

URBAN OBLIVION: AN EVALUATION OF URBAN CONSERVATION
APPROACHES IN TERMS OF GEO-CULTURAL IDENTITY IN THE CASE
OF JEWISH QUARTER OF ANKARA

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF NATURAL AND APPLIED SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ELİF MERVE NALÇAKAR

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
CITY PLANNING IN CITY AND REGIONAL PLANNING

JUNE 2021

Approval of the thesis:

**URBAN OBLIVION: AN EVALUATION OF URBAN CONSERVATION
APPROACHES IN TERMS OF GEO-CULTURAL IDENTITY IN THE
CASE OF JEWISH QUARTER OF ANKARA**

submitted by **ELİF MERVE NALÇAKAR** in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of **Master of Science in City Planning in City and
Regional Planning, Middle East Technical University** by,

Prof. Dr. Halil Kalıpçılar
Dean, Graduate School of **Natural and Applied Sciences**

Prof. Dr. Serap Kayasü
Head of the Department, **City and Regional Planning**

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ahmet Burak Büyükcivelek
Supervisor, **City and Regional Planning, METU**

Examining Committee Members:

Prof. Dr. Bahar Gedikli
City and Regional Planning, METU

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ahmet Burak Büyükcivelek
City and Regional Planning, METU

Prof. Dr. Baykan Günay
City and Regional Planning, TEDU

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayşe Güliz Bilgin Altınöz
Architecture, METU

Assist. Prof. Dr. Nurçin Çelik
Architecture, Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University

Date: 22.06.2021



I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Elif Merve Nalçakar

Signature :

ABSTRACT

URBAN OBLIVION: AN EVALUATION OF URBAN CONSERVATION APPROACHES IN TERMS OF GEO-CULTURAL IDENTITY IN THE CASE OF JEWISH QUARTER OF ANKARA

Nalçakar, Elif Merve
Master of Science, City Planning in City and Regional Planning
Supervisor : Assist. Prof. Dr. Ahmet Burak Büyükcivelek

June 2021, 209 pages

Cultural identity, whether it is physical or not, whether it is concerning a relatively specific community or the society as a whole, is worth protecting for future generations. Planning as a primary tool for conserving an urban place within the considerations of historical values based on both built environment and social structure, constantly manifests itself with conflicts in terms of retaining the cultural identity. Yet, integrating the cultural identity as a crucial aspect for urban conservation approaches have been considered insufficiently, especially in contemporary development practices. The crucial problem is the lack of emphasis on geographic and indigenous cultural features of identity. The necessity of emphasizing the spatiality of cultural identity, summons the incorporation of geo-cultural identity concept with urban practices. Thus, it is possible to distinguish Ulus, the old core of Ankara, in terms of the importance of cultural values and collective memory from not only the physical layout but also cultural structure of the area. In this sense, Jewish Quarter is a significant area with its diverse cultural background

and intricate physical state. This study will consider urban oblivion as a spatial reflection of geo-cultural identity loss and will make a contribution to the literature in the ways of integrating the concept of geo-cultural identity to urban conservation practices. Archived maps and plans will investigate in order to reading of the area within the planning process. Moreover, interviews will be conducted to examine the causality of geo-cultural identity loss of Jewish Quarter. Therefore study will develop an evaluation on guiding the future studies of urban conservation context concerning geo-cultural identity.

Keywords: cultural identity, geo-cultural identity, urban conservation, urban oblivion

ÖZ

KENTSEL UNUTULMA: KENTSEL KORUMA YAKLAŞIMLARININ YER-KÜLTÜR KİMLİĞİ BAĞLAMINDA ANKARA YAHUDİ MAHALLESİ ÜZERİNDEN BİR DEĞERLENDİRMESİ


Nalçakar, Elif Merve
Yüksek Lisans, Şehir Planlama, Şehir ve Bölge Planlama
Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ahmet Burak Büyükcivelek

Haziran 2021, 209 sayfa

Toplumun ortaklığına işaret eden kültürel kimlik kavramı, belirli bir fiziksel çevreye ve sosyal gruba ait olsa dahi, korunması ve gelecek nesillere aktarılması gerekli bir değerdir. Kentsel mekanın hem yapılı çevre hem de sosyal strüktür bağlamında sahip olduğu değerler ile korunması için en etkin araç olarak tanımlanan planlama, kültürel kimliğin sürdürülebilirliği noktasında sıklıkla çatışmalar yaşamaktadır. Özellikle günümüz planlama pratiklerinde somut biçimde karşılaşılan bu durumunun temel nedeni, coğrafi ve yerel çeşitlilikleri vurgulayan bir kavram olarak kültürel kimlik olgusunun, güncel koruma yaklaşımlarına yeterince entegre edilememesidir. Bu bağlamda, ağırlıklı olarak politika ve sosyal bilimler alanlarının vurguladığı yer-kültür kimliği kavramı, mekana doğrudan etkileri açısından planlama literatürünün ve uygulamalarının öznesi haline gelmiştir. Buradan hareketle, Ankara'nın eski kent merkezi olan Ulus, sahip olduğu kültürel ve kolektif değerleri ve anıları ile birlikte önemli bir kentsel değerdir. Bu çerçevede, Yahudi Mahallesi de sahip olduğu özgün ve yerel fiziksel yapısı ve geçmiş birikimlerden günümüze uzanan kültürel çeşitliliği ile öne çıkmıştır. Bu çalışma, kentsel unutkanlık kavramı etrafında, yer-kültür

kimliđinin kaybolma sürecinin kentsel mekandaki etkilerini Yahudi Mahallesi örneđi üzerinden incelemeyi hedeflemektedir. Bu kapsamda alan, geçirdiđi deđişim/dönüşüm sürecini, konu olduđu planlama uygulamaları üzerinden okunacaktır. Buna ek olarak, yer-kültür kimliđinin unutulma ve kaybolma süreci, yerel, merkezi yönetimler ve mahalle sakinleri ile yapılan görüşmeler, yine bu sürecin mekansal etkileri ile geçmiş ve mevcut koruma yaklaşımlarına dair eleştirel bir bakış açısı sunacaktır. Bu sayede çalışma, gelecekteki koruma pratiklerine dair, yer-kültür kimliđi vurgusunu içine alan bir yaklaşım sunarak literatüre katkı koyacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: kültürel kimlik, yer-kültür kimliđi, kentsel koruma, kentsel unutulma



To my father

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my first and sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Assist. Prof. Dr. Ahmet Burak Büyükcivelek for all his guidance, support and for all the enlightening discussions we had throughout my entire graduate education. I would also like to thank the examining committee, Prof. Dr. Bahar Gedikli, Prof. Dr. Baykan Günay, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayşe Güliz Bilgin Altınöz and Assist. Prof. Dr. Nurçin Çelik for their valuable comments and assessments. I owe special thanks to Prof. Dr. Ayşe Güliz Bilgin Altınöz for her guidance on critical issues and to Prof. Dr. Baykan Günay for sharing me his valuable insights all through this journey.

I would like to acknowledge the dear members of City and Regional Planning Department of TED University for their support and encouragements. I owe special thanks especially to Başak Aycan for being there with me as the best research companion I could ever wish for.

During this difficult process, I was very lucky to be surrounded by so many support, friendship and love. I am very grateful; to my all time favourite person Jabze Sine İbrahimgil who always been there for me, to my dear friends Duygu Çayan, Selin Aslangeri, Betül Leblebicioğlu and Ozan Terzioğlu for giving me such joyful memories during this time. Lastly, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Berkay Güney for his endless support, encouragement and love, for all the home delivered emergency kits and for always believing in me, even at the most struggling times. I could not have done this without him.

Last and foremost, I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my family for their unconditional love and support. I am very thankful to my beloved mother Ayfer Nalçakar, to my father Haluk Nalçakar and especially to my safe haven Zeyneb Zuhale Nalçakar. I will be forever grateful to her for being the most amazing sister imaginable, for being my biggest supporter and for always standing by side.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	v
ÖZ	vii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	x
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
LIST OF FIGURES	xv
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Aim and Scope	1
1.2 Hypothesis and Research Questions	3
1.3 Methodology	4
1.3.1 Data Gathering	6
1.3.2 Data Analysis	8
2 FROM IDENTITY TO GEO-CULTURAL IDENTITY	11
2.1 Identity	11
2.2 Cultural Identity	17
2.3 Geo-cultural Identity	24
2.3.1 Components of Geo-cultural Identity in Urban Context.....	29
2.3.2 Geo-cultural Identity in Urban Space	35
2.3.3 Geo-cultural Identity in Urban Conservation.....	40
2.3.4 Spatial Reflections of Geo-cultural Identity Loss: <i>Urban Oblivion</i> .	41
2.4 Concluding Remarks	51

3	GEO-CULTURAL IDENTITY IIN THE CONTEXT OF URBAN CONSERVATION	53
3.1	Urban Conservation and its Relation with Past	59
3.2	Urban Conservation and its Relation with Place	62
3.3	Urban Conservation in Policy and Praxis: Prelude to Research Methodology.....	64
3.4	Global Urban Conservation Context.....	81
3.5	National Urban Conservation Context.....	83
3.5.1	Historical Evolution of Urban Conservation in Turkey	85
3.5.2	Contemporary Legislative Framework of Turkish Urban Conservation.....	94
3.6	Concluding Remarks.....	99
4	THE CASE FOR URBAN OBLIVION: JEWISH QUARTER OF ANKARA	101
4.1	Conservation Process of Ankara in the Context of Geo-cultural Identity 102	
4.2	Geo-cultural Identity of Jewish Quarter in the Context of Ankara.....	110
4.2.1	History and Importance of Jewish Quarter.....	110
4.2.2	Morphogenesis of Jewish Quarter in Planning Practice.....	112
4.3	Urban Space in Peril: Current Status of Jewish Quarter in the Context of Geo-cultural Identity	141
4.4	Assessment of Interviews with Analytical Hierarchy Process	147
5	FINAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUDING REMARKS	175
5.1	Synopsis of the Research	175
5.2	Proposals: A Call for Rethinking of Urban Conservation	177

5.3	Recommendations for Further Studies	181
REFERENCES		183
A.	Overlap of Planning Practices Regarding Jewish Quarter	199
B.	AHP Scoring Table	200
C.	Interview Questions for Interest Group 1: Governance	203
D.	Interview Questions for Interest Group 2: Local Community	205
E.	Interview Questions for Interest Group 3: Jewish Community.....	206
F.	Evaluation and the Calculation of the Interest Group's Importance Values for AHP Analysis	207

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

Table 3.1 Conceptual evaluation of urban conservation praxis in the context of geo-cultural identity and key components	65
Table 3.2 Assessment of methodologic review	80
Table 4.1 Important Spatial and Legislative Regulations for Urban Conservation Developments of Ankara in terms of Geo-cultural Identity	108
Table 4.2 Formation of the AHP Criteria from Literature Review	149
Table 4.3 Standard Scale of Importance in AHP	154
Table 4.4 Interview Details	154
Table 4.5 Decision Matrix of the AHP Analysis for Government Group	156
Table 4.6 AHP Result of the Government Group Interviews	156
Table 4.7 Decision Matrix of the AHP Analysis for Local Community Group....	160
Table 4.8 AHP Result of the Local Community Group Interviews	161
Table 4.9 Decision Matrix of the AHP Analysis for Jewish Community Group..	164
Table 4.10 AHP Result of the Jewish Community Group Interviews	165
Table 4.11 AHP Result of Interest Groups.....	168

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURES

Figure 1.1. Methodology of the research	5
Figure 1.2 Responded methods of hypothesis and research questions	6
Figure 2.1. Conceptual highlights and scholars in identity context	11
Figure 2.2. Identity dichotomy and counter concepts	16
Figure 2.3. Cultural identity in identity context	22
Figure 2.4. Change of urban space by displacement and socio-structural change in terms of diversity	34
Figure 2.5. Conceptualization of Sauer’s perspective on production of cultural landscape	36
Figure 2.6. Conceptualization of urban oblivion in geo-cultural identity	44
Figure 3.1. Time-kinesis in traditional linear context	56
Figure 3.2. Time-kinesis in urban conservation context	56
Figure 3.3. Three pillars of urban conservation (3P)	58
Figure 3.4. Illustration of the “evil planner’s” approach to the concept and practice of urban conservation	69
Figure 3.5. Highlights in global urban conservation context through history	81
Figure 3.6. Highlights in national urban conservation context through history	86
Figure 3.7. Overlap of geo-cultural identity and urban conservation approaches in global and national aspects	98
Figure 4.1. Ankara Citadel and surroundings in 1839 Von Vincke Map	104
Figure 4.2. Geo-cultural identity concern in conservation practices of Ankara ...	107
Figure 4.3. Comparison of geo-cultural identity concern of urban conservation practices of Ankara with global context	109
Figure 4.4. Location of Jewish Quarter of Ankara	111
Figure 4.5. Cityscape of Jewish Quarter of Ankara	112
Figure 4.6. Location of Jewish Quarter in 1924 Ankara “Şehremaneti” Map, spatial organization of Jewish Quarter in 1924 Ankara “Şehremaneti” Map	114

