Effects of Chambers on Transformation of Urban Public Spaces: A Case Study from Ankara[*]

Yunus Emre AYNA[1]

Korkmaz YILDIRIM[2]

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to interrogate public sphere and transformation in urban space with a multidisciplinary view. The ambiguity of conceptual and scientific knowledge about the "public sphere" and its spatialization which constitute the focal point of urban studies makes difficult to reach a solution in contemporary debates. When taking into consideration of urban research, it is difficult to come up with explanations that explore the concepts of "public sphere" and "public space" differently and define their boundaries for certain. To this end, in this study, the question of how Chambers in Turkey get involved in the transformation process of public spaces in Ankara was explained by descriptive analysis. The most significant finding of this study is that the Union of Chambers of Turkish Engineers and Architects (UCTEA) as a non-governmental organization could be evaluated as a crucial actor which has an influence on the creation of public sphere and "publicness" of urban space due to having different legal and organizational structure in Turkey.

Keywords: Public Sphere, Urban Space, Chambers

JEL Classification: N90, O18

Meslek Odalarının Kentsel Kamu Alanların Dönüşümündeki Etkileri: Ankara'dan Bir Çalışma Örneği

Özet

Bu çalışmanın amacı kamusal alanlar ile kentsel alanlardaki dönüşümü disiplinlerarası bir görüş ile sorgulamaktır. "Kamusal alan" ile kentsel çalışmaların odak noktası olan mekânsallaştırılması ile ilgili kavramsal ve bilimsel bilgideki belirsizlik yapılan güncel tartışmaların çözüme ulaştırmasını zorlaştırmaktadır. Yapılan kentsel araştırmalar dikkate alındığında, "kamusal alan" ile "kamusal mekân" kavramalarını birbirinden farklı şekilde açıklayan ve sınırlarını net bir şekilde ortaya koyan açıklamalara rastlamak oldukça zordur. Bu düşünceyle, bu çalışmada, Türkiye de meslek odaların Ankara'daki kamusal mekânların dönüşüm sürecine nasıl katılmaktadır sorusu betimsel analiz ile açıklanacaktır. Bu çalışmanın en önemli bulgusu, sivil toplum kuruluşu olarak Mimarlar ve Mühendisler Odası, Türkiye de farklı yasal ve örgütsel yapıya sahip olmalarından dolayı kamusal

---

[1] Research Assistant, Bingöl University, The Department of Public Administration, yeayna@gmail.com.
[2] Assistant Prof. Dr. Recep Tayyip Erdogan University, The Department of Political Science and Public Administration, korkmazyildirim08@gmail.com.

alanların oluşmasında ve kentsel alanların kamusallığında etkisi olan önemli aktör olarak değerlendirilebileceğidir.

Anahtar Kelimeler*: Kamusal Alan, Kentsel Mekân, Meslek Odaları*

JEL Sınıflandırması*: N90, O18*

1. Introduction

The contemporary debate on conceptual meaning and interpretation of both "public sphere" and "public space" varies over time according to the economic, political, cultural and social structure in each society. In particular, the transformation of the public space has been one of the new outstanding phenomena in urban-politics in the last 20 years, but the idea of transforming the space is not new. Power relations have always been affected by the transformation of urban space in every period of history. Politics and ideology exist in space if it is accepted as a concept which produced by society. Therefore, every ideological and political choice has different demands on the shaping urban space due to having various doctrines and philosophical backgrounds. It is occasionally argued that underlying class relations in any changes or articulation occur in space. In this regard, to analyze urban space that includes ideology and politics, infrastructure and superstructure which built on space, distribution, and exchange relations, decision-making process, the role of the actors in the process and their various instruments need to be addressed.

The aim of this paper is to present a comprehensive assessment on public sphere and transformation in urban space with multidisciplinary views. The study seeks to identify comprehension of the public sphere and public realm across disciplines while divergent meanings scholars bring to the study of public sphere/public realm can add value to see and understand the picture as a whole. Firstly, the study provides a conceptual framework for public sphere through presenting main conceptions in western political thought. Secondly, the study analyses transformation of public space and its "publicness" in the case of Ankara. Finally, the study evaluates the propositions-driven from the literature review with the information from The Union of Chambers of Turkish Engineers and Architects (UCTEA) and discusses the implications of the findings.

2. Defining Concept of Public Sphere

Description and interpretations of the concept of the public sphere in the literature have a wide variety of approaches. Over the course of history, it is possible to get the first comprehension and assessment with regard to the concept of "public sphere" back to the Antique Age. As a matter of fact, the explanation that Aristotle made in the field of political philosophy related to the public sphere constitutes a starting point in the literature. Aristotle who emphasizes several ethical concepts such as virtue, goodness etc. in detail in his studies, argues that the basic aims of the politics and administration form have to make virtuous and good life possible in the societies. With regard to publicness of urban space, he also distinguishes *polis* (such as agora and theaters) that is created by equal and free people (mainly males)

as a political animal (*zoon politikon*) on the basis of equality and freedom, as distinct from the social and private sphere at the time.

Main description and interpretation of the public sphere in western political thought are based on three distinct approaches. For instance, first one is an agonistic tradition which depends on Arendt's thoughts. Arendt, a German-born American political theorist, comprehends two-sided institutional differentiation of modern societies; there is a political realm on one side and on the other side the economic market and the family (Benhabib, 1994: 90). The public realm (as represented by the assembly and the agora), on the other hand, was the realm of freedom. It was a legally and institutionally articulated space in which equal citizens met for deliberation, debate, and decision on matters of common concern (Villa, 2006: 9-10). Indeed, Arendt has two different explanations for the concept of the *public*:

"*First, that everything that appears in public can be seen and heard by everybody and has the widest possible publicity; second, the term "public" signifies the world itself, in so far as it is common to all of us and distinguished from our privately-owned place in it*" (Arendt, 1998: 50-52).

To be more explicit, conceptual description with respect to the "public sphere" developed by Hannah Arendt is mainly explained with three different concepts as; *Work, Labor, and Action*. According to Arendt, while social life can be sustained without *Work* and *Labor* that is mainly carried out in the private sphere in the societies, *Action* seems to be essential for continuing human existence in public realm due to the protection of identities by establishing social pluralism, unity and political structures (Arendt, 1994: 36). He also asserts that free individuals are involved in the public sphere for action and decision-making of the policies. Aforementioned, Arendt evaluates the public sphere from two distinct perspectives as 'agonistic' versus 'associational' and describes them as areas in which entire differences are eliminated and involved by citizens who are concentrated on common objects and things. That is, while *agnostic view* indicates people competes for each other's for recognition, precedence, and acclaim, the *associational view* is characterized as areas they are attempting to prove their superiority, virtue, and freedom by acting in harmony in the public space (Karadağ, 2003: 177). However, in particular, the assessments concerning public sphere that made by Arendt are criticized due to the fact that it does not include women in the public domain (Benhabib, 1999).

The researchers of the Enlightenment Age philosopher in the western world such as Locke, Rousseau, and Hegel, have also provided significant gains in the theoretical discussions of the public sphere in the literature. For instance, John Lock, who became the first British liberal thinker, assess the public sphere as a field in which `social contract` was created and dominated by rationality principles by only men's. In addition, political philosophers such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel describe the differences of private and public spheres and assert the public sphere as areas in which are identified with the state and men dominated place (Çaha, 1998: 78). It is also argued that liberal tradition

depends on the idea of public dialogue based on certain kinds of conversation constraints (Benhabib, 1994: 96).

Another disclosure with respect to the public sphere in the literature has discursive dimension and conceptual background. One of the most comprehensive definitions of the public sphere was made in 1962, by Jurgen Habermas. Habermas argues a realm of social life in which something approaching public opinion can be formed (Habermas, 2003). In discursive dimension, public space is not understood as *a space of competition for acclaim and immortality among political elite.* In general, social and political norms of action engage in a practical discourse affects public sphere (Benhabib, 1994: 105). The German philosopher, Jürgen Habermas from the School of Critical Theory also argues that rational, critical discussions and information exchange in the public sphere will assure fully participatory democratic principles in the modern societies. He argues the formation and development of literary and artistic cultures in the public sphere led to the transformation of social and political changes in the areas where free thoughts can be come up with (Altıntaş, 2007).

The statements of the "public sphere" in the study of Habermas entitled as "The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere; An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society" produced a broad repercussion in European countries (e.g. England, Germany and France). The public sphere used as starting points for social diversity in the period, was discussed in various social sciences including politics, law, and philosophy. It was evaluated as the areas in which different identities were sustained in accordance with proper social structure (Altıntaş, 2007). In his influential study, Habermas, in particular, draws attention to the public sphere that intellectual bourgeoisie form. He states that the literary culture formed in public sphere where the public communication network such as newspapers, journals, and media takes place has gained a political character over time (Habermas, 2003: 15-16). It is also argued that bourgeois society and their public communication networks that are open to everyone are the main reason for the political and cultural change in the developed countries in Europe, especially in the French revolution (Habermas, 2003: 15-16). Similarly, famous social scientist Richard Sennett, an urban sociologist, argues the publicness of the urban space as a city-changing element over time. According to Sennett, the public space has a function of mediating the transformation of the city (Gökgür, 2008: 17).

On the other hand, there has also been a criticism of the concept of the public sphere acclaimed in the literature. For instance, Habermas's view on public sphere that the bourgeois forms, and notion that problems can be resolved in a rational way among inequalities are criticized by scholars. In this regard, the study conducted by Fraser is quite remarkable. Fraser opposes the assumption of social equality in public space, which Habermas put forward as a proposition. It is also asserted that it would be more accurate if accepting many public spheres that have been created by many excluded social structure, rather than the single public domain. Similarly, Fraser considers that many of the issues can be discussed in the public sphere, apart from the assumption of common and public issues that Habermas puts forwards (Fraser, 2004: 112-129).

3. Urban Areas, Public Space/ Sphere

The straight assessment of "publicness" of urban space and transformation on it necessitate complete comprehension of the "urban areas". Therefore, it could be claimed that urban areas as social and public lifestyles could be linked with the public sphere. That is, the public sphere has also a spatial dimension as well rather than a mere social space. All kinds of actions that take place in the public realm require suitable areas of the urban spaces because the place in the urban is the reflection of the order of social life. The change of spatial form is most clearly exhibited in the transformation of the public property. Hence, it is possible to argue that the publicness of urban spaces is shaped by the social and cultural changes in modern societies.

Primarily, urban areas and its characteristics need to be taken account in the evaluation of publicness of urban space due to the fact that it varies from one country to another according to political, economic, social, and demographic and employment form. Indeed, it is not possible to find a definite and common definition for the concept of "urban area" in the literature due to different methods and criteria used such as population size, functional, and administrative units. Based on comprehensive studies, urban areas could be defined as a special manner of human settlement at given time and place including certain features such as heterogeneity, competition, a labor of division, specialization, diversification (Tekeli, 2011: 16). Similarly, Keleş et. al. (2012) assert that it is a human settlement in which there is population growth, non-agricultural activities, more goods-services production and consumption activities allocated to ensure the fulfillment of human needs, involved certain economic and social order.

Spatial constraints significantly affect the potential of a public realm to be a public sphere. The social lifestyle of each society shapes public spaces in accordance with their own political and public space imaginings over time (Çetin, 2006: 37). For instance, places such as Agora, Tholos Council House (Bouleuterion), Odeion as Ancient Greek public spaces, "Forum" in Roman are referred as public spaces (Sennett, 2002: 48). In the Middle Ages, it is considered that the bourgeoisie and mercantilist understanding shaped the urban spaces with disappearances of the Churches and feudal powers (Çetin, 2006: 42). As a matter of fact, the urban spaces have been constantly transformed depending on the effective forces of the time and their dominant ideological conception due to having a different doctrine and physiological background. When taking today's social life consideration, it is possible to notice that urban spaces are confronted as public spaces such as agoras, forums, coffee houses in the history that present equal opportunities participation, and competition or associated common lifestyle that appeals to every individual.

Public sphere can be clearly observed in the cities. Organizing public realm in urban areas means to edit the structure of public opinion in a way. Therefore, if the ruling class edits the space, this provides profit for two sides. On the one hand, it establishes hegemony in society with organizing the structure of thought. Besides, it endargers reproduction of labor. Social services like education, health and culture, and organizations of public consumption that accompanying to them such as

transportation, water and waste services, green areas such as parks are political tools that developed for the reproduction of labor. These policies have been highly effective throughout the 20th century. In the last quarter of the century, public spaces in urban areas have affected by some politics which changed their functions. For instance, these politics which called urban regeneration have changed public spaces to rental areas.

Urban regeneration, in many sources, refers to a process known as gentrification. Historically, the concept of renovation seems to be started to be used before the concept transformation. When considering urban structure is changed by a conscious action, history of transformation based on "*a growing need of improvement in social and economic collapse areas where working class lived, with industrialization in the 19th century and then attempts for defunctionalized industrial areas in early of 20th century*" (Yıldırım, 2006: 7). In other words, the city is a spatial integrity which has been converted throughout the history.

Transformation means continuous process and has a long history that goes through with the concept of urban transformation that the original qualities in a process of change are being described. Urban transformation, especially after the last quarter of 20th century, forms urban with similar models and same principles. These models and principles refer to decomposing policies that enclosed by the integrative structure. This period differs from the prior periods by the beginning of the effective process of globalization and neo-liberalism.

The place includes a social dimension as well as a physical environment (Fırat, 2002: 43). Thus, urban space could be defined as areas that are constantly transforming, playing a role in the establishment of social relations, and illuminating the city's change (Nalbant, 2016:14). The elements of spatial construction are social and are constantly being produced by societies. On the other side, the spaces created by the social structures constitute public sphere as well. To this end, the public sphere is regarded as realm including politics, family practices, and the state as elements of entire social integrity (Sennett, 1996: 119).

In particular, capitalism developed in the Western European countries at the end of the 16th centuries led to form urban life structure by means of industrialization and urbanization in the late of 18th century. With modernization efforts as an extension of capitalism, the major structural change was occurred due to intellectual change in urban areas, (Fırat, 2002: 44). This transformation process clearly changed the economic system and structure of community life, in public spaces (Fırat, 2002: 51). For instance, according to Lefebvre, the essence of the city constitutes a spatial form that is both the result and the creator of capitalist relations in general, while Castells argues that reproduction process of the labor, embraces spatial style (Fırat, 2002: 54). To sum, publicness of the urban space in each country differentiates from the western developed societies. Today, public spaces in urban areas are becoming only a field of action and mobilization and leaving the former socialization function. The demands of governance philosophy together with the globalization push NGOs to participate more in this process (Ayhan ve Önder, 2017). It is also possible to claim that the concept of "public sphere" and "public space" have been assessed

from different perspectives on each discipline over time, different meanings and interpretations have been introduced depending on social changes in modern society.

Globalization and neo-liberalism are main dynamics of the process that capital's movement ability and level of commoditization rapidly increases. The reflections of power relations throughout history have diminished concrete indicators of the dominance of capital cities, it has no longer seen in the last period. Separation and flexion of production and consumption from place and time; change in value instead of the value in use; consolidation of the singular atomistic worldview that sees singular primary instead of integral; the proliferation of the activities carried out within the market mechanisms; change in organizer structure of state, leaving the position of administrator, are features of this period. In the outlined period, the labor force was re-produced in urban, joint consumption co-organized and capital accumulation takes place stood out as the spatial scale. Impacts of neo-liberalism to urban in the age of globalization are privatization of urban services, and new initiatives to ensure that the reproduction of the space (Özden, 2008: 28).

For instance, Ankara, the capital of the Turkish Republic, was directly affected by such political change process. Ankara was involved as a capital in the establishment of a nation-state. The city has been built for the mentality of the modern petty bourgeoisie with the public spaces since the second quarter of a 20th century. In the following period, under the rule of the traditional petty bourgeoisie, the different urban policies were put into effect, and public spaces turn to rental areas. In this respect, the research question of this study is to explore how The Union of Chambers of Turkish Engineers and Architects get involved in the transformation process of public spaces of Ankara in Turkey.

Depending on theoretical background, the propositions of the study can be formed as follows:

• Chambers, as not being a political structure, do not take a place in the creation process of public space.

• Even so, chambers are effective on transformation process of public space.

• In Turkey, chambers undertake other non-governmental organizations' responsibilities.

• In Turkey, chambers cannot serve as non-governmental organizations because of their legal structure.

• Political authority can change chambers' functions and responsibilities if chambers have a negative effect on the transformation process of public space.

4. Public Spaces in Ankara in Establishment of Nation-State and Change in Nature of State

The process of establishing a nation-state required spatial configuration process. To establish a nation-state means creating a national identity and a centralized state structure at the same time. The spatial expansion of the Republican project takes

hinge of this two inter-related purpose (Şengül, 2001: 70). For both of them, space had to be decomposed and a new one was needed to be produced. In the production of new spaces, symbol value of space was very important. *"The making of Turkey was a project of modernity that was premised upon the epistemic and moral dominance of the West"* (Keyman & Kancı, 2011: 320). It was assumed that Ankara was main application area as a reflection of this project. As the capital, building Ankara was aimed at the establishment of a national identity, such as the creation of the modern lifestyle.

It is expected to be the symbolic center of national government and to help the development of a sense of national identity from a modern capital (Vale, 1992: 11). Ankara is one of the capitals this kind of setup of the twentieth century (Others are Islamabad, Brasilia, and Canberra). A capital is the product of political decisions, and in this sense, being a capital city could be considered as a political movement. Choosing Ankara as the capital contains the basic motivations and objectives in a way.

Ankara was declared as the capital city when Republic established on October 13, 1923. Istanbul had been the political and cultural capital of the Ottoman Empire for centuries, although the capital of the republic, but the government moved to Ankara with the radical decision. In this process, the main cause of choosing the capital as Ankara instead of Istanbul were geographical and political reasons. The new design was a safe place to find a social base, which manifests itself in Ankara for its support during the War of Independence, and suitable for establishment of the new regime brought the reputation as the site of the only candidate consistently during the War of Independence (Aydın, et al, 2005: 379).

Above all, it is possible to claim that the political, economic, and spatial targets are main motivation in the selection of Ankara as the capital of the Republic. These targets can be evaluated in three titles. First one is; the intention of the government in Ankara was to erase Ottoman image and imperialist economic control and military power which was also related to the image, to create new bourgeoisie and new lifestyle. The second reason was to unite the internal markets to develop national economy, developing Central Anatolia, moving industrial fields to small Anatolian towns to handle inter-regional disparities. The last one was to create a model city inspired from modern western lifestyle, thus encouraging the lifestyle of the national bourgeoisie (Tekeli, 1984: 325). This fiction city could be an example to other cities in the country by the republican regime and the birth of the city was symbolized a form of success of republic.

Social and cultural characteristics of Ankara could also be evaluated with geographic and political factors in the selection of the capital of the newly formed state. In this context, descriptions like "forgotten Anatolian town", "the city built from nothing" which was used for Ankara are not exactly rational. However, these descriptions used for the new capital during the design, architecture, urban design and planning, in order to promote a national status. Executives sought to define a national sense of identity by manipulation of the built environment (Vale, 1992:

44). The built environment and new lifestyle would add a new impetus to modernization and nationalism in the capital.

In the 1980s, the crisis of capital accumulation as a result of the adoption of neoliberal policies, that Lefebvre (1976) offers a ground which explains how to overcome its own internal contradictions of capitalism for 'cycle model'. In addition, Harvey (1985) explains this movement of capital as 'urbanization of capital' which defined in 'second cycle'. Lefebvre and Harvey's arguments, in line with a significant amount of capital in Turkey since the 1980s, 'the first cycle' pulled from the production of urban space, including consumption areas and the financial markets' were transferred to the 'second cycle' (Şengül, 2001: 11). In addition, municipal management system was adopted in 1984 with the Decree of the Metropolitan Municipality. Urban development plans and the approval of the construction of this decree reduced central control while resources of municipalities increasing. Thus, the municipalities, according to the capital demands created urban rent areas such as infrastructure, public housing, rail transportation systems in major cities. Castells (1977) points that collective consumption areas is exposed state intervention, and costs of urban areas are decreased by capital groups to seize them easily.

5. Role of chambers on Transformation of Public Space

In Turkey, chambers are organizations in quality of public institutions (Günday, 2004: 488-490; Gözübüyük & Tan, 2006: 321-324; Gözler, 2008: 243). They are not direct public organizations but they called as entities in quality of public institutions in 185th article of Constitution. It is not easy to determine the differences between chambers and NGO's within legal regulations and existing practices. Chambers set up by a law as NGO's set up by a regulation. Chambers have some public privileges, and they have compulsory membership system. NGOs are established for nonprofit purposes and profits are not shared among the members (Önder, 2006). They could engage in activities other than its purposes. However, NGO's do not have these properties, so evaluating chambers as NGO seems rational within the existing structure, although different results may emerge in practice.

For instance, The Union of Chambers of Turkish Engineers and Architects (UCTEA) was established in 1954 by the Law 7303 and the Decree-Laws 66 and 85 amending of the Law 6235. The Chamber of Architects is a Constitutional profession, established by a special law, with the mandate to determine the rules for the application of the architectural profession, and for the benefit of the public and society, based on mandatory membership (Cengizkan, 2009: 907). UCTEA is a corporate body and a professional organization defined in the form of a public institution as stated in the Article 135 of the Constitution. At the establishment stage, UCTEA had 10 Chambers and 8.000 members. However, as of October 31, 2012, the number of Chambers has increased to 24, while the number of members reached 410.000. Thus, UCTEA has effect and power that an NGO will not have in this sense. The objectives of UCTEA based on the Law on the Union could be listed as following (TMMOB, 2012: 1):

- *"To separate engineers and architects to professional branches,*

- *To satisfy the common needs of engineers and architects, to facilitate the professional activities and to ensure the development of the professions in accordance with the common benefits,*

- *To sustain professional discipline and ethics relations so as to ensure honesty and trust in the relations among colleagues and their relations with the public,*

- *In issues related to professions and its interests, UCTEA cooperates with official institutions and other organizations, and hence provides help and voices its proposals."*

UCTEA and the members in the Chambers define them as professional democratic mass organizations; they assert themselves as having democrat and patriot character, work for labor and people, anti-imperialist and oppose the New World Order theories, racism, and reactionism, against to war, abuses of human rights and encourage the protection of human dignity, protect their organizational independence in any condition. Their members and scientific studies are the only sources of their strength. They accept that the problems of the profession and the colleagues cannot be separated from the general problems of the people and the country. Implementation of democratic centralist methods in the formation and implementation of the policies, having democratic and participatory in the decision-making processes, determination of the current industrialization and democratization progress, providing policies and proposals for possible solutions, are some of the goals of the champers in cooperation with the democratic mass organizations and non-governmental organizations way (TMMOB, 2012: 1-2). These objectives are quite different from other chambers in Turkey. Because of these objectives, UCTEA is regarded as an ideological organization. It has also been observed that the chamber of architects and engineers is involved in many phases of the political process, including local elections, and there are actions to influence elections as well as to express opinions. An article under the title of "End Reign in Municipalities Administration", where the chairman of the chamber of architects also takes place, describes the form of these actions and practices, as well as the effect of the chamber on political structure and spatial formation (Batuman & Karakuş, 2010).

Over 90% of Ankara Metropolitan Municipality's projects evaluated as inadequate and referenced to legal action by UCTEA. In all over the Turkey, chamber applied to court about local and central units. Since 2006, the number of cases and investigations charged against the central and local government units by the chamber is 524. This number is increasing every day and a power struggle is being created especially between the metropolitan municipality of Ankara and the chamber of architects. It is a political achievement for both sides to continue this struggle. Over half of the cases resulted in favor of UCTEA. If we consider the lack of non-governmental organizations in this field, it can be said that this organization has a great influence the transformation of public space.

Mayor of Ankara Metropolitan Municipality and government judges this organization with having a political stance. This judgment is relevant with mayor's

complaints and non-realization of projects in time. This situation has been preventing the reflection of political power to urban space for some time. It is obvious that this situation would not continue. Government is going to change the law of UCTEA in the next legislative period (Taşçılar, 2012: 1). Hence, the sustainability of the effect of political power to public space will continue during this period.

Another form in which the chamber of architects plays a role in the spatial formation of the public space is projects which have a different form of the legal sanctions and the objection mechanism. Many projects such as the identification of building identities and the establishing inventories; the meeting of architects with society and especially children; and the preservation of the industrial identity of Ankara that carried within the chamber, plays a significant role directly and indirectly in the formation of the public space. It is considered that corresponding practices serve the conservative policy applied at the point of protection of the nation-state structure, and reflect the policies observed since the foundation of the Republic.

In addition, the chamber has an effect that cannot be shown in other chambers in Turkey with national and international meetings, educational activities and publications organized in its own internal structure (Cengizkan, 2009: 911). Although these studies seem to be important at the occupational level, it can be stated that they might be effective in creating public opinion from the political point of view and creating public space in spatial context.

6. Conclusion

The crucial change in the spatial and intellectual domain over time is being regarded as an extension of the economic, political and social structure of the period. This study explores "publicness" and the transformation of the urban spaces by descriptive research methods with a case study of The Union of Chambers of Turkish Engineers and Architects (UCTEA) in Ankara, the capital of the Republic of Turkey since 1923. The role of chambers on this transformation and differentiation on the publicness of urban areas in the capital city, which has been shaped by the modernist approaches over time was evaluated in theoretical arguments put forwarded for public sphere and public space in the literature. In this regard, it is argued that the urban spaces that constantly produced by the society are being changed in the way of differentiation on political structure, property forms and representation types in the urban areas.

Public spaces in urban areas of Ankara shaped in a nationalist approach in the process of establishment of the Republic. Even this was as forming such a conscious perception that no traces of the previous period that included. In early times of the republic, public spaces had seen as gathering, knowledge transferring even in education areas. In these years, non-governmental organizations or chambers did not have any effect on the process of public spaces because there were not many non-governmental organizations. As we see in the process of creation of public space in Ankara, chambers could not take a place.

In last thirty years, a new transformation movement has affected the urban spaces. Globalization has also a great effect on this flow. These periods' governments adapted to period's conditions and reshaped urban areas. In particular, non-governmental organizations are very important actors which can derive governments' act on their own interests. In Turkey, NGO's are ineffective in this area and chambers undertook their responsibilities. Chambers cannot be evaluated as NGO because they have different legal and organizational structure. Lastly, in case of Ankara, it is possible to see that political authority could change chambers' functions and responsibilities if it has a negative effect on the transformation process of public space.

References

Altıntaş, R. (2007), "Kamusal Alan Tartışmaları", Köprü, Üç Aylık Fikir Dergisi, Kamusal Alanda Din- Siyaset- Toplum İlişkileri, Sayı (99), Retrieved from *http://www.koprudergisi.com/index.asp?Bolum=EskiSayilar&Goster=Yazi&Yazi No=864.*

Arendt, H. (1994), "*İnsanlık Durumu*", Çev. Bahadır Sina Sener, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.

Arendt, H. (1998), *The human condition / by Hannah Arendt; introduction by Margaret Canovan*", 2nd ed., The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Aydın, S., Emiroğlu K, Türkoğlu Ö., Özsoy Ergi D. (2005), *"Küçük Asya'nın Bin Yüzü: Ankara*", Dost Kitabevi, Ankara.

Ayhan, E, Önder, M. (2017). "Yeni Kamu Hizmeti Yaklaşımı: Yönetişime Açılan Bir Kapı", *Gazi İktisat ve İşletme Dergisi*, 3(2): 19-48.

Batuman, B., Candan T. K. (2010), "Kentsel Politikada Yeni Biçim Arayışları: 2009 Yerel Seçimleri ve Ankara'da Belediye Yönetimlerinde Saltanata Son Kampanyası", Praksis, No:24: 57-76.

Benhabib, S. (1994), Models of Public Space: Hannah Arendt, the Liberal Tradition, and Jürgen Habermas, Calhoun, C. Ed. Situating the self, Blackwell: 89-120

Benhabib, S. (1999), "*Modernizm, Evrensellik ve Birey; Çağdaş Ahlâk Felsefesine Katkılar"*, translated by Mehmet Küçük, Ayrıntı, İstanbul.

Castells, M. (1977), "*The Urban Question*", Edward Arnold, London.

Cengizkan, N. M. (2009), "Mimarlar Odası ve Türkiye Mimarlık Ortamına Katkıları", *Türk Kütüphaneciliği*, 23(4): 907-919.

Çaha, Ö., (1998). İdeolojik Kamusalın Sivil Kamusala Dönüşümü, *Doğu Batı Düşünce Dergisi*, 5, Doğu-Batı Yayınları, Ankara.

Çetin, A. (2006), "*Kamusal Alan ve Kamusal Mekân Olan Olarak 'Sokak"*Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Üniversitesi, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara.

Fırat, S. (2002), "Kentsel Mekanlarda Kamusal Alan", *Çağdaş Yerel Yönetimler*, 11(4): 41-72.

Fraser, N. (2004), "Kamusal Alanı Yeniden Düşünmek: Gerçekte Varolan Demokrasinin Eleştirisine Bir Katkı", in *Kamusal Alan*, translated by Meral Özbek & Cemal Balcı, Ed. Meral Özbek, İstanbul: Hil Yayınları: 103-132.

Gökgür, P. (2008), *"Kentsel Mekânlarda Kamusal Alanın Yeri"*, Bağlam Yayıncılık, İstanbul.

Gözler, K. (2008), *"İdare Hukuku Dersleri"*, Ekin Bas. Yay., Bursa.

Gözübüyük, Ş., Tan T. (2006), *"İdare Hukuku"*, Turhan Kitabevi, Ankara.

Günday, M. (2004)," *İdare Hukuku"*, İmaj Yayıncılık, Ankara.

Habermas, J, (2003), *"Kamusallığın Yapısal Dönüşümü"*, Çev. Tanıl Bora & Mithat Sancar, İletişim, İstanbul

Harvey, D. (1985), *"Urbanisation of Capital"*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.

Karadağ, A., (2003), "Kamusal Alan Modelleri: Çoğulcu Perspektiften Bir Değerlendirme", *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*: 58(3): 171-195.

Keleş, R., Hamamcı, C., Çoban, A. (2012), *"Çevre politikası"*, İmge kitapevi. Ankara.

Keyman E. F., Kancı T. (2011), "A Tale of Ambiguity: Citizenship, Nationalism, and Democracy In Turkey", *Nations and Nationalism*, 17(2): 318–336.

Lefebvre, H. (1976), *"Survival of Capitalism"*, Macmillan, London.

Nalbant, M. (2016), "Türkiye'de Kentsel Mekânlarda Kamusal Alanın Konumu: Tarihsel Perspektiften Bir Değerlendirme". *Bitlis Eren Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Akademik İzdüşüm Dergisi*, 1(1): 12-27.

Önder, M. (2006). How Local Conditions Affect the Existence and Capacity of the Nonprofit Sector: A Test of Competing Theories (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University).

Özbek, M. (2004), *"Kamusal Alan"*, Hil Yayınları, İstanbul.

Özden, P. P. (2008), *"Kentsel Yenileme"*, İmge Yayınevi, Ankara.

Sennett, R. (2002), *"Ten ve Taş, Batı Uygarlığında Beden ve Şehir"*, Translated by Tuncay Birkan, İmge, İstanbul.

Sennett, R. (1996), *"Kamusal* İnsanın Çöküşü", Ayrıntı Yayınları, İstanbul.

Şengül, H. T. (2001), *"Kentsel Çelişki ve Siyaset: Kapitalist Kentleşme Süreçleri Üzerine Yazılar"*, Wald Demokrasi Kitaplığı, İstanbul.

Taşçılar, M. (2012), "TMMOB 'yok etme' yasasına direnecek", 15.12.2012, Cumhuriyet Gazetesi.

Tekeli, İ. (2011), *"Kent, Kentli Hakları, Kentleşme ve Kentsel Dönüşüm",* Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.

Tekeli, İ. (1984), "Ankara'nın Başkentlik Kararının Ülkesel Mekân Organizasyonu ve Toplumsal Yapıya Etkileri Bakımından Genel Bir Değerlendirilmesi", in *Tarih İçinde Ankara*, ed. Erdal Yavuz & Ümit Nevzat Uğurel: 321-338., Eylül 1981 Seminer Bildirileri, ODTÜ Mimarlık Fak. Basım İşliği, Ankara.

TMMOB (2012), "Brief Information about UCTEA, Türk Mühendis ve Mimar Odaları Birliği", http://www.tmmob.org.tr/index_en.php.

Vale, L. J. (1992), *"Architecture, Power, and National Identity"*, Yale University Press, London.

Villa, D. R. (2006), "Introduction: The Development of Arendt's Political Thought", in *Cambridge Companion to Hannah Arendt*, ed. Dana Villa, Cambridge University Press.

Yıldırım, E. (2006), "Güncel Bir Kent Sorunu: Kentsel Dönüşüm", *Planlama Dergisi*, 1: 7-21.