızılay Square in 1939, was the first cinema in the city. After that Süreyya Night Club which was a popular and pleasantly designed place, performed at the basement of Soysal Apartment between the years 1942-1963 (Sümer, 2011). There were many patisseries nearby Kızılay Square, like Kutlu and Özen where classical music performances and poem nights were organized (Sümer, 2011; Bayraktar, 2016).

In the 1940's, Jansen Plan became insufficient to supply the intended needs, of the extensive population growth and the intensive pressure of land speculation (Tankut, 1993). Nevertheless, until the 1950s, the development of Ankara continued according to the general planning decisions of Jansen Plan. In this period, Kızılay Square was acted as a symbolic space where the public sphere of the Republic was created and new public values were produced, assembled and displayed.

3.2. 1950 -1980 Rising Out as a Meeting Place and Central Business District

The second period starts with the end of Second World War and the beginning of multi-party regime in Turkey (1946) and ends in 1979 by the destruction of Kızılay Building. After the 1950s, Turkey has undergone a change in every aspect and started to integrate with the world. In the early 1950s, Ankara was rapidly growing in terms of urban population and area. Besides, neighborhoods of illegally built squatter houses were emerging rapidly. Within these problems, need for a new city plan was emerged. In 1957, Raşit Uybadin and Nihat Yücel's Plan won the international competition. Uybadin-Yücel Plan drew an Ankara picture with 750.000 population, monocentric and concentrated by the year 2000. The Plan defined Ulus as the central business district (CBD) that would stay around the castle and the old town district. According to Bilsel (1977) the planners could not comprehend the urban functions in Kızılay.

After the 1950s, the identity of Ankara as the modern, secular and western model city of the Republic's modernization project changed (Sarıkulak, 2013). According to Tekeli (1975) the ideal of making the city a role model and creating a new legal basis for other Anatolian cities was abandoned. To make a bigger impact on the global arena, the new political power of multi-party regime placed more emphasis on Istanbul. In this context, Ankara began to lose its unique value, the image of Republic. This period was characterized by the increase in commercial functions in Kızılay. Bilsel (1977) argues that Kızılay lost its sub-center characteristics in the 1950s and started to develop as the CBD of the city. After CBD functions concentrated at Kızılay, major changes took place in economic, social and built environment aspects.

In 1952, a regulation was implemented to arrange the ground and basement floors of the newly developed high-rise buildings in Kızılay, as the shopping passages and their upper floors for the commercial functions. In 1955, indoor public spaces, such as Ülkü Alan and KocabeYOđlu Passages, Büyük and Zafer Bazaars, emerged as the pioneer of shopping malls. By the effect of this regulation Kızılay started to change and became the new city center of Ankara. In this period, Kızılay became a retail centre for upper and upper-middle income groups. Luxurious hotels and recreational areas were located around Kızılay (Şenyapılı, 2004: 217).

In the second half of 1950s, the public buses remained inadequate, so transportation facilities were provided by "dolmuş" operated by private-sector entrepreneurs (Türel, 1998). In 1957, due to the increase in vehicle ownership Atatürk Boulevard was widened for vehicle traffic by narrowing sidewalks and diminishing the green refuge in the middle of the Boulevard. Kızılay Park became smaller and the pool and sculpture were moved out of the Park. At the end of the 1950s, Kızılay Square had acquired a political character and became a place for social opposition demonstrations against the Democrat Party government. In 1959, the construction of Emek Office Building -the first skyscraper in Turkey- was started. After the military intervention of 27 May 1960, the name of Kızılay Square was changed as "Hürriyet Square" by the Municipal Council, but the square continued to be called as Kızılay.

By the 1960s, the prestige of Kızılay increased with the new Parliament Building in Bakanlıklar, and the public agencies in Yenışehir. Fashion houses, photographers, hairdressers, advertising companies, insurance and real estate firms, local and foreign travel agencies and the branches of the banks started to be located in Kızılay. Restaurants, cafes, patisseries, bistros (like Piknik) and luxury hotels also increased in this period (Batuman, 2009) (Figure 3). One of the interviewed users of Kızılay emphasized "On Atatürk Boulevard from Kızılay Square to Bakanlıklar, on the left side there were patisseries and the sidewalk was a popular walking place for people walking and greeting each other. On Atatürk Boulevard from Kızılay Square to Sıhhiye, on the right side there were some special stopping and eating places like, Piknik and Goralı. They were symbolic places that everyone knew". Also

Düşhekimi cites “While fast food empires in the world were not popular yet, Piknik with its famous sandwiches became a unique fast food trademark” (<http://www.ergir.com/Piknik.htm>). In 1964, Emek Office Building was completed and became the new symbol of Kızılay (Figure 4). Set Cafeteria at the terrace of Emek Office Building and Gima, the first “department store” of Turkey with an “escalator” and “self-service shopping” style at the ground floor of Emek Office Building broke grounds (Koçak, 2008).



Figure 3. A view from Piknik restaurant (1970s) (www.ankarahaber06.com)



Figure 4. Kızılay square and Emek Office Building (1970s) (<http://m.ego.gov.tr>)

Ankara exceeded the predicted population of Yücel-Uybadin Plan before 1965 and a new city plan became a necessity. However, rather than making a new city plan, Regional Flat Regulation Plan was came into force in 1965. The plan increased the density by raising the building heights as much as possible. Maximum building heights were increased to ten stories between Kızılay and Sıhhiye Square and thirteen stories between Kızılay and Akay Junctions (Cengizkan, 2006). Between the years 1960-1970, most of the apartments on Atatürk Boulevard and connecting Avenues were demolished and replaced by multiple story buildings whose ground floors were used as offices, while upper floors left for housing. As a response to the rapid centralization, both the functions like cafes and patisseries and the residential units along the Boulevard that provide Kızılay’s vitality began to be replaced with central functions and then transformed into prestigious offices due to high land value.

In the 1970s, Güvenpark lost some of its green areas with the location of bus station and minibus parking lots (Memlük, 2009) and became an entrance door to the city center, rather than a resting place (Batuman, 2009). In this period, for encouraging public transport, separated bus lanes were formed between Dikimevi and Beşevler, along Gazi Mustafa Kemal and Ziya Gökalp Boulevards. Kızılay Park had completely disappeared and turned into a small garden. In the second half of the 1970s, Sakarya and Yüksel Avenues, Konur and Karanfil streets, part of the Izmir Avenue were closed to traffic and were organised as pedestrian areas. However, as this arrangement was seemed as an obstacle for businesses, the pedestrian areas were partly re-opened to traffic (Osmay, 1998: 146). Furthermore, in 1978, as a part of “Pedestrian Region Projects” the first pedestrianization project in Kızılay for Sakarya Street and its environs was realized. One of the interviewed shopkeepers indicated “Street corner kiosks selling döner and sandwiches, pubs providing a quick service to a wider mass of consumers replaced the spaces like Piknik”. Especially in Sakarya pedestrian area, the number of restaurants and cafes increased steadily.

3.3. 1980-2000 Period: Transforming From a Meeting Place to a Controlled Place

The military coup on 12 September 1980 and aftermath operations of the military regime influenced all aspects of life in Turkey. New social, political and economic arrangements were realized by the effects of both military regime and neo-liberal economic policies. One of these arrangements was the Law of Metropolitan Municipality enacted in 1984. Metropolitan municipalities were established in İstanbul, Ankara and İzmir in the same year. While the control of central government was decreasing, the authority in designation of building plans as well as their approval was given to municipalities and financial resources of municipalities were increased by means of laws (Tekeli, 1998). In second half of the 1990s, nationalist and conservative groups came into power in municipalities. This period was dominated by conservative and pro-Islamist view became an integral part of the implementations of municipalities, particularly metropolitan ones (Koçak, 2008).

During these circumstances, Ankara became a metropolitan city with 1.230.000 population and 14.000 hectares urban area. The core area of the city reached to its topographic thresholds on north, east and south boundaries (Günay, 2006). A new “1990 Master Plan” was prepared by the Master Plan Bureau of Ankara between 1970-75 and was approved by the Ministry of Public Works and Settlement in 1982 (Koçak, 2008). The central policy of the plan was growing towards periphery mainly towards the west corridor of the city. The plan decentralized the city along İstanbul and Eskisehir axes, where new large mass housing areas such as Batıkent, Eryaman and Çayyolu and additional industrial districts in İvedik and Ostim were proposed. Strengthening the existing and new sub-centers was proposed that brought a more polycentric urban structure (Sat et al., 2017).

In this period, important legal arrangements were enacted i.e. Law no. 2805 in 1983 and 2981 Development Amnesty in 1984 which added squatter areas into urban land market by implementing improvement plans. In 1993 legalized squatter areas reached to 93.9% of the total illegally developed areas (Büyükgöçmen, 1997) and high-rise buildings at suburbs emerged instead of squatter houses.

Kızılay Square had lost its public space characteristics and transformed from a meeting place into a controlled place consisting of an intersection of vehical and pedestrian traffic as a result of a series of spatial interventions at the end of the 1970s. Actually, deformation of spatial organization of Kızılay Square continued by means of the new interventions throughout the 1980s. One of the interviewed academicians also supported this idea and explained that “After the 1980s, Kızılay became an intersection point for traffic as a result of military regime and some of the spatial interventions. It was one of the most important socialization areas and its user profile was mostly senior bureaucrats, intellectuals and etc. that was very different than today”. A shopkeeper, who has a fish shop on Sakarya Street since the 1960s, mentioned that “some of the popular restaurants, cafes and pubs were closed and moved to Çankaya, especially to Arjantin and Köroğlu Streets. Their customers followed them and leaved Kızılay”. Similarly another interviewed academician indicated that “consumption policies affected the city during the 1980s and 1990s. The bureaucratic and political features of Kızılay were weakened in these years and Kavaklıdere gained popularity for retail and business.”

According to Batuman (2009), there were three important projects that transformed the form and content of Kızılay Square during the 1980s and 1990s: the rehabilitation project of Güvenpark, destruction and reconstruction of Kızılay Building and transportation projects (Kızılay Metro Station Project, Pedestrian Zones Plan and pedestrian overpass constructions). Dolmuş and bus stops occupied Güvenpark and the Park had transformed into an insecure place at nights in the 1980s. In 1986, Ankara Metropolitan Municipality proposed a parking space to accommodate 1500 cars and a shopping mall below the park (Can, 1987: 60) that can cause the loss of its

historical and symbolic meaning. As a result of public reactions and a judicial decision, the project was cancelled. Although, buses and dolmuş stops continued to dominate the park, Güvenpark and Güven Monument were declared as “Natural Protection Area” by the Committee on Protection of Cultural and Natural Heritage of Ankara in 1994.

The second important project was destruction and reconstruction of Kızılay Building during these years. The historical Kızılay Building located in Kızılay Park was demolished in 1979. In 1980, a competition was held for “Kızılay Social and Rant Facilities Architectural Project” including a shopping center. This area was left empty and used for parking, open cloth market etc. until the construction of the building in 1993. Then, the construction site occupied the important public space as covering a large part of Kızılay Square. Although the construction was completed in 2001, it was opened in 2011 (Figure 5).



Figure 5. Kızılay Mall (www.mimdap.org)



Figure 6. İzmir Street (www.promim.com)

Kızılay Metro Station Project was crucial for the transformation of Kızılay. The project was started at the beginning of the 1970s and continued for 27 years. This affected Kızılay negatively as the square was closed for six months for the construction in 1992 and Kızılay-Batıkent line was opened in 1997. Besides, during the 1980s, many streets were taken into account for pedestrian use in Pedestrian Zones Plan that was prepared by Ankara Metropolitan Municipality, but only İzmir Street and Yüksel Street were left for pedestrian use (Figure 6) (Bayraktar, 2013).

3.4. After 2000s: Becoming a Chaotic Place

2000s can be considered as the years when significant changes took place in the planning practice of Turkey. Main factors behind these changes were the impacts of neo-liberal policies, which have been more noticeable by the 2000s. The new urbanization dynamics have been clearly observed in the Turkish metropolitan cities i.e. İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir where urban planning approaches have changed from comprehensive planning to action planning, as the comprehensive planning approach was taught to be sluggish to follow the new developments which have been under the pressure of market demands.

By the 2000s, the population of Ankara reached to 3.356.000 which is now increased to 5.346.000. The decentralization decision taken by the 1990 Master Plan accelerated the development in the peripheries and resulted with the urban sprawl problem. The improvements in communication and transportation technologies and changing social structure, new lifestyle have created new urban trends and the new spatial forms in the city. The new common trends for housing, commercial, business projects in this period required large open spaces which could only be supplied in the outer skirts of the city.

Started by 1990 Master Plan, Ankara have transformed from a monocentric structure to a polycentric structure. The new sub-centers have mostly been supported by shopping malls where shopping, recreation, social activities, etc. be served together for the community. These changes have direct or indirect impacts on the city center and Kızılay Square. In “2023 Capital Ankara Master Plan” which was approved in 2007, the problems of the city center were carried to the agenda. The Plan paid a special attention for Kızılay, for strengthening its role of being a cultural and business center.



Figure 7. Kızılay Square (2000s) (<http://3.bp.blogspot.com>)

During 2000s, one of the main problems of Kızılay have been the increase in the vehicle-oriented solutions suggested by the local governments starting from the mid-1990s. Due to these solutions, the mobility of pedestrians became more difficult and the connections between pedestrian zones became insufficient and non-functional. Despite its financial and commercial importance, Kızılay has loosen its bureaucratic and political center characteristics, as well as its cultural center characteristics due to the decentralization of administrative buildings to Eskişehir Road and the construction of shopping malls and etc. In this period, the users of the area have changed. The upper and upper-middle income groups left the area to the middle and low income groups (Bayraktar, 2013). While Kızılay Square and Atatürk Boulevard was used to be one of the most important spaces for social interactions, today they become a place of passage due to high population and intensive traffic (Figure 7). The changing meaning of the Square and its becoming a chaotic place due to the problems/effects was underlined by the interviewees. According to one of the specialists “Local government’s implications are the most important forces behind the transformation process of the area, and Kızılay Square”. “Management conflicts between Ankara Metropolitan Municipality and Çankaya District Municipality” is another problem identified by an academician during the interviews. He emphasized the management problems as one of the factors that didn’t let the solutions or production of useful projects.

The vehicle oriented transport interventions to the area have also created difficulties for pedestrians. This is also the main reason of people preferring shopping malls with no parking problem. From the interviews with the shopkeepers, it is understood that they mostly deal with the changes in the amount of their profit and they complained about the decrease in their economic conditions. Thus, even if it is a general problem of society, the new shopping style

(internet, mall etc) and other economic problems have affected the main feature of shopping and gastronomy facilities of the area negatively. In addition to all these problems, since 2015 the security problems occurred with the terror attacks also appeared as another problem for Kızılay. From the interviews with the local citizens, Kızılay Square became an unsafe and chaotic place when considering the current character of it as a passage zone. The area has transformed into a midpoint station for the commuting of inhabitants and a meeting point for the users of the area.

4. CONCLUSION

The aim of this study is to explore the changing meaning of Kızılay Square, which has an important place in the formation of the capital identity of Ankara, in relation with the social, economic and spatial changes since the foundation of the Turkish Republic. To reach this aim, an oral history methodology was held to investigate the changing meaning of Kızılay Square in the memories of the citizens.

Ankara is “a city symbolizing the successes of Republic, maintaining modern and contemporary way of lives and being a model for the whole country”. Kızılay Square, on the other hand, was a lively, vital commercial center representing the new modern lifestyle. During the 1940s with the effects of social, cultural and economic facilities and activities, Kızılay and Atatürk Boulevard became a place of highbrows, bureaucrats and students who met each other, had fun and relaxed that created the cultural identity of Ankara. Kızılay Square was a spatial repercussion of modernization and statism. The 1950s was an important milestone for Ankara and Kızılay Square, since the new political power placed more emphasis on İstanbul to make a bigger impact on the global arena. In this context, Ankara began to lose its only value, the image of Republic. The users’ profile of Kızılay Square had started to change from a homogeneous society (high-middle income) to a more heterogeneous society (including low-income inhabitants, migrants). The Square functioned as the service place for luxury consumption of bourgeoisie, the commercial center for big capitals, the political stage for workers’ protests, and a place for integrating squatter inhabitants to urban life. In these years, both Güvenpark and Kızılay Square became the central places for the political protests, marches, and meetings.

New social, political and economic arrangements were realized by the effects of both military regime and neo-liberal economic policies after 1980. The political protests, meetings and marches were forbidden, thus the meaning and the function of Kızılay Square changed from a meeting place to a controlled place. The square started to serve as an intersection point for the vehicle traffic as a result of a series of spatial interventions. During the 2000s, Kızılay continued to weaken not only by its bureaucratic and political center characteristics, but also by its commercial center characteristics due to the newly emerging shopping malls throughout the city (Table 1).

The experience of the transformation process of Kızılay Square shows that, physical transformations deeply affect social, cultural and economic life of the citizens. In order to preserve and maintain spaces as a place of our memories, there is a need of different policies, since space is a repercussion of social construction process shaped by our everyday life practices. Such public spaces are crucial for carrying today’s memories to the future, as creation of the new public spaces and accumulation of new memories take a long time.

Table 1. Changes in the Kızılay Square in time

Periods	Main characteristic of the period	Morphological changes at Kızılay	Social changes at Kızılay
1923-1950 Spatial Repercussions of Modernization and Statism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • establishment of Turkish Republic • designing Ankara as a modern, secular and western capital city 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kızılay Square: construction of major public spaces in the new city • construction of Kızılay Building & Kızılay Park • Güven Monument & Park 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new modern way of life • evening concerts, evening walks, cinemas, theaters, music facilities, book shops, patisseries, restaurants, nightclubs etc.
1950 -1980 Rising Out as a Meeting Place and Central Business District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • multi-party regime • changes in the identity of Ankara • migration to cities and rapid increase in urban population 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • construction of CBD : increase in commercial, high rise buildings, shopping passages • new Parliament Building in Bakanlıklar • loss of green areas in Güvenpark & Kızılay Park • pedestrian area projects • destruction of Kızılay Building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • upper and upper-middle income groups • gaining bureaucratic, political and cultural center characteristics • luxurious and prestigious functions • social opposition demonstrations
1980-2000 Period: Transforming From a Meeting Place to a Controlled Place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • military regime and neo-liberal economic policies • new social, political and economic arrangements • new legal arrangements on city administration and planning implications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kızılay Square: losing its public space characteristics • concentration of vehicle and pedestrian traffic • rehabilitation project of Güvenpark • construction of Kızılay Mall • Kızılay Metro Station Project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • senior bureaucrats, intellectuals etc. • an intersection point for traffic • from a meeting place to a controlled place • socialization area • movement of popular restaurants, cafes and pubs to Kavaklıdere
After 2000s: Becoming a Chaotic Place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new urbanization dynamics • new planning approaches • new development implementations under the pressure of market demands. • terror attacks in city center 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • decentralization resulted with urban sprawl • new sub-centers supported by shopping malls where shopping, recreation, social activities, etc. be served together for the community. • increase in the vehicle oriented solutions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • middle and low income groups • loosing bureaucratic, political and cultural center characteristics • a place of passage due to high population and intensive traffic • security problems and fears

REFERENCES

- Aydın, B. 2014. Kentlerin Meydanları ve Meydansızlık Durumu Üzerine: Gezi Direnişi Ekseninde Kentsel Ortak Alanlar. Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Kentsel Politika Planlaması ve Yerel Yönetimler Anabilim Dalı II. Kentsel Politika Planlaması ve Yerel Yönetimler Öğrenci Konferansı, 2-3-4 Mayıs 2014, pp. 46-54.
- Bayraktar, N. 2013. Tarihe Eş Zamanlı Tanıklık: Ulus ve Kızılay Meydanlarının Değişim Süreci. Ankara Araştırmaları Dergisi, 1(1), pp. 20-35.
- Bayraktar, N. 2016. Başkent Ankara'da Cumhuriyet Sonrası Yaşanan Büyük Değişim: Modern Yaşam Kurgusu ve Modern Mekanlar. Ankara Araştırmaları Dergisi, 4(1), pp. 67-80.
- Batuman, B. 2009. Mekân, Kimlik ve Sosyal Çatışma: Cumhuriyet'in Kamusal Mekânı Olarak Kızılay Meydanı. Ankara'nın Kamusal Yüzleri Başkent Üzerine Mekan Politik Tezler, G.Arif Sargın (ed.). pp. 41-76. İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Bilsel, S.G. 1977. Ankara'nın Kentsel Gelişmesinde Yıkılıp Yeniden Yapılma Yoluyla Yükselip Yoğunlaşma Olgusu ve Yaygınlaşma Seceneği. Mimarlık, 1977/3, pp. 54-59.
- Büyükgöçmen, N.A. 1997. Effects of Improvement Plans on Squatter Areas: Ankara Case. Unpublished master thesis, METU, Ankara.
- Büyükyıldız, F. 2009. Başka kent Ankara. Phoenix Yayınevi, Ankara.
- Can, K. 1987. Otopark Değil Güvenpark, Şehir: Kent Kültürü Dergisi, pp.58-62.
- Cengizkan, A. 2002. Kurgu, Tasarım ve Kullanım: Cumhuriyet Dönemi Kamusal Mekanları İçin Bir Çalışma Programı. Ankara'nın Kamusal Yüzleri Başkent Üzerine Mekan Politik Tezler, G.Arif Sargın (ed.). pp. 215-243, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Cengizkan, A. 2006. 1957 Yücel - Uybadın İmar Planı ve Ankara Şehir Mimarisini. Cumhuriyet'in Ankara'sı: Özcan Altaban'a Armağan, Tansı Şenyapılı (ed.). pp: 24-59, ODTÜ, Ankara.
- Çağlar, N., Uludağ, Z. and Aksu, A. 2006. Hürriyet meydanı: Bir Kentsel Mekanın Yenilik ve Dönüşüm Öyküsü. Gazi Üniversitesi Mühendislik-Mimarlık Dergisi, 20 (1), pp. 177-182.
- Düşekimi, www.ergir.com/Piknik.htm, "Piknik" - Tuna Caddesi, 1/A, Yenışehir / Ankara (date of connection: 06.02.2017)
- Günay, B. 2006. Ankara Çekirdek Alanının Oluşumu ve 1990 Nazım Planı Hakkında Bir Değerlendirme. Cumhuriyet'in Ankara'sı: Özcan Altaban'a Armağan, Tansı Şenyapılı (ed.). pp.61-118, ODTÜ, Ankara.
- Kılınç, K. 2009. Öncü Halk Sağlığı Projelerinin Kamusal Mekânı Olarak Sıhhiye. Ankara'nın Kamusal Yüzleri Başkent Üzerine Mekan Politik Tezler, G.Arif Sargın (ed.). pp. 119-156. İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Koçak, F. A. 2008. Social and Spatial Production of Atatürk Boulevard in Ankara. Unpublished Phd Thesis, METU, Ankara.
- Memlük, Y. 2009. Bulvarın Yeşil Parçaları. Cumhuriyet Devrimi'nin Yolu-Atatürk Bulvarı, Çağatay Keskinok (ed.). pp.73-88, Koleksiyoncular Derneği Yayını, Ankara.
- Osman, S. 1998. 1923'ten Bugüne Kent Merkezlerinin Dönüşümü. 75 Yılda Değişen Kent ve Mimarlık, pp. 139-154. Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Özbilen, E. 2013. Urban Plans of Ankara in the 20th and 21st Century. Prostor, 2(46), pp. 302-311.
- Sargın, G.A. 2009. Öncül Kamusal Mekanları Tasarlamak: Başkent Ankara Üzerine Kısa Notlar. Mülkiye Dergisi, 241, pp. 1923-1946.
- Sarıkulak, S. 2013. Changing Identity of Public Spaces: Güvenpark in Ankara, Unpublished Master Thesis, METU, Ankara.

- Sat, N. A., Gürel Üçer, Z. A., Varol, Ç. and Yeniğül, S. B. 2017. Sürdürülebilir Kentler İçin Çok Merkezli Gelişme: Ankara Metropolitan Kenti İçin Bir Değerlendirme, Ankara Araştırmaları Dergisi (baskı sürecinde)
- Sümer, A. 2011. Ankara bir umuttu yoktan var edilmiş bir şehrin mucizesindeki umut. Bir aşk bir hayat bir şehir, Ankara'nın mekanları, zamanları, insanları, G. Tunç (ed.). pp. 41-52. Dipnot Yayınları, Ankara.
- Şahin, S. 2015. Kentte Meydanın Rolü, Ankara, Kızılay Meydanı Unpublished Master Thesis, Atılım Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Şenyapılı, T. 2004. Barakadan Gecekonduya, Ankara'da Kentsel Mekanın Dönüşümü: 1923-1960. İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Tankut, G. 1993. Bir Başkent'in İmarı Ankara (1929-1939). Anahtar Kitaplar Yayınevi, İstanbul.
- Tekeli, İ. 1975. Ankara Nazım Plan Çalışmaları Üzerine, "Ankara' da Yeşil Alan Sorunu ve AOÇ Semineri", Ankara.
- Tekeli, İ. 1994. Ankara'nın Başkentlik Kararının Ülkesel Mekân Organizasyonu ve Toplumsal Yapıya Etkileri Bakımından Genel Bir Değerlendirmesi. Ankara Enis Batur (ed.). Yapı Kredi Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Tekeli, İ. 1998. Türkiye'de Cumhuriyet Döneminde Kentsel Gelişme ve Kent Planlaması. 75 Yılda Değişen Kent ve Mimarlık, pp.1-24. Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, İst.
- Türel, A. 1998. Kent ve Ulaşım. 75 Yılda Değişen Kent ve Mimarlık, pp. 155-170. Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Türkyılmaz, M. 2015. Ankara'da Havuzbaşları: 1923-1950. Ankara Araştırmaları Dergisi, 3(1), pp.105-136.
- Vale, J. L. 1992. Architecture, Power, and National Identity. Yale University Press, London.
- <http://ankaraarsivi.atilim.edu.tr/shares/ankara/images/K%C4%B1z%C4%B1lay%20Eski%20Merkez%20Binas%C4%B1.jpg> (date of connection: February 2017)
- <http://www.ankarahaber06.com/fotogaleri/ankara-fotograflari/ankara-fotograflari-1950-1980-arasi/30/p-3.html> (date of connection: February 2017)
- <http://m.ego.gov.tr/FotoGaleri/Resimler/1028/ankara-nostalji-fotograflari#&gid=1&pid=32> (date of connection: 2017)
- <http://www.mimdap.org/?p=30301> (date of connection: February 2017)
- <http://www.promim.com/tr/projeler/kentsel-acik-alan/izmir-caddesi-kentsel-tasarim-projesi> (date of connection: February 2017)
- http://3.bp.blogspot.com/jXhKL_8kDIw/U2S2m3OjOOI/AAAAAAAAAVZk/Rewlg9l6hI0/s1600/ankara-kizilay.jpg (date of connection: February 2017)