Figure 4.7. Location of Jewish Quarter in 1924 Lörcher Plan, spatial regulation of Jewish Quarter in 1924 Lörcher Plan	116
Figure 4.8. Location of Jewish Quarter in 1932 Jansen Plan, spatial regulations of Jewish Quarter in 1932 Jansen Plan	119
Figure 4.9. Old City and surroundings with new settlements in Jansen Plan	11
Figure 4.10. 1/500 scaled design study of Hermann Jansen for Jewish Quarter	20
Figure 4.11. Location of Jewish Quarter in 1957 Uybadin-Yücel Plan, spatial regulations of Jewish Quarter in 1957 Uybadin-Yücel Plan	124
Figure 4.12. Jewish Quarter in Ankara Zoning Floor Order Plan (1961-62) inside the 6-storey structure right given commercial area and commercial axes	126
Figure 4.13. Condition of high-rise buildings and their impact	127
Figure 4.14. Ankara's planning process in 1970-1990 period (1) 1990 Ankara Structure Plan, (2) 2015 Ankara Structure Plan of METU	129
Figure 4.15. Location of Jewish Quarter in 1990 Ulus Historical City Centre Conservation and Rehabilitation (Bademli) Plan, spatial regulations of Jewish Quarter in 1990 Ulus Historical City Centre Conservation and Rehabilitation (Bademli) Plan.....	133
Figure 4.16. Location of Jewish Quarter in 2007 Ankara Historic City Centre Urban Renewal and Conservation Master Plan, spatial regulations of Jewish Quarter in 2007 Ankara Historic City Centre Urban Renewal and Conservation Master Plan.....	136
Figure 4.17. Location of Jewish Quarter in Ankara 2023 Master Plan	137
Figure 4.18. Location of Jewish Quarter in 2014 Ulus Historic City Centre Conservation Master Plan, spatial regulations of Jewish Quarter in 2014 Ulus Historic City Centre Conservation Master Plan	138
Figure 4.19. Geo-cultural identity concern in conservation practices of Jewish Quarter in comparison with global aspect and Ankara	140
Figure 4.20. Structural Change of Jewish Quarter (1988-2020)	142
Figure 4.21. Structural change of registered buildings in Jewish Quarter (1988-2020).....	143

Figure 4.22. Structural change of physical conditions in Jewish Quarter (1988-2020)	144
Figure 4.23. Abandoned buildings of Jewish Quarter in poor physical condition	145
Figure 4.24. Collage of the news and reports about Jewish Quarter and Ulus Historical Centre & surroundings in the periods of 2010-2020.....	146
Figure 4.25. Five stages of Analytical Hierarchy Process	148
Figure 4.26. Consolidated results of the AHP Analysis for government group ...	157
Figure 4.27. Comparison of the weight value and priority rate of Government Group according to AHP Analysis	158
Figure 4.28. Consolidated results of the AHP Analysis for local community group	162
Figure 4.29. Comparison of the weight value and priority rate of Local Community Group according to AHP Analysis	163
Figure 4.30. Consolidated results of the AHP Analysis for Jewish community group	166
Figure 4.31. Comparison of the weight value and priority rate of Jewish Community Group according to AHP Analysis	167
Figure 4.32. Consolidated results of the average AHP Analysis for interest groups	169
Figure 4.33. Comparison of the weight value and priority rate of interest groups according to AHP Analysis.....	169
Figure 5.1. The cycle of value in geo-cultural identity	180



CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Aim and Scope

Protecting and enhancing the historical environment concept has gone through a breaking point with the understanding of “reproduction” in post Second World War era. In the following period, world’s understanding of urban conservation shaped around the focus of environmental and cultural diversity of an area. On the other side, the existence of this understanding in Turkey is an area to explore.

Historical urban areas have two main features. The first one is environmental capital which is based on physical values of structures, the second one is socio-cultural capital which is generated by the sense of community belonging and social cohesion. Those concepts are directly linked with the social and cultural components of the identity in urban context. As a sociologic approach that embraces environmental and cultural capital together in an urban area, the concept of geo-cultural identity, it is significant to think historical urban areas upon a continuous timeline which represents past, present and future.

In this context, as a historical urban centre, Ulus is significant since its cultural and historic values such as being the Republican Capital of Turkey, especially in recent researches. From Lörcher Plan to this day, Ulus has been an important subject to many conservation studies. When we consider Jewish Quarter (İstiklal Neighbourhood), this area comes to forefront because without any construction, rehabilitation or renovation process, the neighbourhood has managed to survive and from 16th century until 20th century, the Jewish community of Ankara lived in the neighbourhood. The collective memory and remainders of community, civil

architecture samples that represent environmental values of the era are some of the motivations behind the selection of the study area. Within this framework, the study will pursue the existence of geo-cultural identity notion in past and present conservation approaches, try to reveal the absence of geographic and spatial features of the notion in terms of oblivious urban development practices and propose the integration of geo-cultural identity aspect on urban conservation practices in order to define a theoretical and practical framework for successful urban conservation. Study's first aim is to contribute to a new comprehension of conservation concept within the focus of geo-cultural identity and how this approach can be integrated and sustained in future planning approaches for Ankara. In this regard, the study will investigate the concepts identity, cultural identity and geo-cultural identity in the literature. As a notion prevalently considered in social and political fields, geo-cultural identity, its spatiality, relation and importance for urban studies will be examined in-depth. The lack of emphasis of the geo-cultural identity in urban place will be constructed as urban oblivion in order to express the reflections of geo-cultural identity loss and its effects on urban area within the case of Jewish Quarter of Ulus. Moreover, study will construct a framework of successful urban conservation theory and praxis within the references from global urban conservation context and its emergence through history. In comparison with national context, study's second aim is to evaluate the performance of urban conservation practices from a historical perspective, within the context of geo-cultural identity. In this respect, as a first step of the methodology, spatial and historical development of the area will be analysed with mapping and reading of the area within the framework of past plans and projects regarding Jewish Quarter. Secondly, in-depth interviews will be conducted with decaying Jewish community of Ankara, local community of the neighbourhood and local government officials, in order to understand the process of geo-cultural identity loss of study area and for generating new planning/conservation tools to emphasize the importance of geo-cultural identity in planning practices.

This study eventually will unfold the geo-cultural identity loss of an urban area as a spatial reflection of the diminishment of a minor community, will evaluate the urban

conservation performance with developing a critical viewpoint to the urban conservation approaches of Ankara throughout the history. Finally will aim to make a contribution to the literature by proposing a dynamic approach that is focused on preserving geo-cultural identity and secure its continuity.

1.2 Hypothesis and Research Questions

As indicated in the previous section, study aims to investigate the spatial reflections of geo-cultural identity loss within the framework of contemporary urban conservation praxis with evaluating their performance regarding Jewish Quarter.. From this point, the hypothesis of the research shaped as the acceptance of *the existence of geo-cultural identity components is the key for successful urban conservation practice*. Therefore, study's main research question is generated as *"How the geo-cultural identity loss (urban oblivion) reflects itself in an urban area considering the performance of urban conservation practices?"*

Alongside this main research question, several sub research questions developed based on the theoretical background of the study, which addressed both global and national contexts of urban conservation. The theoretical backbone of the study is generated as geo-cultural identity discussion and pursuits of it in urban conservation context. Therefore, sub research questions are emerged as following.

- a. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Turkish urban conservation approaches in comparison to global context within the scope of Ankara?
- b. How did Ankara's and Jewish Quarter's urban conservation process evolve throughout history in terms of geo-cultural identity?
- c. How did the social, cultural and spatial structure of Jewish Quarter change throughout history in terms of geo-cultural identity?
- d. What are the spatial reflections of geo-cultural identity loss in an urban area (*urban oblivion*)?

Is it possible to accept geo-cultural identity as an essential component for future urban conservation praxis of Ankara?

1.3 Methodology

The analysis methods and data gathering techniques are briefly mentioned in aim and scope section. This section provides a broader understanding of the methodology of the research with explaining the data gathering, analysing and assessing process.

Alongside the literature review focused on urban conservation and geo-cultural identity; single case study will be used in order to construct a holistic approach for this research. Single case study provides a multi-layered combination of different research methods and analysis techniques as a study model. In this research, the single case study have two pillars which are archival research and in-depth interviews.

The archival research will provide a broader perspective on the spatial and political transformation process, with using archived written/visual materials regarding Ankara and Jewish Quarter. Within this scope, study will pursuit answering the sub research questions a, b and c. In the second step of the single case study, study will conduct in-depth interviews with interest groups in order to unfold the reflections of the urban oblivion process that Jewish Quarter has been experincing from the perspectives of three different interest groups. With this, study will try to answer the sub research questions d and e. Overall, with using this methodological structure, which is considered as a content analysis, study will develop a response to the main research question and therefore, testify the hypothesis.

The conceptual diagram demonstrating the methodological structure of the research with indicating the main methods, analysis techniques and evaluation tool used on this study, is shaped as below.




Figure 1.1. Methodology of the research

For content and the process of data gathering, data analysis and data evaluation, the next chapters will provide a detailed explanation. Study will primarily focus on archival research and in-depth interview sections of the process. However, to summarize the process briefly, the study will collect archived written and visual materials from different institutions and platforms in order to develop a broad understanding of the changing, transformation and *oblivion* process of the case area. Moreover, the study will collect linguistic data from in-depth interviews conducted with three interest groups which are local government, local community and Jewish community groups. Four in-depth interview has chosen as suitable and efficient for each group; therefore 12 in-depth interviews have been used in total.

The data analysis method for archived data is shaped as mapping with using Adobe Photoshop and Adobe Illustrator softwares which are commonly used for editing and visualizing ‘raster’ (non-vectorel) images as in collected archived visual materials. Secondly, the linguistic data collected from participants will be analysed with Analytical Hierarchy Method with using AHP-OS and Microsoft Excel

software as analysis tools. The content and details of the analysis methods, techniques and tools will be discussed in following chapters below.

1.3.1 Data Gathering

As mentioned, this research has been conducted a data gathering process within two pillars. The first pillar has been constructed based on the archival research, maps, plans, reports, international charters and photographs have been collected. The maps of the past plans, the base map that have been used for the mapping and visualizing, and plan reports has been reached via physical archives of Ankara Metropolitan Municipality and Middle East Technical University: Maps and Plans Archives. The online archives have been accessed are VEKAM Library Digital Archive: Ankara Map and Plan Collection, Technical University of Berlin: Architectural Museum (*Architekturmuseum der TU Berlin*). In addition, several resources such as articles, books and visual documents have also been used for collecting both written and visual archived materials. Also, personal archives from field observations and from different scholars have been used to answer the research questions (*Figure 1.2*).




Figure 1.2. Responded methods of hypothesis and research questions

According to the research structure, the study has been divided the interest groups into three as the local government group, the local community group and the Jewish community group. In the period from 26 May 2021 to 13 June 2021 (including the deciphering process) 16 interviews were conducted within the three interest groups, although 12 interviews were determined as efficient for evaluation. As Saaty (1980) and Kuruüzüm & Atsan (2001) emphasized, knowledge and awareness on the subject were the main consideration while defining the participants for each group. Therefore, the informations such as gender, age or household informations were excluded from interview questions. The main focus was their involvement and their profession in order define their involvement.

The second pillar of data collection has been constructed based on the linguistic data from interviewees collected in two platforms. The first platform has shaped as on-site. In this respect, the officials from Ankara Metropolitan Municipality, Altındağ Municipality and Ankara Metropolitan Municipality Department of Cultural and Natural Assets has been visited in those institutions. Four out of five interviews have been selected as suitable for this group. The second interest group's interviews have also been conducted on-site, with six participants. Four out of six interviews have been selected as suitable for this group as well. The second interview platform was created virtually for third group, Jewish community, with using "Zoom" software, due to both Covid-19 conditions and the necessity of remote communication with the migrated members of the Jewish community. Two interviews with Jewish community members has been conducted by the author. The other interviews have been used in this research were conducted for a joint study regarding the Jewish Quarter of Ankara, which is being prepared in partnership with *UrbanObscura* and The Union of Turkish Israelis, with the Jewish citizens who used to live in Ankara yet immigrated to Israel. The recordings of these interviews were accessed with the permission and approval of *UrbanObscura* and The Union of Turkish Israelis. From their archive, two out of six interviews have been found suitable based on the linguistic data corresponding to the interview questions.

The local government group has been asked to answer 15 questions, the local community group has been asked to answer 15 questions and the Jewish community group has been asked to answer 11 questions which can be found on the appendix. In addition, the criteria evaluation table has been prepared for every interviewee/evaluator and has been asked to make a pairwise comparison between two out of eight criteria. Therefore, the evaluators scored 28 rows in total. The criteria evaluation sheet can be found on the appendix as well.

1.3.2 Data Analysis

Analysis of the gathered data has also been divided into two steps, parallel to the structure and setting of the research. The first step has been shaped as **mapping** based on the archived visual materials of maps, projects and plans. Since many of the collected data of maps, projects and plans were in **rastered (non-vectorial) image format** for visualizing and mapping, the software of Adobe Photoshop has been used as an analysis tool. The collected data in the **vectorial image format** has been edited and visualized with using a vectorial-based software as an analysis tool, Adobe Illustrator. As seen in *Figure 1.2* above, the mapping method will aim to answer the sub research questions a, b and c. From this perspective, plans and projects regarding Jewish Quarter has been analysed with mapping, based on its spatial, morphological and political regulations within the periodical context.

The second step of the data analysis process was shaped accordingly to the linguistic data from in-depth interviews. From this perspective, as will be explained in more detail in the relevant chapter of the research, the pursuits of finding a suitable method in accord with analytical and rational thought led the research towards **Analytical Hierarchy Process Method**. Thomas Saaty has developed the method in 1980 and he indicates that the Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) method is a basic and useful method for clearing the complex structure in order to conduct an analytical decision making, evaluation and/or performance assessing process (Saaty, 1980), which shaped as the main research question of the research as mentioned earlier. As Ferretti

et al. (2014) indicated, using AHP Method, as a sub context in Multi-Criteria Decision Making Method and cultural based urban conservation, many of the studies in that field considers the literature-based criteria definitions is at the core of the application of the AHP Method (Ferretti, Bottero, & Mondini, 2014).

From this point, the study has been used the AHP Method on collected qualitative data as a linguistic format described as “**fuzzy**” inputs in the context of AHP. Therefore, the **fuzzy set theory** has been articulated in this method by Buckley (1985) in order to define the proper **defuzzification** method for collecting quantitative data for converting them into “**non-fuzzy**” inputs for the AHP method (Buckley, 1985; Chen, Yoo, & Hwang, 2017). From this respect, the study has been used the **Weighted Average Method (WAM)** as one of the most used defuzzification methods for evaluating a survey/interview-based collected data (Radhika & Parvathi, 2016).

From this perspective, the interviewees from three interest groups were asked to conduct a pairwise comparison between the epitomized criteria based on the geo-cultural identity concern in the urban conservation processes and practices. Their pairwise comparison will be conducted according to AHP Method’s **Standard Scale of Importance** which is defined as between 1 to 9 according to the difference in importance between each pair of criteria. Based on the scoring of the interviewees/evaluators, the most valued criteria in terms of its importance and priority has been determined. After conducting an AHP analysis for each interest group, in order to reveal the most critical and prior criteria for successful urban conservation in the context of geo-cultural identity, an average AHP has been conducted between three interest groups. Therefore, the study aimed to unfold the differences and similarities between different interest groups’ perspectives on the issue and make a valid assessment of the perception of an urban conservation practice’s performance.

From this perspective, the PHP and SQL based software called “**AHP-OS**”, which Klaus Goepel released in 2014, has been used for this research. AHP-OS provides a

comprehensive and straightforward tool for conducting a AHP based study with multi-criteria (Goepel, 2018). Although the software also provides a defuzzification basis with different methods such as Weighted Sum Method (WSM) and Weighted Product Model (WPM), this study used the program **Microsoft Excel** for Weighted Average Method (WAM) with using the GEOMEAN and SUM tools, in order to generate a more diverse methodologic background.



CHAPTER 2

FROM IDENTITY TO GEO-CULTURAL IDENTITY

“All identity is individual, but there is no individual identity that is not historical or, in other words, constructed within a field of social values, norms of behaviour and collective symbols.”

(Balibar & Wallerstein, 1991, p.94)

2.1 Identity

To describe the cultural context within the whole cultural identity literature, firstly, there is a need to understand the concept of identity itself. As one of the oldest and consistent concepts, identity is with a simple description, mainly indicates an individual meaning to seeking an answer to a basic “who we/am are/I?” question. For this chapter, the research will focus on the identity concept within the spatial framework; therefore the consideration of identity will concentrate on more pluralist and communal meaning instead of the definition of singularity and individuality of identity context.




Figure 2.1. Conceptual highlights and scholars in identity context

As indicated in *Figure 2.1* above, identity arguments are based upon the 17th century philosophers and thinkers who generate the theory of consciousness. Regarded as the spearhead of Cartesian thinking in 17th century, Descartes firstly discussed insinuatingly the identity context on his methodological writings and his product of his way of thinking on one of the fundamental principles of philosophy with the approach of “*I think therefore I am.*” He remarked on the importance and cruciality of knowledge and personal background and accumulation of this knowledge in time. He resolved the human being as a physical matter and the human being as a source of immaterial knowledge. For Descartes, that is what identifies a person. From the point of Descartes, in 18th century, Fichte developed the concept of “*pure I*” based upon his readings and researches inspired by Kant (Fichte, 1871). This concept later expanded into a philosophical theory based upon the self-sufficiency element of identity. In this period, the selfness and sameness of the identity have questioned by those thinkers. Still, according to Calhoun (1994), the focus of identity context in this era remained as generally focused on individualism as well as in 19th century (Calhoun, 1994).

In 1950s, with his emphasis on “one and many dichotomies” in philosophy and also his description about how the arguments on being a human being through “*belonging together*”, Martin Heidegger brought the discussion from individuality to commonness and to a more pluralist way of thinking (Heidegger, 1973). The discipline of philosophy identifies being as a paradox in terms of identity (Griffiths, 2017). But for Heidegger, identity is a way of defining itself as a “being” and making itself understood by others. Moreover, in his understanding -differently from previous debaters- identity is not constantly about a human being’s characteristic, but about indicating herself/himself to others, along the same line, perspective of conceiving others. He defends that if identity arguments stick with the metaphysical structure of a being rather than its own meaning defined above, the whole identity notion falls into oblivion. Another important highlight of Heidegger’s perspective that he does not set against the identity arguments as a constituent of sociologic paradox; he embraces the paradox with its differences (Heidegger, 1957). His

emphasis on togetherness or his own description of “*belonging together*” situation reflects on this perspective. Therefore, Heidegger’s way of thinking is one of the changing points on the timeline of identity discussions throughout history.

Another significant point on the ontological perspective from Heidegger, he claims that the Cartesian way of thinking based on previous debaters’ point of view is out of date. Heidegger acknowledged the dialectic relation between mind and being and he identifies the notion of being in terms of location and time which considered the human being’s awareness of both themselves and others (Günay, 2009). The essence of Heidegger’s view is that being with others is in every human being’s nature. This interrelation between the people and the others leads the concept to observe the same situation from different views and share the experience together that will be mentioned in the next discussions in this chapter.

Later, these ideas started to evolve towards common identity and its fundamental elements. As one of the foremost philosophers on modern identity arguments, Foucault claims that identities are concrete objects generated by regimes that diffuse in our being, reshaping and determining our personal identities in terms of specified limitations (Weir, 2009). From Foucault’s perspective, identity discussions have more political aspects that affect the creation of both individual and communal identity. Therefore, he insists that every single part of a community is classified and divided into different social categories by external factors (Foucault, 1982). According to his perspective, this divided form of identity manifests itself in an individual as “depended on another individual” in terms of perception of her/his identity. Individual identities’ division into social categories constructed by other individuals and their shared communal substance which hold them together (Martin, 2005). From this point, Foucault’s (1982) emphasis on individuals as subjects in terms of identity puts the identity discussion on a transition point from ontological to social perspective.

In the late 20th century, more sociological perspectives came to the foreground of the identity discussions. Different from early thinkers who consider identity in a more

ontological way within the focus on individualism and only a little emphasis on communal identity, the arguments have completely metamorphosed to collective identity in this era. For Taylor (1989), identity has been evaluated over time through different perspectives within the influences from political and social philosophy. He argues that an indisputable paradigm shift occurred in the late 20th century from individualism to multi-layered pluralism. He related multi-layered pluralism with contemporary multiculturalism and defined this shift as a cornerstone of the ascending idioms; cultural and collective identities (Taylor, 1989).

According to Calhoun (1994), one of the leading thinkers of collective identity context, identity in basic meaning is recognized in significant ways by other participants of a society (Calhoun, 1994). For Calhoun, the identity concept refers to the complete cognition of ‘belonging’ in a human being’s nature. This perception also describes the human identity itself alongside the communal and collective identity within the emphasis on recognizing others, the relationship between selfness and others. The word “others” here describes the subjectivity of the identity concept according to an individual’s perspective for the issue and it also refers to the differences and diversity of the community. He explains that identity concept refers to people’s perception of who they are in terms of individual identity and collective identity, which is constructed based on their cultural backgrounds.

As one of the furthest researchers dedicated to the identity context, Castells describes the term “identity” from the sociological perspective with reference to one of the focuses of this thesis, building a meaning based upon a cultural attribute which is transcendent to other meanings. According to Castells, for an individual of society, or for a collective participant of society, the existence of plural identities will be considered as a moral certainty (Castells, 1997). In society, this plurality of identities or a majority of a specific identity creates a social tension or a conflict among community hence the existence of the minorities and contradiction of “identity” and “roles” that are given from institutions or organizations regarding the majority to them. Castells also discusses this conflict by defining the role-sets as; labels assigned by norms constructed by institutional actors of the society (Castells, 1997). In

reference to Castells' point of view, contemporary arguments and researches show the fact that identities and role-sets should separate in terms of their meanings, from themselves. Those so-called "label" and role-sets also define the community's diverse structure and emphasize its difference. Over the recent years, discussions on difference have become a crucial feature for the debaters influenced by post-modern and post-structural theory (Smith, 2001). Therefore, the identity concept states the human being who thinks what is her/his own selfness in an individual or collective level and the process of the cultural context in community.

In the late 20th century, more pluralist perspectives occurred with post-Marxist approaches from different thinkers. Those ideas are affected by post-structural theory; thus, this understanding is claimed as a tool for analysing both the construction process and crucial hallmarks of cultural identity (Torfing, 2005). Torfing (2005) states that cultural identity as a notion defines not only the human being's comprehension of who they are or want to be but also the meaning they assign to different objects, experiences, places and events (Torfing, 2005). From his point, identity context defines by not just with one's identity or its relation with other identity owners, but also the relationship with the specific historical periods of events in time and space.

As seen, identity context has been considered with different perspectives and views throughout time. According to researchers with ontological or sociological perspectives, the compact dichotomy of the whole identity context is divided into two main subjects in order to remain restricted to the framework of this study (see *Figure 2.2*). Thus, the first subject with the early ontological perspective considers as *personal identity*. The early thinkers of identity concepts were strict to the sub contexts as self-consciousness, individuality, personal memory and self. As deeply discussed above within the historical timeline, these arguments are mainly focused on a person's own identity and its pursuits. By debaters like Calhoun and Castells, the second subject considered as *impersonal identity*. The reason for choosing the word "impersonal" here is, the sociological way of thinking of the identity concept includes not only the social identity but also the historical and cumulative shared

experiences among society which considers as collective identity further and *cultural identity* which contains both historical and collective values and therefore brings broader perspective in order to lay this research's way open to the core of the thesis. According to social thinkers' perspective as thoroughly mentioned above based on the historical timeline, impersonal identity context comprises sub contexts as public consciousness, plurality, shared experience and community notion.




Figure 2.2. Identity dichotomy and counter concepts

According to the discussion above, it is seen that the identity discussions are consistently defend that the identity and its conditions of existence are inseparable. According to the contemporary discussions of identity context, those conditions are directly related to the togetherness of equivalence and difference of the society and their shared experiences. The emphasis on shared experience and togetherness leads the identity context to one of its important components in order to construct the framework of the thesis: cultural identity.

2.2 Cultural Identity

The concept of cultural identity refers to the latest discussions held based on identity context about its plurality and collectiveness. The diverse structure of a specific community directly related with its differences among participants. From this point of view, the concept of culture came into the core of identity arguments in the literature.

According to the basic lexical meaning of the word “culture” the main idea lies in emphasizing a community with common facts (a society with abundance and diverse structure) and a specific physical environment and a time period. *A group of people* with shared experiences and memories occurred in a specific *urban area* in a particular *time*. This understanding generates three main elements of the culture concept; community, time and space.

For Friedman (1994), the term “culture” has been used to emphasize the discrepancy of culture which consists of the features of social, behavioural and representational aspects of a specific population. For him, this usage based on the identification of the concept of otherness (Friedman, 1994). This way of thinking brings and counter perspective to the traditional understanding of culture indicating the single human behaviour. Friedman distinguishes those two perspectives as “generic culture” and “differential culture” and expresses them not only counter arguments for each other but also defends that those two concepts have a dialectic relation. He explains that generic culture is the origin of distinctness, of variation in a specific population. He defines the generic culture as the locus of social creativity, diversity and productivity. On the other hand, in his definition, differential culture is a comprehension of historical values of generic culture and a reflection of generic culture with its spatial specificity (Friedman, 1994). This statement has an emphasis on the concept of identity in terms of remarking the individual and common culture approaches in the cultural studies literature.

From this understanding of collocation of culture and identity concepts, the cultural identity arguments come to the foreground in order to shape the framework of this study. The context of cultural identity first identified by Collier and Thomas (1988) as a sense of attachment or belonging to a social group with collective features like ethnicity, shared values or geographic origins (Collier & Thomas, 1988). Also, in his later studies, he defined cultural identity as an admission of social identifications by individual participants or groups of specific settings (Collier, 1998).

According to Martin (2005), the concept of identity contains in itself the cultural features of an individual. He acknowledges identity as a leading and constructing aspect of collective human interrelations. In his perspective, collective identity lies at the core of perceiving another individual's identity based on collected values, mutual tolerance and understanding. He also underlines the cultural features from different social categories among society shapes the collective identity (Martin, 2005).

The classification discussions of cultural identity concept vary in the literature, in order to set its place into the scientific structure, from different perspectives of researchers. Jameson (2007) in her research based on cultural identity classification, placed the context of cultural identity as a part of subjective identity and an element of its sub context: collective identity (Jameson, 2007). Although Jameson (2007)'s understanding of cultural identity directly refers to the economic development and business communication considerations, she underlined the dissociation of making concessions to nationality in terms of vocation and class. From her perspective, cultural identity needs to provide an equilibrium among its components related to geography, religion, language and other social aspects (Jameson, 2007).

According to Triandis (1989), the context of subjective identity comprises personal and collective identity (Triandis, 1989). For Jameson (2007), personal identity is directly bounded with self-recognition acquired from a specific individual, in other respect, collective identity is bounded with self-recognition acquired from community (Jameson, 2007). From this perspective, collective identity contains both

social and cultural aspects and therefore, cultural identity places as an element of collective identity. Jameson (2007) and Triandis (1989) from different fields (economy and psychology) have similar thoughts in refer to classification of cultural identity. They both approach the concept as taking social and cultural identity as bounded with each other but not referred as the same. For Jameson (2007), cultural identity comprises the historical background, transferring knowledge gained from historical background and shared common values from the past through the next generations. On the other hand, social identity refers to a specific and significant period (Jameson, 2007). Thus, social identity focuses on the interactive relation between people and the present time; where cultural identity focuses the interactive relation between people and the past, and how they approach the future within reference to past experiences.

For Kim (2007), the concept of cultural identity has occupied a central place in social sciences, particularly in communication and social psychology (Kim, 2007). From this perspective, cultural identity is generally considered as a sub-case in social identity literature. According to his studies on how the concept of cultural identity has evolved throughout past decades, the understanding of cultural identity has changed from traditional way of thinking which mainly focused on “melting pot” perspective on intergroup relations toward a more pluralist way of thinking on ethnic differences, race and culture among different parts of the community. By the term “melting pot”, the theory of cultural identity considers a milieu where similar subjects with diverse features on ethnic origin, race, culture, religion etc. come together and affect each other. According to Kim’s analysis, the ideological shift process on cultural identity discussions reflected in the academic field as well since the 1970s.

For De Vos (1990), cultural identity shapes as a paralleled idea between selfness and commonness. It generates a sense of belonging to a particular origin, being a part of shared common values, as well as it provides a definition and identification to an individual among society (De Vos, 1990). From his perspective, there is an understanding of the relation of cultural identity with the pluralist structure of the

community. From this point of view, the perception of collectivity and shared collective memory in a community or in a social group is placed at the heart of the cultural identity concept. Therefore, as an element of social identity arguments, cultural identity has placed wider, more in-depth and more complex structure than common social identity research in the literature.

From the perspectives of different debaters mentioned above, cultural identity is generally considered as a crucial aspect of social identity. As emphasized before on identity review in *Chapter 2.1*, some social thinkers like Calhoun and Castells whom considered the whole “identity” arguments within the outlook of urban planning and urban development context more than others, shaped the cultural identity notion not as the *divided* part of social identity, but as an embedded perspective considered *with* social identity literature. For this emphasis, the concept of “impersonal identity” conveyed to identify a broader way of thinking for social identity and cultural identity collocation.

This point of view is also corresponded by Wan and Chew (2013)’ research on cultural identity and its generation. Wan and Chew (2013) describe the whole context as a “process.” For their perspective, cultural identity has its components, but it cannot be taken under consideration as an element of any other identity sub arguments and cultural identity context is unthinkable to separate from social and collective identity. Generating and creating a cultural identity concept in any community requires an association of both social and collective identity and they should think as periods of the whole cultural identity generation process.

For a holistic understanding of this perspective, Wan and Chew’s research will take under consideration more deeply. Wan and Chew define cultural identity as a notion that generates a definition and identification of a being as a part of the community. This understanding indicates the mental connection between the being and its culture (Wan & Chew, 2013). As mentioned before, according to Wan and Chew, cultural identity is a process developed by an individual linked with social and collective aspects. They describe the process of the development of cultural identity as follows;

The first phase of the process is connected with developing a proficiency on cultural background with collecting cultural knowledge of cultural values, convictions and concrete practices from the society that individual belongs to. Gaining and collecting cultural knowledge in this regard owns a crucial role in order to develop the cultural identity in a specific community.

The second phase of the process focuses on providing membership in a particular cultural collective. This phase also provides a mental connection between the member and the cultural collective. Thus, cultural identity bounds with impersonal collectivity derived from the member. For Wan & Chew, second phase produces a label based on this membership (Wan & Chew, 2013). Although those labels, as Castells (1997) indicated and mentioned in the previous chapter, assigned by norms constructed by institutional actors of the society, labels are still have influence on strengthen the diverse and heterogeneous structure of the community. Labels are also obviating the - in the words of Wan & Chew (2013) - *loss of the memory* of “depersonalized collective.” This understanding directly channels the concept of categorical labels to the concept of collective memory as an essential aspect of cultural identity.

According to Wan & Chew (2013), the third phase of developing the cultural identity is directly linked with social interaction among the community. This social interaction in their view, be constituted in a culture. Social interaction can address a relationship among small ties such as family or close friends and wider ties of communal assemblage such as neighbours. Alliance of those ties provides a connection between the individual and the cultural environment to which the individual is attached to. (Wan & Chew, 2013).

According to Taylor (1994), identity in cultural sense correlates with the concept of authenticity, equality, dissimilarity and a necessity of recognition in society (Taylor, 1994). This emphasis on being equal with his/her diverse identities in a society and being recognized as the way she/he is, derived the focus on cultural identity context from romantic individualism to more impersonal and objective direction.

Waldron (2000) also criticized the concept of individualism and its metamorphosis towards pluralism. According to Waldron (2000), the growing emphasis on the issues like differences, ethnic and cultural identities, plural identities took a stand against modern politics (Waldron, 2000). From this point of view, generating a new classification became compulsory in order to shape a convenient model with reference to Jameson (2007)' scheme (see *Figure 2.4*). Approaching the concept of cultural identity in a scientific way requires a way of thinking focused on discussing it in a developing process, instead of dissociating the concept from its aspects. Therefore, cultural identity places as a wider element of impersonal identity alongside collective identity and social identity regarding collective memory & membership and social relations in a society.




Figure 2.3. Cultural identity in identity context (remodelled from Jameson, 2007)

In reference to the previous discussions about the whole context, according to Castells (1997), the building process of identities requires significant matters from history and geography as well as from collective and personal memory among society. But individuals, social groups, and societies use all these matters and re-identify their meaning, according to their social background, and their space/time framework (Castells, 1997). From cultural identity theory, constructing a cultural identity refers to embracing the beliefs, behaviours, collected memories and cultural products of mentioned cultural groups. The word “cultural product” here implies

such as songs, art pieces, books or a specific spatial regulation in any scale. To define the relation with components of cultural identity and its spatial reflections, urban space as a spatial regulation will mention beside the “cultural product” term. According to Zittoun and Gillespie (2016), cultural products provide common values and shared experiences which put a new complexion on cultural identity (Zittoun & Gillespie, 2016). From this perspective, as Castells (1997), Zittoun and Gillespie (2016) emphasized, cultural identity construction processes use tangible materials such as spatial settings alongside intangible values in order to define not only one’s individual cultural identity but also the whole community’s or a specific social group’s cultural identity. Thus, cultural identity contains both elements of the self as well as the community to which the self belongs. Therefore, the concept of *urban space* as a spatial setting in which shared experiences occurred among diverse society, came to the foreground.

As mentioned in *Chapter 2.1* within the arguments, concepts and scholars based on identity have moved towards the more pluralist thinking at the beginning of the 21st century. Many scholars like Sandercock, Ashworth and Bhabha related this era with the acknowledgement of the *pluralism* in culturally diverse (or in Bhabha’s suggestion, “culturally differentiated”) societies. This understanding later emerged as *multiculturalism*. According to Ashworth et al. (2007), for a holistic explanation of multiculturalism, recognizing and embracing the multiple ethnic identities and minority groups in a community is crucial as well as understanding these differences and producing mutual participation for a more tolerant society (Ashworth, Graham, & Tunbridge, *Pluralising Pasts: Heritage, Identity and Place in Multicultural Societies*, 2007).

In contemporary arguments on cultural identity context that juxtaposed the concept of multiculturalism, the notion of *hybridity* comes to the foreground by Homi K. Bhabha with his studies mainly focused on this issue. According to his perspective, there is an *interspace* (“in-between space”) in the identity production/reproduction processes in multicultural societies and he defends that this gap paves the way for

the emergence of the “cultural hybridity” in terms of cultural identities that embraces the cultural difference apart from the social hierarchy or -as Foucault claims- politically imposed role sets and identities (Bhabha, 1994). This understanding is generally assumed for multicultural 21st century societies including different minority groups and ethnic origins. Based on this point, Ashworth et al. (2007) relate this concept with migration, diaspora and minority issues with the linkage of geographic transnationalism (Ashworth, Graham, & Tunbridge, *Pluralising Pasts: Heritage, Identity and Place in Multicultural Societies*, 2007). According to Bhabha’s Derridean-based perspective, the concept of hybridity addresses the cultural difference and corresponds to the spatial and geographical difference as an input for the formation/reformation of cultural identities. For Ashworth and Graham again (2005), the transformation of space or *interspace* into *place* is considered as a geographic reformation process that roots in the collected memories of culturally diversified societies (Ashworth, 2005). From this perspective, the concept of geo-cultural identity that refers to these discussions above within the re-reference of Castells’ *place-based cultural identity* comes to the fore in order to shape the core of the research.

2.3 Geo-cultural Identity

The holistic comprehension of urban conservation and cultural identity and their reflection on a specific urban area with historical and cultural values, requires more complex and spot-on discussion.

As mentioned before, the concept of urban space was placed at the core of cultural identity context. It is directly associated with geography as a broader perception including urban space and cultural landscapes in this sense (Choudhary, 2014).

Lewis (2002) also relates cultural identity with symbols and meanings produced by human imagination. According to his view, an individual or a community attaches itself to specific artefacts constructed by visual features, signs, as well as intangible

features (Lewis, 2002). Therefore, the concept of cultural identity forms itself as a phenomenon by embracing concrete values gathered from different parts of the society and settings they attached to.

When it comes to the geographic perspective of the concept, definition and acceptance of culture and cultural identity notions have an important place in this regard. According to Mitchell (2000), the concept of culture is bounded with human imagination and giving specific meanings to particular values from both society and the physical environment (Mitchell, 2000). He puts a more geographical perspective into the cultural studies literature with emphasizing its difference from other disciplines. He indicates that the concepts of culture and generation process of cultural identity in a particular society have more focus on *materialistic* constructions in other disciplines such as politics, anthropology, economy, etc. On the other hand, in geography and other place-based disciplines, the way of looking at cultural studies has been constructed based on both *materialistic* and *symbolic* relations (Mitchell, 2000). These symbols produced within the imagination of an individual who belongs to a specific community are directly linked with their past experiences both individually and commonly accumulated through time.

From this point of view, it is clear that, in spatial and geographic disciplines cultural identity develops with the transformation of man-made materials into symbols that have specific meanings attributed to them by the community. From urban planning perspective, geo-cultural identity directly corresponds to this way of thinking. Therefore, the notion comes to the fore as a crucial concept in terms of society as “meaning -maker” and urban space which is assigned as “meaningful.”

Thus, the issue of the relation between urban space and society comes into discussion. From a social perspective, geo-cultural identity addresses the collective beliefs, values and backgrounds which considered as crucial in terms of forming human behaviour and social relations among community (Aboutorabi, 2018). As mentioned with reference to Aboutorabi (2018) in *Chapter 2.2.3*, the transition process of most cities are experiencing currently from singular culture to plural

cultures has had a reflection on cities in terms of both physical and social structure of urban areas. This transformation process has influenced not only the diversification of the built environment (urban tissues, public spaces etc.) but also the diversification of society. At this point, it is valid to acknowledge the coexistence of these diverse features of cities.

In order to comprehend the diverse structure of cities in terms of geo-cultural identity context, first, the relation between place and society will examine in depth. Culture and its components have an apparent impact on the variation of any society in today's multicultural cities. Ethnic origin, religion, beliefs, traditions and any other cultural difference based on a specific social group, had or/and have been affected the socio-spatial stratification process. According to Aboutorabi (2018), these elements create a dichotomy in terms of the coexistence of social groups. According to his view, different features and characteristics make a way of the possibility of both cohesion and divergence (Aboutorabi, 2018). For understanding the spatiality of this issue, the perspective from Oscar Newman comes to the discussion. According to Newman (1972), this cohesion and/or divergence situation manifests itself on the urban area in terms of these social groups' choice of clustering or distancing with/from each other (Newman, 1972).

Another scholar on spatial reflections of geographic site selection for different social groups of the society, based upon Jon Lang's study. According to Lang (1987), this social clustering provides an option for reforming and rearranging urban areas - mostly public spaces- in regard to existing of these social groups based on their specific cultural backgrounds (Lang, 1987).

Rethinking the concept of cultural identity in urban planning and conservation framework with its components and spatiality, the argument of geo-cultural identity which refers both cultural identity of an urban area and dwellers who identify themselves with the place they live in becomes prominent.

“A man dwells when he can orientate himself within and identify himself with an environment, or, in short, when he experiences the environment as meaningful” (Norberg-Schulz, 1980, 5).

Norberg-Schulz identifies in order to highlight the importance of the context within the emphasis on gathered experiences from the past, which leads the argument to the concept of collectiveness of the identity. The relation between space and cultural identity is also stressed by Castells (1997) as; the generation process of collective identities in a particular society, always takes place within the framework of cultural materials from history, religion and geography (Castells, 1997). Therefore, the notion of cultural identity with its multi-faced structure is considered as an issue for planners in urban planning theory and urban conservation practices. According to Rodwell (2009), the concept of management of historic cities in terms of urban conservation practices, is based on protecting and sustaining their physical and social development, taking into consideration of geo-cultural distinctiveness and identity (Rodwell, 2009). The relation between urban context and cultural identity is directly linked with the cultural diversity of both space and society.

From this point, axiomatically summarised description of geo-cultural identity; according to Atkins et al. (2014), is a concept of the result of its formation within a particular area and a particular national and regional cultural context (Atkins, Brian, & Ian, 2014). According to Neill (2004), the planning field must put less emphasis on the notion of only space but more on the meanings that are given to particular qualities of specific places (Neill, 2004). From this perspective, it is perceptible that the notion of geo-cultural identity corresponds to the specificity and diversity of an urban area they attached geographically.

For Talukder (2019), the concept of geo-cultural identity is based on classifying a person or a social community regarding their geographical and cultural origins. According to his perspective, in cultural identity context, the notions of identity and culture are engaged on a social level and in a multicultural society the conservation and protection of the identity is linked with the culture only. On the other hand, in

the framework of geo-cultural identity, some other concepts are fundamentally significant in order to conserve and protect by all. Talukder (2019) determines those concepts as identity of a person's geographical heritage -which refers to the subjectivity and diversity of identity- and shared cultural values by both minority and majority of a particular community (Talukder, 2019).

According to the perspective of Kymlicka (1995) on such issues, recognizing diversity while at the same time valuing geo-cultural identity puts multiculturalism in the core of the argument. Therefore, geo-cultural identity in the urban context considers a multicultural society as a community of a particular urban area. The multicultural structure of society links itself with minority groups with different ethnicity, dialect or religion. Kymlicka criticized the traditional theories on multiculturalism by their incognizance of differences among various minority groups in a multicultural society. Therefore, perspective on geo-cultural identity, is bounded on ideas as diversity among national minorities, differentness of ethnic groups, cosmopolite structure of a geography and cultural membership (Kymlicka, 1995).

From this perspective, Sandercock (1998) emphasizes the relationship between the politics of 'multicultural citizenship' (Kymlicka, 1995) and the politics of reclaiming urban and regional space by indigenous peoples or so-called 'minorities'. Each of these is having a profound effect on shaping the cities and regions of the next millennium, leading to the central importance of a new 'cultural politics of difference' and seriously undermining the modernist paradigm on which planning practices have been constructed (Sandercock, 1998). Thus, the multiculturalism and multicultural structure of both built environment and community came to the forefront of urban conservation and planning discipline. When these socio-cultural forces are ignored in the process, it is easy to fall into an analysis in which the economic pressures of globalization are seen to be shaping everything (Castells, 1996).

To sum up, a minority group of a community in a particular urban area is perceivable as the dwellers of geo-cultural identity.

2.3.1 Components of Geo-cultural Identity in Urban Context

The fundamental components of the concept of geo-cultural identity regarding previous discussions have been divided into four: cultural capital which considers urban space and physical component of the built environment as a cultural product; collective memory which considers the past experiences as an input for geo-cultural identity with referring the issues such as place attachment and belonging; social capital which deals the community-based identity approach and lastly the diversity component which considered as an umbrella concept for other three components that takes the geo-cultural identity context under the consideration within the physical, social and cultural diversity.

2.3.1.1 Cultural Capital

The cultural capital component of the cultural identity has been shaped around the references from Wan and Chew' and Castells' perspectives mentioned above in detail. In other respects, cultural capital concept will take in hand with different approaches from social theorists who considered the notion of "culture" as an essential input for the production of any society.

According to French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, cultural capital plays a subtle but substantial role in producing or reproducing society (Bourdieu, 1986). With influences from Marx, he developed an idea based on emphasizing the importance of cultural values and cultural products in the economic field of society. Within the term 'cultural production', Bourdieu brings a broader perception of the concept of 'culture' by emphasizing sociology, law, religion, alongside with the impressions and expressions derived from art, history and literature (Hesmondhalgh, 2006). He defines those values and products on his further studies based on culturally accumulated knowledge and background by society as 'cultural capital'. His understanding regarding this concept located in-line with Marxist theory. From one step forward to Marxist theory, Bourdieu indicates cultural capital as an important

actor in social classification and individual' social class on the hierarchical structure of the society.

The term of cultural capital used above can be described as an additional cultural value of an asset that should be considered separately from its economic value. To describe this in a more intuitive way, it is possible to think of a historical building which as a real estate provides a particular economic value but also has a cultural value for the community as an aesthetic or symbolic entity and this cultural value may overcome or be separated from the economic value of the building. It should also be noted that cultural capital is valid for both tangible and intangible forms (Throsby, 2005). With the development of cultural values of heritage as an industry the recognition of support for cultural activities has become more critical since such activities are essential in promoting different policy results such as regeneration (Pendlebury, 2009).

Bourdieu divides cultural capital under three main branches, namely embodied, objectified and institutionalized (Bourdieu, 1986:243-244). Embodied cultural capital refers to the passively the accumulated capital over time which includes values passed down from generation to generation. Objectified cultural capital refers to accumulation of the capital through having knowledge on a certain entity, for instance, ability to value and acquire an antique piece. Finally, institutionalized cultural capital refers to gaining recognition for achievement through institutions, usually referring to success for an education degree. In Bourdieu's point of view, being able to collect these branches enables one to join certain fields. This means that he mainly considered society as a whole but his approach also included different and specific meanings of cultural capital based on the entity itself which may differ in various locations. But it should be noted that different cultural entities will often mean that the accumulated cultural capital will have different values (Beel & Wallace, 2020).

2.3.1.2 Collective Memory

The concept of collective memory in geo-cultural identity relates itself with past experiences in an urban space. In addition to this perspective, collective memory reflects a cumulative process from the past to the present. In this regard, as Assmann (1995) stated, a “transition” concept comes to the fore. This transition process also underlines the production of geo-cultural identity which acts in the parallel-ground with the production of urban space as well (Assmann, 1995).

Collective memory manifests itself on urban space as a reflection of the cultural characteristics of a social community which is considered as the producers of the urban space and the identity as well in the context of geo-cultural identity. From this perspective, collective memory has linked with both the intangible aspect and the tangible aspect of the concept of cultural identity, in addition to Assmann (1995)’s perspective.

One of the foremost scholars in collective memory context, Maurice Halbwachs classified collective memory as a component of impersonal identity (Halbwachs, 1980; Jameson, 2007). According to his perspective, in communities with different groups of individuals, there is a tendency on impersonalization of surroundings by assigning the collected memories into it. He defends that this impersonalization is more dynamic and not concrete. This understanding corresponds to the previous discussions on pluralism and hybridity.

Collective memory, considered as an assigned meaning to a physical surroundig, shapes by both individual’s and community’s impressions and expressions (Halbwachs, 1980). Therefore, the impressions came from collected memory of the groups manifest themselves as an expression, which is the physical environment. Thus, it is deducable that collective memory and urban space are intertwined in terms of their production and reproduction cycle. Halbwachs indicates, that this cycle has an endurance based on the continuity of both the physical environment and *remembered* collective memory of the society which can be considered as *living*

memory. In this sense, Boyer (1994) also emphasized the cruciality of remembering and re-remembering in terms of this cycle of production of place with underlining the communal acknowledgement of the collective memory (Boyer, 1994). From this point, the importance of community and its social structure in every aspect becomes one of the crucial components of the geo-cultural identity discussion.

2.3.1.3 Social Capital

Henri Lefebvre has developed the relationship between space and social aspects in his book titled “The Production of Space”. He claimed that space is produced by social relationships while being continuously shaped by it. This argument enabled a new approach which meant that the culture can influence space. This further means that space is a part of cultural capital that is influenced by the cultural value (Lefebvre, 1991; Aboutorabi, 2018).

Social capital can be explained as the collective value included in society and is formed through the means of participation or social networking. Similar to cultural value, social value is primarily an intangible entity requiring an examination based on the generation models. Bourdieu claims that the social value can be advantageous once realized by the individuals since it can provide certain types of relationships of mutual recognition (Bourdieu, 1986). Beel and Wallace (2020) stated that social capital has been in decline since the residential, work and leisure patterns were changing in urban areas but in specific areas such as Outer Hebrides, this was not valid due to the fact that the cultural value of the area strongly contributed to the social capital as well (Beel & Wallace, 2020).

According to Bhabha (2006), cultural identity is not a monolithic concept, nor has a dialectic relation between the specific “self” with the specific “other” (Bhabha, 2006). Cultural identification as a *process* requires more profound thinking with its different components. This understanding refers to the community’s social capital and the cultural knowledge accumulated from it in order to generate the geo-cultural

identity, also underlines the importance of cultural difference and cultural diversity in post-modern multiculturalist societies.

2.3.1.4 Diversity

As mentioned in *Chapter 2.2*, within the re-reference to Taylor (1994), cultural identity has authenticity, dissimilarity and the idea of the difference in its sense (Taylor, 1994). From this perspective, Waldron (2000) argues that the notion of difference begins with the recognition of an individual as the way he/she is even if his/her identity is not the way that another individual perceived (Waldron, 2000).

From the perspective of culture and cultural identity context, diversity comes to the fore spontaneously with thinking culture's sharpest meaning. Culture, as a notion combining different entities of beliefs, traditions, arts and any other section attached to the way of life, directly includes distinctiveness and diversity in itself. According to Barker and Jane (2016), cultural identity responds to the regulations that society produced in order to sustain and develop its own existence (Barker & Jane, 2016). Within the acceptance of society is a whole consisting of different groups from different backgrounds, every human being or every group of people develops their own approach to regulate their existence. This consumption evokes that cultural identity from different groups with different experiences reflects different ways of life in society and therefore, in urban area. From this point, difference as a notion will argue as an entity and as a right that every part of a community demands.

According to Mitchell (2000), diversity has been described hand in hand with culture by Mitchell by who stated that culture is the collection of different patterns of different people (Mitchell, 2000). For this reason, the different patterns represent a unique formation of hierarchies of importance. In this sense culture can be seen as a reflection of different groups of people. This also means that social activities and interactions produce culture. This sort of definition promotes how cultural heritage is defined as well. Cultural heritage in this approach stands as a medium of

production and reproduction of society, power relations and identities of people. Definitions of heritage usually arise from debates and struggles between different interests of different geographic scales. So, as Pendlebury states, heritage can hardly ever be seen as a neutral component or use for good or bad in a political mind-set (Pendlebury, 2009).

The value of any sort of diversity, including ethnic, cultural or economic diversity, is typically evaluated through theories regarding cities and life in cities. Many authors considered cities as a hub of difference including Lefebvre, Harvey and Ashworth (Lefebvre, 1991; Harvey, 2001; Ashworth, 2005). Even when cultural diversity is promoted as a beneficial economic tool for urban areas, cultural diversity is considered a very important asset for any city (Zukin, 1982).




Figure 2.4. Change of urban space by displacement and socio-structural change in terms of diversity

This importance is considered by those scholars in terms of both socio-cultural aspects and also physical aspects as well. As seen in *Figure 2.4*, socio-cultural diversity manifests itself in urban area as spatial diversity as a physical output of the city. Therefore, its weakening and loss considerably affect the geo-cultural identity reconstruction as well as the spatial setting of urban space in terms of diversity concept.

From this understanding, the relation between geo-cultural identity and urban space will be taken under consideration more deeply in following sections.

2.3.2 Geo-cultural Identity in Urban Space

From the discussion where identifying the components of geo-cultural identity, study will proceed through the pursuits of the relation between cultural identity and urban space in order to unfold the “place-based” structure of the geo-cultural identity. In this regard, the perception of urban space, thereafter study will engage the discussion with comprehending the urban space and built environment through the perspective of geo-cultural identity. Within this scope, before comprehending the relation between geo-cultural identity and urban space and their dialectic link while co-producing each other, this chapter firstly will dig into the spatiality of culture itself and space-culture relationship.

According to Choudhary (2014), the first understanding of space in scholars is mostly considered a sharp geometric physical statement (Choudhary, 2014). This conception is considerably relates with the Euclidian perspective of space phenomenon. Afterwards, the concept of space was conceived as a totality of various parts of natural environment with distinctive features such as hilltops, valleys, plains etc. This perception has shaped around the notion of absolute space (Choudhary, 2014).

From this point of view, in the early 20th century Carl Sauer has generated a perspective on the relation between absolute space and culture as cultural landscape, which is mainly built upon an acceptance of the collocation of naturally built environment and culturally segregated groups of people (Sauer, 1969). According to his perspective, the association of cultural group and an environment –rather, it reflects Euclidian space or absolute space of nature- produces cultural landscapes. He describes *culture* as an agent that includes society as a whole or as a minor group, *natural area* as a milieu representing a lebensraum with natural environment and man-made built environment and *cultural landscape* as a result of this coexisting (see *Figure 2.5*). In his way of thinking, the development process of both milieu and culture -in other words, built environment and society- connected with each other as

creating a cycle which consequently affecting the result: cultural landscape throughout time (Sauer, 1969).




Figure 2.5. Conceptualization of Sauer's perspective on the production of cultural landscape (modelled from Sauer, 1969)

Sauer also emphasized the fact that within the inclusion of different culture to an existing milieu, this cycle will be similarly proceed with an enlivenment impact to the cultural landscape (Sauer, 1969). Therefore, he defends the variety and diversity in both built environment or milieu and culture has a significant contribution to cultural landscapes or in this sense, cultural spaces.

As mentioned above, first understanding of the concept of shape around the Euclidian thinking with geometrical form-based. As discussed in *identity* chapter, this era argued within the emphasis on Cartesian thinking as well in terms of identity context. Like Kant, Descartes, Fichte and others described, Cartesian thinkers, put time and space in different platforms. In their perspective, as an absolute physical material, human beings exist with their knowledge they accumulated throughout time. In the same point of view, absolute space represents –in Sauer's words: “neutral void”- with including absolute physical materials and objects (Choudhary, 2014). As emphasized by Mumford (1938) too, from the acceptance of separateness of time and space with referring the Cartesian or Euclidian thinking era, different cultures cannot be exist in the same period of time and same occupation of space and humankind behaved in this sense (Mumford, 1938).

From the perspective that relativity theory brought, time and space are intertwined existences. According to Choudhary (2014), different cultures from different backgrounds produce different relationship typologies and different associations between individuals (Choudhary, 2014). Therefore, within the references from both relativist thinking and postmodernist thinking which followed the Cartesian thinking era discussed above, absolute and abstract space perceptions changed towards interference of time and space.

According to Casey (1998), the scholars who deal with the investigation of urban space phenomenon within the framework of its historical and cultural aspects hold a large extent of place in literature (Casey, 1998). Fogle (2009) took the case from Bourdieu's perspective and expressed that in terms of urban space and built environment, historical and cultural circumstances are essential for both theories of urban space and practice of urban space (Fogle, 2009).

Urban space is considered the foremost aspect for construction of identity that is recognised with its social and cultural features. The identity construction process conducted with individual's relation and bound with particular urban space and territory in terms of both spatial and social ways (Keith & Pile, 1993). According to Martin (2005), the territorial bonds between the subject and its identity is not only directly linked with their place-based conditions, but it is also linked with the generation process of that specific place with all visual and cultural elements in it (Martin, 2005).

According to Aboutorabi (2018), urban space is mostly recognized by its cultural background formed throughout history, its cultural heritage and its authentic and unique visual features of its form. For his perspective, this recognition process is formed by the cultural and collective memory based on built environment, gathered from its citizens from every part of the society (Aboutorabi, 2018). From this point, it is crucial to comprehend the built environment and urban space have influenced the designation of cultural identity and vice versa. It is highly perceptible that the

cultural identity and urban space has a dialectic connection based on the past and shared experienced among the community.

Another worth mentioning perspective on geo-cultural identity and urban space relation will be considered under the framework of Marxist way of thinking on the relation of class, production and urban space. As mentioned in *identity* chapter, within the reference of Castells (1997), the “roles” that subjects gained from the institutions regarding majority of the society, also interrelates with the concepts of class identity. This concept also highlights one of the crucial elements discussed in next chapters deeply; diversity and difference among community.

As a subjective “role” with emphasizing the difference and otherness in society, class identity argues within the framework of the Marxist perspective in terms of production and property connections which directly intercepts with urban space (Aboutorabi, 2018). According to Massey (1995), the production and its connections are located and distributed spatially in capitalism. This perception leads discussion through understanding the spatial diversity caused by capitalist production in terms of urban space. According to his perspective, this dividedness and discrepancy of space affect human movements, patterns, courses of action and social relations in the city in terms of class identity (Massey, 1995).

Martin (2005) emphasizes the importance of urban space and spatiality of cultural identity in terms of “positioning the habitants spatially” formed by production relations which refers to the “class identity” and “role” discussions (Martin, 2005). Nevertheless, when taking this discussion under the consideration of previous perspectives detailed above, urban space all by itself is an essential notion in terms of producing the identity, role or position. As Sennett (1973) indicates, urban area, production area or any other territory which includes residents or workers from society definitely will generate an area with the closure that involves shared experiences, communications and behaviour patterns both collectively and individually. This collectiveness and individuality are not separate but concentric in terms of cultural accumulation (Sennett, 1973). This perspective framed by the

emphasis on living and/or working spaces, also underlines the cruciality of cultural identity in urban space and also in everyday life.

From this point, discussion leans towards the one of the greatest thinker on the philosophy of space and everyday life, Henri Lefebvre's works. According to Lefebvre (1991), there is no absolute space, instead of this he makes an inference that; within the social action in the community, space is concordantly exploited and separately occupied. This induces another space conception as more relevant and abstract (Lefebvre, 1991). As a Marxist, Lefebvre also underlined that capitalist production brings into existence its own space which is parallel with Massey's perspective detailed above. He classified urban space as 'abstract space' -as mentioned- which became relative in terms of production activities, 'sacred space' as in emphasizing the more historically rooted communities which becomes prominent with stressing religion and traditions, and lastly the 'distinctive space' which addresses more diverse and heterogenic structure of a community. Thinking this classification in terms of production of space and -at the coplanar ground-society; in historical perspective, Lefebvre considered the third class -'distinctive space' - as a forthcoming issue which will be prospectively concerned by both spatial and cultural fields (Lefebvre, 1991). According to Hubbard (2005), from the famous perspective Lefebvre brought; urban space with its dialectic link between community and its three dimensions; "perceived space, conceived space and lived space", considered as a social output based on a production process. According to his perspective, as the forthcoming issue of globalization, distinctive space -or in his word "differential space", considerable deals with the historical, cultural, spiritual, i.e. diverse structure of the built environment in all levels (Hubbard, 2005).

Lefebvre has developed different perceptions on urban space and diversification of those perceptions based on urban space. According to his perspective, society creates and recreates space throughout time. He identified society as an agent to build the parts and divisions of urban space, as well as to reconstruct it (Lefebvre, 1991).

Within the reference from Lefebvre's perspective, Choudhary (2014) states that production in every level and -as an outcome of production- cultural accumulations collected from all parts of the society, demands physical space (Choudhary, 2014). Therefore, the concept of physical space had been placed at the heart of the culture and cultural identity literatures as one of the two aspects of relativity: time and space. Additionally, Choudhary has associated the concept of physical space with geography as a broader field in this sense (Choudhary, 2014). As Lefebvre and many theorists claimed, the modernist movement in architecture and urban planning failed in terms of diversifying the components of society and acknowledge its direct impact on the creation/recreation process of physical space. From this reality, Choudhary states that each physical space has its own cultural accumulation, therefore urban space cannot be described as monotype in the context of geo-cultural identity.

2.3.3 Geo-cultural Identity in Urban Conservation

As mentioned in previous chapters, geo-cultural identity has an intense cohesion with urban space and these notions have interlocked with each other in terms of planning discipline. As an important dimension in both identity and urban planning contexts, geo-cultural identity is an essential indicator for conservation praxis. Therefore, this chapter will discuss the positioning of geo-cultural identity in urban conservation.

According to Aboutorabi (2018), most European cities are currently having the rapid transformation process from mono to multi-cultural framework in terms of both built environment and social structure due to globalisation. This changing structure is a call for rethinking the traditional individualism and singular oriented approaches from planning praxis in terms of physical and social regulations, towards the more diverse and complex urban settings with embracing crossed-cultures of society (Aboutorabi, 2018).

According to Bandarin and van Oers (2012), local and central governments commonly tend to abstain from their responsibility for producing approaches and

practical solutions to conservation and protection of historical urban areas due to their perception of conservation practices' retarding effect on urban development. On the other hand, urban development process' cognized as a constraint in terms of sustenance of geo-cultural identity and historic urban areas (Bandarin & van Oers, 2012). From counter perspectives, this understanding was criticized by several scholars in terms of emphasized and conspicuous effects of geo-cultural identity and urban conservation on urban development process in the first place. As indicated by Tweed and Sutherland (2007), geo-cultural identity that combines cultural heritage and collective memory and its continuity reinforces the physical and economic development within the framework of urban conservation practices (Tweed & Sutherland, 2007).

Therefore, it is valid to comprehend geo-cultural identity as a driving force to protect a historic urban area in terms of its cultural identity gained from past experiences and values. On the other hand, the important factor in here is the fact that a protected historic urban area will certainly give a brand new identity to itself and also to the whole city. Thus, recognizing of geo-cultural identity in terms of urban conservation provokes a dialectic relation between these two concepts.

2.3.4 Spatial Reflections of Geo-cultural Identity Loss: *Urban Oblivion*

“One day, all past culture will be completely rewritten and completely forgotten behind the rewrite.”

(Kundera, 1971, p.8)

The etymologic background of the word “*oblivion*” roots back in 13th century with its Latin reciprocity, “*oblivisci*” which refers to the verb “forget.” According to Century Dictionary's definition;

“Oblivion is a state into which a thing passes when it is thoroughly and finally forgotten. Oblivion stands for a sort of negative act, a complete failure to remember.”

In Ancient Greek, the word “*lethe*” is the synonym of the word oblivion which has its roots in the mythological *River Lethe* or *The River of Oblivion*. According to Ancient Greek mythology again, the River Lethe gives those who drink its water a state of complete forgetfulness and it prepares them for their rebirth.

Buchanan, expressed the concept of oblivion within the anthropological perspective as a failing process of recovering the cultural memory (Buchanan R. D., 2005). According to one of today’s foremost cultural theorists Liedeke Plate, cultural oblivion represents the dialectic relationship between remembering, forgetting and in some cases, re-remembering (Plate, 2016). From this perspective, the concept of cultural oblivion will be considered as *urban oblivion* as a spatial output of this remembering/forgetting and constructing/reconstructing process. From her theory of cultural oblivion and “amnesiology”, *urban oblivion* also addresses the *spatially and politically produced remembering/forgetting*.

Marc Augé wrote in his book, *Oblivion* (2004);

“...oblivion is the life force of memory and remembrance is its product.”

(Augé, 2004, p.21)

From this perspective, oblivion is directly related to forgetfulness on the other hand, it is a form of a consideration of the past. From Augé’s perspective, oblivion has a dialectic relation with human consciousness. He argues that “forgetting” and “oblivion” is a back and forth process with forgetting things, and bringing new memories to the opened place by forgetting. He emphasized that this vanishing process may generate an abstract space for new experiences which will consign into the past in the future in this back and forth timeline.

According to Choudhary (2014), within the impact of the globalization process, numerous of ideas, cultures, ethnicities and fundamental rights of minority groups under the pressure of globalized hegemonies, are currently experiencing their vanishing process for the sake of so-called national identity (Choudhary, 2014). He

indicates that this conflict is mostly dominant in less developed countries, especially within the fact that they have been experiencing the partition caused by the rencontre between diverse cultural identities and national identity. This situation can be taken under consideration as *collective oblivion*. According to his perspective, this rencontre process triggers “vanishing cultural identities”. In his study, Choudhary is directly pointing out mostly the less developed countries with referencing his own hometown India but referring to Turkey as well in this respect. In addition to this, based on his studies, especially in less developed countries (LDC), this situation affects one single case of everyday life and affects every aspect of life itself which directly reflects the concept of culture (Choudhary, 2014). From the framework of geo-cultural identity context, the cultural identity that accumulated from the community’s historical and spatial experience, it is apparent that being sensibly attached to a specific geographic space has a crucial role in *forming* and *deforming* of cultural identities, for especially LDC’s. This forming and deforming processes of cultural identity based especially on minor groups of community, is a fundamental component of the space production process and as Bozkurt (1997) indicated, its regularly being ignored and overpassed by hegemony (Lefebvre, 1991; Bozkurt, 1997).

The critical factor which primarily causes; the deformation of cultural identity, or in other words, the disintegration of cultural identity and disappearance of its diversity component, is the reflections of information age and globalization (Jakobi, 2009). This factor also highlighted by Greig (2002) by emphasizing the geographical aspect of cultural identity –which refers geo-cultural identity in this sense- and putting the distinctiveness of urban space to the focus in the process of its lost caused by globalization and the pressure of nationalization (Greig, 2002).

From this point of view, the current circumstances of information age and globalized world consider the geo-cultural identity loss as a process defined as deformed cultural identity by geographical indicators. As discussed in *Chapter 2.2.2*, urban space and its creation/recreation process by society moves proportionally with formation/deformation of cultural identity of the community with its all

distinctiveness. Therefore, the concept of *urban oblivion* which refers the spatial reflection of geo-cultural identity loss of a specific urban area, states the spatial results of the transformation of urban space after deformation and disappearance of the cultural identity belongs to a community which geographically and collectively attached to that urban area. With this perspective, it is to the fore that deformation of cultural identity and disorganization of urban space has a dialectic cause/effect relation which manifests itself as urban oblivion.

From Harvey's perspective, this spatial reorganization and redevelopment process cannot be considered separate from the accumulation process of capitalist economies and has definite limits in terms of differentiation of urban space, society and cultural identity in so-called less developed countries (Harvey, 1982). As discussed before, Lefebvre defends that society is the primary entity who produce space. Yet, according to Choudhary (2014), it is a cognitive complexity that the individuals that produced and reproduced the space are not the same as the individuals who are considered as administrators, policy and decision-makers and right owners of that space. He defends this situation had and will resulted as diaspora in individual's own geographic area and deformation of cultural, therefore spatial identity. (Choudhary, 2014). According to this perspective, the major indicator of urban oblivion is politic forces that manipulate and manage the urban space with externalising the (re)producers of urban space (See Figure 2.6).




Figure 2.6. Conceptualization of *urban oblivion* in geo-cultural identity context

“Silently I walk among these concrete landscapes, / Rupturing our roots so we will leave or fade away, / Watching my surroundings being ravaged by their greed, / Replaced by someone's vision to create the concrete dream.” (Stenbekk, 2017).

Stenbekk (2017) sang as a member of the Norwegian diaspora, about demolishing many of the urban structures in her neighbourhood in the South-West Coast due to the local government's disposition to construct a new industrial zone. The lyrical expression behind the story can be concluded as a clarification of the place attachment and the meaning that the minority has attributed to the neighbourhood that they live in, which is deeper and stronger than the majority of the local community.

According to Seamon (2020), one of the important to acknowledge the impact on creating place identity is directly bound by society's interrelation of urban space which constructed throughout time by collecting shared experiences (Seamon, 2020). This understanding reflects itself differently among different groups of society. Groups are, rather belong to minority or majority, accumulate different communion and conduct different association and as a spatial result, they product different spaces in shared built environment. In this sense, Aboutorabi explains this situation, referencing Muslim minorities from different cities which he mostly conducts his studies based on that case, as; cultural acquaintance based on their religion, perceptibly reflects itself on the urban area they live. For example, many of them usually use the term “*Muslim Neighbourhood*” rather than the neighbourhood's official name (Aboutorabi, 2018). Therefore, their identification of a specific urban area echoes back to their cultural identity.

The notion of importance and direct reflections of minor and/or ethnic groups of society to urban space in terms of cultural variation and construction of cultural identity, examined by several scholars. The concept of “diaspora in urban space” reflects the migration of particular social groups from their own land to another and the becoming a minority status in their own land by politics. Therefore, concepts like

minority group and ethnic group will be taken under consideration in the frame of urban oblivion, as one of the essential keystones of the study.

According to Krase (2004), urban space and neighbourhoods with an ethnic population or ruins of ethnic population which considered as cultural capital, can be seen as a reflector for demonstrating urban elements from both past, present and the future in the same plane (Krase, 2004).

From another perspective, the existence of such spatial ethnicity in urban space provides different viewpoints for assessing the city. On the one hand, cultural capital worth protecting which is considered as the incarnation of past, present and future, regards the urban area as a “living organism” which refers to Geddes’s way of thinking on urban space. On the other hand, this existence of cultural capital regards the urban area as a scenery for production and reproduction of city or “circuits of capital” which refers to Castells’, Harvey’s and Lefebvre’s way of thinking.

Another perspective from Hayden (1991) conducted as, the existence of urban images and elements belongs or have belonged to ethnic or minor group of society has an absolute benefit to the overall urban image and also to present and future urban development plans which considered or will be considered that specific urban area. According to her understanding, in this case, that diverse and considerably different part of the urban area will make the city image more habitable, more attractive and will certainly make everyday life more equal and more tolerated (Hayden, 1991). According to her, these kind of urban images considers as cultural heritages of built environment with both culturally and significantly valuable in terms of preservation. These urban images comprise local, historical buildings, monuments, ruins or any other constructed features representing and reflecting a significant historical memory and collected experience belonging to a particular ethnic group. The vital issue in here is, even if that specific urban image directly reflects the collective memory of specific ethnicity, the subsistence of that urban image impresses the reflection of the whole identity (Hayden, 1991).

Considering this perspective with previous perspectives from Geddes, Castells, Harvey and Lefebvre, an urban tissue that belongs to specific ethnicity and reflects whole identity, also considerably expresses the city's political and economic vitality. Within the acknowledgment of the city as a scenery for the production cycle, the physical entities from the past with their diverse and valuable features provide an essential input.

According to Harvey (1989), as a result of the natural flow of life, different parts of the society in terms of class difference, construct their own perception of urban space and community based on their roots and their attachments to that associated class. He emphasized that governments have been oblivious to this natural result in general, and they have been tended to adopt the modernist approach which defends that it is valid to count human beings as similar physical entities. Therefore they support that the construction of a community should be based upon social similarity and standardisation (Harvey, 1989).

In spite of Harvey's that statement against the modernist approach, there are few examinations in the academic field, from the counter viewpoints of Harvey and Hayden. According to Zelinsky, the affirmation of diverse structured ethnic urban spaces is unnecessary enriching. He disclaims the existence of such urban spaces provides cultural input to the city, economy and future urban development projects. Although he accepts the concrete subsistence of such urban areas in the city, he considers diverse and ethnic cityscapes which combine different architectural values as nothing but ornamental and shallow built structures. Therefore, he defends that such built structures are transient and doubtfully worth protecting nor strong enough to construct an urban development strategy around it (Zelinsky, 1991). This way of thinking brings out the conflict on conservation praxis, especially in terms of the absence of owners and builders of the cultural identity of that specific urban area.

Krase (2004) took the argument from both modernist flow and Zelinsky's point, and reoriented towards embracing the importance of the city's diverse social and physical structure. According to his perspective, the existence of diverse structures in an urban

area cannot be conceived as a mere physical semblance. These easy-on-the-eye and interesting physical features contain their constructors which are also considered as the creators and owners of that identity. Even though that urban area has lost its ethnic community, its remains reflect history, experienced everyday life and collective memory as an urban retrospect. He also defends that staking a claim on the physical remains of an ethnic or diverse community signifies that being a part as an essential agent on the production/reproduction circle of the city is a fundamental right for every single member of the community (Krase, 2004).

As mentioned in previous chapters, Castells puts the concept of cultural identity to the core triangular relation between space, users of space and power relation in the context of production and reproduction motion. In this logic, the essential agent is the entity of different social groups and their different constructions on urban space. He emphasized that this notion has a fundamental role in the motion -which is considered as space-kinesis- an also on generating the local community's identity. From this point, the most crucial inference of his, that the globalization, the power itself has generated its own motion -which is considered as power-kinesis-. He describes the conflict between space-kinesis and power-kinesis in urban area results itself as threatening to impress local and cultural identity loss in the globalizing world. He defends that with the loss of cultural and place-based identity -i.e. geo-cultural identity- the society with all of its culturally diverse members will definitely lose their power. As a result of that communal weakening cities, regions, neighbourhoods will lose its power too (Castells, 1996).

From Castells' point of view, physical and communal weakening in urban areas will be rapidly increased by power. He identifies the situation as deauthorizing the residents of that particular neighbourhood or city by decision-makers. From his assumption, Castells suggested the recognition of geo-cultural identity and place-based community and rebuilding the neighbourhood or city in this respect which is their meaning attribution for that neighbourhood or city. For this, he proposes an urban development approach at three simultaneous stages: "political, cultural and economic" (Castells, 1996, Krase, 2004, Lawrence, 2010). For this research, it is the

cultural aspect that is most relevant when considering the existence of minority and ethnic communities and/or their remains in neighbourhoods.

Krase (2004) conducted a research examining the Italian ghettos in America from the perspective of cultural identity. His study highlights the geo-cultural identity issue in this context while stating that “territoriality” is one of the most crucial concepts while withstanding the cultural identity loss in globalized world (Krase, 2004). Agreeing with Castells, he indicates that Castells’ concept of space-kinesis and power kinesis or in his original words, “space of flows” is a direct cause for place-based cultural identity loss. As the concept of place-based cultural identity refers to geo-cultural identity in Castells’ view, Krase also supported his view while defining territoriality of cultural identity and referring to geo-cultural identity.

As it is understood here, the existence of ethnic members in a community is not just important because of its added value with generating diverse physical structure, it is also highly important in terms of generating a more enrooted society, thus resisting more solidly against space/power kinesis in the globalized world. This understanding is underlining the importance of the more powerful society and urban space in terms of rights to the city. Therefore, the preservation and sustenance of such urban areas or neighbourhoods is a necessity for developing that power.

In order to provide a more explanatory perspective to the concept of urban oblivion with its causes and results in urban area, Krase’s research on Italian ghettos of America will be taken under consideration in the following. In his work, the process that New York City Italian (Sicilian) neighbourhood in city core has been experienced is a guiding case in terms of causes and spatial results of urban oblivion. This process has started with a mass migration of society’s majority (mentioned as “white bourgeois”) from core neighbourhoods to capitally more valuable suburban areas of the city. After they left, the neighbourhood started to invade by Italian American population and the main reason behind their site selection was decreasing capital and land value of the city core and the corruption process that the city core has experienced in that process.

This notion is also considered in Chicago School as well and the concept of *succession – invasion* has been argued. New York's Italian ghettos' experience in the 1960s also showed and supported this concept. But from the perspective of conservation -which refers to preserving leftover spatial and cultural identity with or without the owners of that identity- this approach shifts towards more complex arguments.

From this point of view, Zukin's understanding based on this urban change process comes to the fore. According to Zukin (1982), if we took under consideration this urban change within the framework of urban conservation, the concept of gentrification summons itself spontaneously in this respect (Zukin, 1982). In her view, a spatial and demographic change in culturally valued urban areas that holds its geo-cultural identity with the presence of the ethnic habitants or those who lived in the past, directly represent itself on urban space in terms of cultural and spatial capital. This representation often reflects itself as a gentrification process held by central/local government or/and different beneficiaries while transforming the culturally valued entities to a physical meta. Alongside this, the speculative and uncertainty atmosphere of the conservation or renewal process hazards the current habitants in terms of their quality of life and their fundamental rights both to the city they live and the community they attach (Zukin, 1982). According to Harvey (1989), the effectiveness and strength of a control system is directly proportionate to its force on externalizing the minor or uninvited factors that can be considered ethnic, religious, class or gender based discrimination. Therefore, those who withhold or desire to withhold such power may easily manipulate those factors in the social and spatial production/reproduction process (Harvey, 1989). With intersecting Zukin's and Harvey's perspectives, it is apparent that urban conservation processes - especially focuses on geo-culturally valued urban areas or neighbourhood in its time of jeopardising its geo-cultural identity existence and facing off gentrification- requires a much more complex and strategic way of thinking.

2.4 Concluding Remarks

The scope of the chapter is mainly shaped around the changing theoretical structure of the identity discussion throughout history, from personal towards impersonal discussions. This evolution process of identity to the geo-cultural identity unfolded the production and emergence of the key components of geo-cultural identity. The definition of the components of the geo-cultural identity has also shaped the spine of the interviews which will be used for each interest group. This discussion of the geo-cultural identity component has also provided a rational comprehension of the division of interest groups as well.

As mentioned and emphasized in related topics, all the aspects and elements have their own impressions on construction/reconstruction process which can be considered as movement of a pendulum in terms of its continuity and dialectics of geo-cultural identity. In this sense, the process of destruction of geo-cultural identity has been intertwined with the memory loss which referred as *urban oblivion* in terms of its spatial reflections within the geo-cultural identity framework. Although it can be considered as a losing and forgetting issue, as mentioned, the process of *urban oblivion* also paves the way for constructing new geo-cultural identities after displacement of a specific minority ethnic group. It is another dialectic relation and it manifests itself in the urban space which can be seen as a scene where this construction/reconstruction and remembering/forgetting movement is in continuity.

Undoubtedly, this argument brings further discussions on the emergence of the equilibrium of this movement and its possible reflections on urban space as well. As mentioned, another significant issue which was emphasized is the spatial relation between the urban space and geo-cultural identity.

The comprehension of the stability of the impersonal -in that sense, it refers to the impersonal identity- encounters the movement discussed above. From this point, as a tool for spatially and politically produced remembering/forgetting, urban conservation planning comes to the foreground of the discussion.

From this perspective, the question of “who is conserving?” explicitly becomes more important than the question of “what has been conserved?” in the theoretical context. With this respect, the study will discuss the effective power of the geo-cultural identity loss discussions with addressing the urban conservation context, as a reciprocity for the arguments that have been stated in this chapter from the identity viewpoint.



CHAPTER 3

GEO-CULTURAL IDENTITY IN THE CONTEXT OF URBAN CONSERVATION

The concept of protecting the built environment begins with adopting the permanently settled life of humankind, without any doubt. Accepting the importance of belonging and affiliation to define the built environment's identity leads to the built environment's preservability. For Maslow, belonging and affiliation is one of the basic needs of people and it directly affects the human behaviour for both with each other in social terms and also to the built environment among them (Maslow, 1954). For this understanding, this chapter mainly focus on urban conservation and its relation with planning theory, how and when the concept of conservation first addressed both in global and national contexts, and also the importance of conserving and preserving the built environment within the emphasis of the necessity of the concept for whole urban planning theory.

According to Larkham (1996), urban conservation practices define as an empirical action, not only an ethic or a theory defined certainly by scholars (Larkham, 1996). Therefore, when we take the planning discipline as a whole system process of spatial and social regulation, the conservation concept underlies the planning discipline from the beginning.

For Pendlebury (2009), the concept of conservation states, physical assets from a built environment with legally labelled as worth preserving and sustaining with its historical, cultural and structural values expressing past life experiences from a specific and/or significant time period (Pendlebury, 2009).

The historical evolution process of urban conservation will be taken under consideration in next chapter in itself, yet, it is pursuant to mention this process briefly from the parallel perspective with planning theory's evolution. The concept of urban conservation has based upon the 18th century, long before the time of

awareness of planning as a profession. According to Zancheti and Jokilehto (1997), urban conservation has bounded with architectural restoration from the very beginning of the preservation issue in spatial context. Architectural perspective on urban conservation in terms of restoration has majorly led and advocated the urban conservation practice, majorly in the 20th century. From their perspective, urban conservation requires a comprehensive, convenient and holistic field in order to construct a bridge between theory and practice (Zancheti & Jokilehto, 1997). Although, the architectural perspective and architectural restoration field will be connected to the concept, it is apparent that identifying the urban conservation field as a subject of policy and decision making, implementing and monitoring process which directly links the issue with spatial and social planning.

According to Zancheti and Jokilehto (1997), urban conservation is perceived as a process of controlling and managing the changing structure of the physical urban environment by protecting its values and securing its continuity (Zancheti & Jokilehto, 1997). They defined this process as a collaboration of various types of fields from different professions that concern the urban environment. They distinguished the professions and contributors according to the two main states of urban conservation context (Zancheti & Jokilehto, 1997). As mentioned before and will be emphasized in-depth in next chapters, conservation deals with the past. Such a broad notion consequently requires excessive alignment with different fields. From this perspective, Zancheti and Jokilehto's first state defends a cooperation based on physical assets and subjects of urban conservation practice, including manifold domains, wide and extensive knowledge from the professions such as history, geography, architecture and engineering. Another matter in the definition of Zancheti and Jokilehto is the fact that urban conservation also deals with the changing structure of urban environment and protecting its values with securing its continuity. Therefore, urban conservation's secondary speciality is based on these concepts. According to their second state, which considerably correlates with urban planning in a more relevant way, defends that urban conservation practice's crucial requirement is to generate an environment in order to construct an interaction

between protecting and sustaining the whole spatial subject with its historical, physical, cultural and social values (Zancheti & Jokilehto, 1997). This perspective directly summons the social, political and economic components of specific professions. Therefore, urban planning with both theoretically and practically ensconced itself in the core of urban conservation.

With reference to Zancheti and Jokilehto's second state, the correlation between urban conservation and urban planning discipline, within the emphasis on protecting and sustaining, the monitoring part of these processes links the concept to decision-makers and various stakeholders who have the dominance on urban environment directly in this sense.

Decision-making and implementation of urban conservation approaches on any historical urban area directly require public and private partnership to emphasize public good. The public and private stakeholders include residents, property owners, central and local governments, landholders, and citizens who have the right on city's immovable cultural heritage values. Citizen and resident expectations shape the decision-making process conducted by public and private sector partnerships. According to Zancheti and Jokilehto, the important feature in this regard is to encounter this expectations' majority at highest level, further to that, it is crucial to determine this feature with referencing the future, not the current situation (Zancheti & Jokilehto, 1997).

According to Hobson (2004), urban conservation has influenced the planning discipline with introducing new understanding on authenticity, specificity, identity and locality in terms of built environment. This understanding played a significant role in improving design strategies and development policies in planning practice (Hobson, 2004).

After defining the relation between urban conservation and urban planning in a theoretical and practical context, the process and its flow will be taken under consideration. According to Jokilehto (2002), the urban conservation process has three major stages which are monitored by the two states explained above. The first

stage is determining the historical values of the urban area, the second stage is the resolution process which directly will be considered the determined values and how they will be conserved, and the third stage is implementation and action which will carry out the preservation of values on the urban environment. All these stages have their own decision-making process at the end. Individual decision-making processes allow to finish one stage and lead the next stage (Jokilehto, 2002). Jokilehto also emphasized this three-phased process as an iterative process with dynamic back and forth movement, instead of constant, static and linear movement (Jokilehto, 2002). From this perspective, even though urban conservation practice majorly deals with the past, the urban conservation planning process considers time as a changeable factor in terms of the built environment. This understanding revamped the common traditional timeline structure and unfolded the new time phenomenon as a movement of a pendulum (see *Figure 3.1* and *Figure 3.2*). This concept also highlights the decision-making and monitoring processes as a back and forth attempt to bring the past to the future with preserving past values and considering today's and future's conditions.



Figure 3.1. Time-kinesis in traditional linear context (produced by the author)




Figure 3.2. Time-kinesis in urban conservation context (produced by the author)

For Avrami *et al.* (2000), urban conservation is an aggregation of processes that comprises the physical, political, social, economic and cultural matters (Avrami, Mason, & De la Torre, 2000). According to Orbaşlı (2000), differently from 19th and 20th century's conservation approaches which led the traditional perception on the issue, new paradigms occurred and will continue to affect the conservation practices in 21st century. This new paradigm has accepted the fact that public and private sectors are intertwined as well as the new and more complex structure of both built environment and people's everyday life activity. According to her perspective, both in contemporary social planning and physical planning, there is a more conflicted structure and the community is currently being developed in this direction (Orbaşlı, 2000). The community's changing situation on social terms also considered as a conflict. This perception also refers the conflict theory and conflict resolutions in the planning context. According to Freidine (2012), conflict theory ("*conflictology*" in social sciences) encounters the "change" in terms of urban development processes and urban planning practices. With transformation process of planning theory; with its social and physical change (conflict) from homogeneous development strategies into heterogeneous development strategies with embracing different groups and cultures, the urban conservation approach has also transformed (Freidine, 2012).

Looking back at the historical background of the conservation concept indicates the growing interest and concern about preserving especially historical urban landscapes. This realization leads to the importance and necessity of the concept. From this point of view, this chapter will focus on the cruciality of urban conservation and its value for cultural heritage and cultural identity contexts.

Larkham (1996) discussed five specific reasons explaining why the concept of conservation is crucial in an urban area (Larkham, 1996). This emphasis is shaped around psychological, financial, fashion, didactic and historical literature. Those literatures are also present main reasons for growing attention to the concept of conservation in recent years. The didactic aspect of the conservation in Larkham's idea, mainly focused on how a community learn from its cultural heritage by reading

or observing the urban landscapes, monuments, buildings, people, events, daily life etc. and how this community can pass or teach this learned knowledge to the future generations. Larkham linked the fashion aspect of the conservation to the transmutation of the historical dwellings and becoming prestigious urban fabrics. Although this fashionable conservation point of view also argued by Larkham himself, based on causing the gentrification or displacement issues, it still has a place on the agenda. The finance or economic aspect of the conservation concept is linked with the feasibility and as a major sector for this case, tourism. The key issue in here lies in renewing a historically valued dwelling while making it liveable and also making it a cultural capital.

The historical and psychological aspects of the conservation concept based on Larkham's idea, are more deeply discussed in the following chapters in terms of emphasizing the connection of conservation with cultural heritage, memory and cultural identity. Therefore, within the context of geo-cultural identity, the context of urban conservation is divided into three fundamental pillars as seen in *Figure 3.3* above, as; past, place and policy (3P).




Figure 3.3. Three pillars of urban conservation (3P) (produced by the author)

3.1 Urban Conservation and its Relation with Past

Regarding with the concept of history and historicism, conservation context has to preserve a part of history in itself. From this point, the relationship between urban conservation and historical aspects links with the dichotomy between conservation and preservation.

With reference to previous discussions, the perception of urban conservation as a process, inherently summons the emphasis on time. The back and forth movement of the conservation process with spatial planning theory perspective, also highlights the physical, social and cultural features of the city which gained their worth protecting characteristics directly from the past.

In various discussions in the conservation literature, protecting an urban area is completely and physically is directly related to preservation. Remaining an urban area without any interference and making it untouchable comes to mean preserving history in this context. The conflict with literature starts with the contrast between preservation and conservation. According to Ruskin (1849), whether conserving a structure from history or not is not up to our decision. