



A New Architecture through *Gar Gazinosu* Building: Representing a New Nation

Melike AKYOL^{1,*}

¹ 0000-0002-2365-7166, Gazi University Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences, Department of Architecture, Eti Mah. Yükseliş Sok. No.5 Maltepe, Ankara

Article Info

Received: 15/01/2026
Accepted: 09/02/2026

Keywords

*Modern Movement,
Architecture Culture,
National Architecture,
Early Republican Turkey
Zeitgeist*

Abstract

This study aims to theoretically evaluate the architecture of Early Republican Period in the context of socio-cultural developments along with modernity. The formation of the republican Turkey required a new approach in urban and architectural construction compatible with the new national identity. The dominant era of modern architecture coincided with the early years of the Republic. The emergence of the Modern Movement in architecture also influenced the way of life, and the modern living required new functional spaces in architecture. *Gar Gazinosu* is a casino-restaurant that provides a social space for inhabitants of Ankara, located next to the Railroad Station building. The main focus of this study will be on *Gar Gazinosu* as a cultural object, representing the revolutions of a new nation state. In this article the socio-cultural role of *Gar Gazinosu* will be discussed concerning three principles of Modern Movement, which are Internationalism, Zeitgeist, and industrial revolution. These principles will be examined based on the discourse of modernism in early 20th century architecture. Therefore, this article intends to offer a theoretical interpretation of the principles of modernity in relation to the unique context of *Gar Gazinosu* in terms of its formal style, location, and function. For the theoretical readings, main references will be the texts, which particularly dwelling on modernism and modern architecture.

1. INTRODUCTION

This article aims to evaluate the modernization process in the Turkish Republic in its early years through the lens of everyday and entertainment culture, which is considered parallel to the socio-cultural spatial production in line with the ideology of the new republic. Studies on spatial and daily life underline the connection between socio-cultural development and the contemporary approach to architectural and urban planning in the early republican period. [1, 2] Ankara was considered a “testing ground” since its role as an urban model for other cities of the republic was deemed important. [3] The modern urban life was a completely new experience for the whole nation; therefore, the purpose of constructing a new urban culture was to transform citizens' lives. [2] In consideration of similar studies conducted on this subject, the original contribution of this article is that architecture is an important cultural and representative production. Especially in the context of Turkish Republican ideals, architecture – together with urban planning – in Ankara’s previously underdeveloped areas, served as the new image of the new nation-state. The importance of early Republican-era architecture as cultural production is evident in its representative role, which reflects the principles of a strong nation-state, unity among the people, and modern urban life. In this regard, *Gar Gazinosu* is considered both a representative of modernism and a place where modern lifestyle habits were experienced and embraced.

As Goldhagen and Legault (2000) put it, “the modern movement has been premised upon the notion that architectural culture must grapple with the society of its time.” [4] This statement clearly reveals the modern understanding. Every act should be proper to the time it is performed. Architecture, as a cultural act, should be practiced to correspond to the needs of the society of its time. It is obvious that there is a

* Corresponding author: makyol@gazi.edu.tr

strong tie between modern architecture and the way of life it serves. The requirements for the new way of life determine the new architecture.

The formation of the Turkish Republic was a significant process following the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, with people tired of war. The architecture of the new capital city, Ankara, was designed to reflect a completely new look, embodying the entire ideology behind the revolution. Although Ottoman Revivalism persisted in the early years of the new republic to foster national awareness, the efforts to develop a new architecture suited to the new nation continued after the 1930s, this time with different approaches influenced by the European Modern Movement.

As Sibel Bozdoğan (2001) states, the architectural production of the early years of the republic underlined the bond between the “modern” and the “national”. Modern Movement, for some, was “the most rational response to site, context, and program”, Bozdoğan argues that this principle is in itself national, and Turkish architects attempted to “nationalize the modern” in line with the ideals of the republican developments. [5] This connotes that the modernist approach for Turkish architects requires them to focus on national architectural culture, not an international one.

Gar Gazinosu (The restaurant-casino of the Ankara Railroad Station) [Figure 1, 2] is an example of 1930’s buildings designed by a Turkish architect, Şekip Akalın in a modernist approach. Designed next to the Railroad Station Building, which is also by Şekip Akalın, and attached to that building with a colonnade comprising three double columns, *Gar Gazinosu* possesses the features of a new architecture to provide a public space for the citizens of the new republic. [Figure 3, 4]

The development of modern entertainment culture accelerated after Ankara became the capital. Moreover, those who came from Istanbul especially for diplomatic reasons were accustomed to the Western lifestyle, so they differed from the native population of Ankara. In time, this differentiation led to changes in city’s social environments and the formation of entertainment venues that Ankara had been unfamiliar with until then. *Gar Gazinosu* was among the first entertainment venues in Ankara in the early republican era, with a modern aesthetic reflecting modern social life, hosting both foreign and local orchestras and activities like dancing. [17]



Figure 1-2. Ankara *Gar Gazinosu*, 2010, photographs by the author



Figure 3-4. The pillared connection between *Gar Gazinosu* and the main Railroad Station, 2010, photographs by the author

Bearing in mind that architecture is a cultural production, this study's method will be to primarily examine architecture as a cultural object, and in particular *Gar Gazinosu* building as a social and cultural representation of the urban life style of the city. Theoretical interpretation of modernism, architecture, and the Modern Movement will establish the basis for a critical ground on which to read *Gar Gazinosu* as a republican modernist social space. The theoretical readings draw on the literature of early Twenties' modernist discourse, and the experiential interpretations draw on the author's field study from which the photographs were obtained. The casino building embodies three principles: internationalism, *Zeitgeist*, and the industrial revolution, which will be evaluated in the theoretical framework by readings on early Twenties' modernism.

This article focuses on *Gar Gazinosu* because one of the main objectives of the new Republic was to connect the entire country with a railway network; at the same time, railway stations played an important role as gateways to cities within the urban structure. [6, 7] Industrial developments, in this respect, were integral to the state policy and the construction activities essential to the establishment of the new image of the Republic; moreover, the contribution of railways to modernization was emphasized in national discourse. [8] Based on existing literature and discourse, the complex formed by the Railroad Station and *Gar Gazinosu* constitutes a special representative area that reflects both the structure of the nation-state and the modernization process through everyday life.

2. ARCHITECTURE AS A CULTURAL OBJECT

Architecture, as a cultural object, is important for denoting the spirit of revolution and the new way of life of modern times through the history of the Turkish Republic. Michael Hays, in his "*Critical Architecture: Between Culture and Form*," discusses a critical architecture that is "one resistant to the self-confirming, conciliatory operations of a dominant culture and yet irreducible to a purely formal structure disengaged from the contingencies of place and time." [9] Hays believes that it is beneficial to explain critical architecture through two cultural views. One of the views sees the architecture as a representational medium of cultural values that existed before. The second view, on the other hand, treats architecture as an autonomous intangible formal system.

One side describes artifacts as instruments of the self-justifying, self-perpetuating hegemony of culture; the other side treats architectural objects in their most disinfected, pristine state, as containers of a privileged principle of internal coherence. [9]

The former perspective supports the view that the architecture of the cultural environment of 1930s Ankara reflects the revolutions underway in every field for Turkey's development in the early Republican era. Ankara, the capital city of a modern, post-imperial, republican Turkey, too, embraced the Modern Movement via the modernist practices of architects. Modernism was accepted as an epitome of the

modern *Zeitgeist* with its instructions of progress and rationalism by all of the practitioners of architecture in the 1930s. [5]

The Turkish art historian Metin Sözen states that one can trace the stages of social development reflected in the architectural environment by considering Republican Turkish Architecture. Sözen emphasizes that architecture, in a way, is an indication of a nation's societal, economic, political, and cultural improvements. [10] In parallel, "architecture as an instrument of culture" underscores the reciprocal interaction between architecture and culture. [9] Therefore, "architecture ennobles the culture that produces it, reconfirms the hegemony of culture and helps to assure its continuity"; since it both depends and supports the collective processes of culture of the states. [9] In that context, Gar Gazinosu is considered a cultural object, reflecting the cultural ideals of a newly founded social, political, and economic order of a nation.

The mentality of the Modern Movement, which was born and thrived in Europe, went parallel to the path that the Turkish Republic pursues. All the endeavors of modernism were for people, likewise the revolutions made for the modern nation's people. Architecture has the skill to represent mental thoughts and acts physically. Therefore, the built environment, through the new vision of the tangible, provides people with a better comprehension that they are the inhabitants of that gradually evolving environment, and makes them feel that they are an important part of that new life.

The Railroad Station building with its *Gar Gazinosu* next to it, is in that sense, a public showcase, through which its users see the power of new state by reconciliation of the splendid elevation of the station building as an entrance to the new capital city to the achievements in railway systems on the one hand; and on the other, the modernist pure appearance of restaurant-casino building evoking the new beginnings in life. Society can pursue the changes and transformations in economics and politics through those in architectural forms. This is a continuous cultural dynamism that could be depicted by architectural narrations of forms most radically.

3. MODERNISM AND ITS ARRIVAL IN TURKEY

Sarah Williams Goldhagen and Réjean Legault (2000), in the introduction to the book *Anxious Modernisms*, attribute the demise of the Modern Movement to the defects of its founding aspirations for a new international language, which ignore local culture, climate, and variation in types. Besides, because the movement prioritized mass production provided by technological developments, it eliminated not only "the phenomenological experience of space, texture, and light" but also the "socio-critical orientation" of the modernist approach. [4]

Thomas Kuhn's concept of a paradigm can be useful for understanding the changes within the discourse of Modern architecture. Kuhn (1970) defines the paradigm as "an accepted model or pattern. He also considers anomalies to be the natural consequence of science, underlining that research within a paradigm can induce a paradigm change. [11] That is to say, a paradigm can present a contrasting idea to the existing one, since paradigm shifts become possible through critical scientific approaches to the ongoing research process. In the architectural scene, the Modern Movement established a strict international style paradigm, with its own formal terminology.

Goldhagen searched for the answer to the question "Why is the style-based paradigm so tenacious, so difficult to escape?" She expressed one clue to the answer: style, while functioning as an intellectual construct, also serves as a "basic level category," as George Lakoff and Mark Johnson have argued. A basic-level category creates mental images that are easily recalled, even when one might look at a single image as an example and representation of the whole category. [12]

It was in the late 1920's that the Modern Movement, which flourished in Europe, began to influence architects in Turkey. Its arrival was announced in the official republican daily, *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* (National Sovereignty), in 1930, which is a very powerful medium for creating nationalist consciousness. Being published in the official newspaper, modern architecture proved ideologically crucial to the regime.

[5] The formal characteristics of the movement, such as cubic forms, flat roofs, and transparency, have found their place in the designs of architects who adopted the Modern Movement's ideals and formal properties, in contrast to other architects of the same period who designed in the Neoclassical style.

The three principles of Modern Movement- internationalism, *Zeitgeist* of modern times, contrary to the traditions of the past, and dominating use of technology and mass production by means of the industrial revolution- manifest the context of early Twenties' modernism. In this article, these three principles of modernism will be interpreted in the context of Turkish architecture through the work of *Gar Gazinosu*.

In order to achieve the first principle, the internationalization of the movement, as argued by Golhagen, codifications were put forth by the International Congress of Modern Architecture (CIAM), and modernism in architecture was reduced to one single style without considering its sophistication and pluralism. [12] Goldhagen's reference to Reyner Banham's argument on the paradigm of Functionalism in *Theory and Design in the First Machine Age* proves that the elaborate mentality of the movement was eliminated, and it was degraded to only one aspect, i.e., Functionalism, in the case of Banham's debate. Banham starts with the place of the word *Functionalism* in the architecture of the Twenties as an umbrella term. [13] He manifests that "no single-valued criterion, such as functionalism, will ever serve to explain the forms and surfaces of these buildings," referencing the buildings he scrutinized in the text, Barcelona Pavilion by Mies van der Rohe and Villa Savoye by Le Corbusier. [13] Like functionalism, Henry Russell Hitchcock and Philip Johnson's "narrow focus" (in Bletter's terms) on style (in their *The International Style*, 1932) could also be insufficient to define the features of Modern Architecture. Moreover, that narrow focus was inadequate to decide which buildings to include in that particular style and which to exclude. [14] Even if some features are designated within a style-based paradigm, other details will remain outside its boundaries.

Early Republican Architecture gradually evolved with the efforts of both Turkish architects and foreign architects who were summoned to Turkey as either instructors or practitioners. It was mostly Turkish architects who practiced the principles of modernism. *Gar Gazinosu*, an example of a "style-based paradigm" in Goldhagen's terms [12], exemplifies the understanding of similar buildings from the 1930s Turkish modernist aesthetic. The horizontal block and the clock tower, as a complementary vertical block, show plainness purified of ornamentation and offer an asymmetrical balance. The building is a felicitous example of the buildings booming from the plan. The walls are pure extrusions of the lines of the plan, with, of course, the windows through them. Horizontal window bands, the projections bounding them from above and below, and the wide canopy extending through the air accentuate the horizontality. To create contrast, the clock tower is more emphasized by the vertical slots formed by a different material on the monochrome surface. Though it reveals an asymmetrical arrangement with its entrance to the building at the corner, there is a symmetry axis cutting it longitudinally. In the current situation, it appears more asymmetrical due to the additional buildings reclining and converging to the whole façade of the back side of the entrance. [Figure 5, 6]



Figure 5-6. Horizontal window bands and the canopy of *Gar Gazinosu*, 2010, photographs by the author

The making of the plan schema on the basis of functionalism and rationalism is evident in *Gar Gazinosu*. This functionalist manner reveals itself in “a rational arrangement of different components of the program in *plan* and a consideration of site conditions, materials, climate, cost, and so forth, as design factors.” [5] Being a restaurant-casino open to the public, it has no obstructions within the completely free space reserved for rest and recreation. This approach suits the needs for a casino building as an interactive place.

According to the functionalist view, cubic architecture is considered rational because of the forms it adopts, which are interpreted as derived from nature. It is embraced because it is logical, and every element serves a function within the building's overall composition. [5] So, the rational thought makes New Architecture “national.” Turkish architects didn't regard New Architecture as a style, argues Bozdoğan, and continues: on the contrary, it was a rejection of any style, such as Ottoman Revivalism. [5] Bozdoğan discusses Sami Macaroğlu's criticism of the domination of social life by a set of logical and rational rules, and his view that art is the only area in which to act out feelings. Modern Architecture cannot be defined or formulated; the only way to live its aesthetics is to see and experience it. [5]

If *Gar Gazinosu* had been based on a functionalist and rationalist paradigm, then it shouldn't have had the color and material differences, different heighted blocks, spaces with varying qualities like terrace open to outside, and the restaurant hall with more transparent surfaces by wide windows; a long block with the clock tower contrasting to the horizontal block. If it were just the extrusion of walls from the plan plane, then all buildings of modern architecture would become an enigmatic closed box, fully pure from the outside, with no clues to the inside.

That time paradigm becomes nothing but everything, defining what one perceives and interprets. Neither functional nor style-based paradigms nor any other particular paradigm is enough to explain the whole mentality behind the modern movement. It is, as the modern movement suggests, a cast of mind of the *Zeitgeist* of the contemporary.

Stanford Anderson (1987) makes his statement on the fiction of function: “If it was a fiction to treat functionalism as a crucial feature of even part of modernism, it is a grosser fiction to treat the whole of modernism as functionalist.” [15] If functionalism is actually a fiction, a function-based paradigm, and any paradigm in general, is invalid for people to understand modernism.

But what if the paradigm completes itself together with its anomalies and follows a path of perfection? If a building is considered based on a paradigm, there will certainly be exceptions. These are, therefore, the anomalies of that paradigm; they are accepted as part of that paradigm for that particular building. However, the spectrum of features assigned to what a paradigm includes becomes so broad that it intersects with features from other paradigms, so that every building fits as an example of more than one paradigm. This is because a separate paradigm, which human beings can ground their experience, could be created; such a paradigm whose principles change from view to view according to what interpretation one had taken from a building, such as Turkish architects, Bozdoğan, summarize:

They were, however, quite insightfully aware that the best definition of a modernist aesthetic was that it could not be defined beyond generalities such as *geometric*, *abstract*, and *undecorated*. Unlike classical styles, which could be codified into fixed orders and motifs, a modernist aesthetic was one that you knew only when you saw it. [5]

The appearance of the *Gar Gazinosu* resembles *Ankara Sergi Evi* by Şevki Balmumcu and *Su Süzgeci*, and *Palais Stoclet* by Josef Hoffmann, as well as *Hilversum Town Hall* (which is mentioned in Goldhagen's text as an anomaly) by Willem Dudok, outside Turkey. Among those buildings, *Ankara Sergi Evi* (Ankara Exhibition Hall) (1933-1934), with its long body contrasted by a clock tower and three vertical elements that express the main entrance, was perhaps the most influential on the design of *Gar Gazinosu*. Ankara Exhibition Hall was selected from among the other projects in an international competition in Ankara in 1933. Bozdoğan notes that, according to the journal *Mimar*, opening a competition is a better choice than commissioning the job to a foreign architect, which has always been the case. The journal also declares that Turkish architects can design for Turkish culture with a proper understanding of the revolutionary spirit. But there is a paradoxical humor in the fact that the project is indeed an aesthetically perfect exemplar of European modernism. [5]

It is necessary to include Hegel's *Zeitgeist* to understand the second principle, the Modern Movement's rejection of the past. Gombrich asserts Hegel's *Zeitgeist* in his texts, *Style* (1968) and *Norm and Form: Studies in the Art of the Renaissance* (1966):

Seeing history as the manifestation of the Absolute in its growing self-awareness, Hegel conceived of each stage of this process as a step in the dialectical process embodied in one particular nation. A nation's art, no less than its philosophy, religion, law, mores, science, and technology, will always reflect the stage in the evolution of the Spirit, and each of these facets will thus point to the one common center, the essence of the age. [16]

Styles, in other words, were seen as manifestations of that spirit of the age which had risen to metaphysical status in Hegel's vision of history. [17]

Heinrich Wölfflin (1998), as Goldhagen also points out, discussed period style by considering the Early Renaissance, High Renaissance, and Baroque. [18] For Wölfflin, following Hegel's lead, period style "represents and embodies the efflorescence of a cultural mentality, the *Zeitgeist*." [12]

The difference between past and present is mostly due to changes in stylistic approaches. Wölfflin presents these changes, with clear comparisons given one by one, between the Renaissance (which is classic) and the Baroque (which is modern). [18]

Kenneth Frampton, in the introduction to his book *Modern Architecture: A Critical History*, discusses approaches to architectural history and theory. The explanation of modernist theory varies. Frampton mentions the relation of modernism to nineteenth-century thought regarding the *Zeitgeist*:

In one sense, modernism was a continuation of the positivistic traits of nineteenth-century thought. According to this view, architecture possessed meaning as a reflection or symptom of a particular stage of historical development. The interpretation of history implied that meaning in

architecture did not depend on the memory of its own past. The spirit of the age demanded that architecture be absolutely new. [19]

By abandoning the traditions of the past and concentrating on the current time that we are living in, modern man reached one of his aims, *Zeitgeist*. It is blatant that there is a strong tie between modern architecture and the new way of life. With the Industrial Revolution, the pace of living accelerated. To meet the needs of mobile people, as modern life necessitates, the buildings in which they live should be simply designed and simply decorated so as to be easily accessible. The Deutscher Werkbund's ideal of creating a new society through the fulfillment of that new phenomenon demonstrates that will. It is traced in Werkbund's practices in which modern interiors, buildings, and devices began to be produced. Industrial innovations contributed to that rapid development, and most probably, as a reciprocal effect, they opened the way for that kind of movement to arise.

It is not just America and Europe, but also other countries, among them Turkey, on which the Modern Movement revealed its effects through the modern spirit, contrary to old traditions. İnci Aslanoğlu (1980) indicates the reasons why the modernist approach has spread in Turkey as: the belief that the architecture of the past is invalid, the will to be contemporary, expansion, heightened awareness, and Turkish architects' efforts to prove themselves among foreign architects. Aslanoğlu underlines that in the years when Western dictatorial countries practiced the neo-classical style, there was an increase in modern buildings since there was no such political structure. [20]

Gar Gazinosu is one of the best representatives of the new revolutionary spirit in Turkey. In accordance with the revolutions along the path to be modern, very different functions were gathered in the casino building. Aslanoğlu mentions the governments' proposals for style in Europe and the USA, opposing this, arguing that in Türkiye, architects designed buildings in the styles they find appropriate. [20] In that freedom of the architectural environment of the 1930s, the *Railroad Station* with *Gar Gazinosu* is a noteworthy project. The two buildings, designed together but with different narratives, appeared as formalist and stylistic differences. As the name of the building implies, the casino building is more than a space for visitors of the city to meet their needs of cleaning, rest, and food; it is also a space, as Aslanoğlu indicates, "to experience a nice time." [20]

The last principle engaged with modern architecture is the Industrial Revolution. Goldhagen and Legault consider the Hegelian *Zeitgeist* to argue that the technology brought by industrial innovations plays a crucial role in modern life. [21] Introducing and using new materials and new production techniques became dominant in the early twentieth-century:

And so the innovations associated with industrial technology and the machine were consistently used, yet used very differently, according to the practitioner's attitude toward what the movement had defined as the *Zeitgeist*. [21]

Bozdoğan's punctuates that "Machine Age" wasn't the period that Turkey was living in. Although Turkey learned from European modernism and applied them beginning from the late 1920's on and during the 1930s, the new methods of production were absent. Flat roofs were not "rational" because, under Ankara's climatic conditions, they require insulation and methods for discharging rainwater, so they are not economically or logically sound. [5] Some buildings of the 1930s are built with high parapets to conceal the pitched roof behind so that the building appears to be formally modernist, except in reality the construction techniques are still traditional.

Still, as a contribution to the development of techniques, the reinforced concrete frame system was chiefly used in modernist buildings of the 1930s in Turkey. Common features included the use of *Ankara taşı* (Ankara stone) on lower floors and brick on upper floors; grey edelputz plaster, Ankara stone, and artificial stone to simulate Ankara stone on facades. [20] These commonalities were evident in *Gar Gazinosu* as well.

4. CONCLUSION

Gar Gazinosu, with its distinctive function next to the station building, makes it unique. The building depicts the transformation in social life and in the city's architectural aesthetic. As Lale and Koca (2023) discuss, the entertainment spaces of the early republican Ankara functioned as almost schools that essentially taught culture and manners to citizens. Moreover, they were planned in relation to their surroundings. [1] The connection provided with urban space makes these entertainment buildings the tools that connect people to the culture of city life and social relations.

The theoretical background on architectural culture of modernism and the Modern Movement addressed in this article makes clear that the architectural environment affects the social and cultural life of the nations. The construction of a new, modern nation can be evaluated in terms of freedom in the Turkish architectural environment. Although it was important to closely follow the social and technological developments in the West, Turkish architects prioritize the national representation of republican identity through architectural production.

On the other hand, architectural productions of early Republican Turkey cannot be evaluated as "fixed and homogenous bodies" without consideration of the influences of "trans-cultural forces" as discussed by Ergut and Özkaya (2014). [22] Cultural influences on modernity and modern life flourished within architectural and urban environments. Consequently, *Gar Gazinosu*, as a cultural entertainment space, has been considered in this study as a structure representing the transformation of cultural and social life through modernity, which originated in Europe and spread to other countries.

The Railroad Station, as a symbol of transportation developments, also marked the beginning of industrialization. It is similar to western railroad stations, with rounded blocks on both sides of its entrance and a clock tower; however, *Gar Gazinosu*, annexed to the main station building, makes them a distinct composition. This building complex, with two separate yet connected functions, is a sign of the new republican capital, showing both the modernist aesthetic on the one hand and the power and continuous improvement of the new state on the other.

REFERENCES

- [1] Lale, B. & Koca, D. (2023). Modern İdeolojinin Mekânsal Oluşumu: 1923-60 Yılları Arası Ankara Gazinoları, *Tasarım Kuram*, 19(39), 334-350.
- [2] Uludağ, Z., & Aycı, H. (2016). Modernin Güçlü Sahnesi Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Ankara'sında Kolektif Belleğin İnşası ve Toplumsal Unutma Süreci. *İdealkent*, 7(20), 746-773.
- [3] Gülbahar Tuncel, S. & Dinç Kalaycı, P. (2018) Modern Kentten Güncelleşmeye: 21.yy Ankara Mimarlığı Üzerine Bir Okuma, in Z. Özlem Parlak Biçer, (Ed.), *Mimarlık Planlama ve Tasarım Araştırmaları*, Mimarlık, Planlama ve Tasarım Araştırmaları, Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık, 465-489.
- [4] Goldhagen, S. W. & Legault, R. (2000). Introduction: Critical Themes of Postwar Modernism, in S. W. Goldhagen & R. Legault (Eds.), *Anxious Modernisms: Experimentation in Postwar Architectural Culture*, Cambridge Mass.: The MIT Press, 11-23.
- [5] Bozdoğan, S. (2001). Introduction: Modernism on the Margins of Europe. *Modernism and Nation Building: Turkish Architectural Culture in the Early Republic*, Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2001.
- [6] Çetin, S. (2012). A Review of the Modernizing Impacts of Station Approaches in the Early Republican Period, *ITU AZ*, 9(2), 89-106.
- [7] Tekeli, İ. (2010). The Story of Istanbul's Modernisation, *Architectural Design*, 80(1), 32-39.
- [8] Ağraz, G., Eroğlu, E., Ertosun Yıldız, M. (2020) Modern Kentin Saati: Sivas Cer Atelyesi, *Mimarlık 414*, 72-77.
- [9] Hays, K. M. (1984). Critical Architecture: Between Culture and Form, *Perspecta*, vol.21, 15-16.
- [10] Sözen, M. (1984). Giriş. *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Mimarlığı (1923-1983)*, Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yay.
- [11] Kuhn, T. S. (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [12] Goldhagen, S. W. (2005). Something to Talk About Modernism, Discourse, Style. *JSAH*, 64(2), 144-167.
- [13] Banham, R. (1983). Conclusion: Functionalism and Technology. *Theory and Design in the First Machine Age*, Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- [14] Bletter, R. H. (1996). Introduction, in A. Behne, *The Modern Functional Building*, translation by Michael Robinson, Santa Monica: Getty Pub.
- [15] Anderson, S. (1987). The Fiction of Function, *Assemblage*, no.2.
- [16] Gombrich, E. H. (1966). Norm and Form: The Stylistic Categories of Art History and Their Origins in Renaissance Ideals. *Norm and Form: Studies in the Art of the Renaissance*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [17] Gombrich, E. H. (1998). Style, in Donald Preziosi (Ed.), *The Art of Art History: A Critical Anthology*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- [18] Wölfflin, H. (1998). Principles of Art History, in Donald Preziosi (Ed.), *The Art of Art History: A Critical Anthology*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [19] Frampton, K. (1992). Introduction. *Modern Architecture: A Critical History*, London: Thames and Hudson.
- [20] Aslanoğlu, İ. (1980). *Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Mimarlığı*, Ankara: METU Architecture Faculty Press.
- [21] Goldhagen, S. W. & Legault, R. (2000). Coda: Reconceptualizing the Modern, in S. W. Goldhagen & R. Legault (Eds.), *Anxious Modernisms: Experimentation in Postwar Architectural Culture*, Cambridge Mass.: The MIT Press, 305-306.
- [22] Ergut E. A. & Özkaya B. T. (2014). Editors' Introduction: Culture, Diplomacy, Representation: "Ambivalent Architectures" from the Ottoman Empire to the Turkish Republic, in E. A. Ergut & B. T. Özkaya (Eds.), *New Perspectives on Turkey*. Vol. 50, 5-8.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The main idea of this study was developed by inspiration from the fundamental readings in the syllabus of the methodology course conducted by Prof. Dr. Ayşen Savaş Sargın at METU, Department of Architecture.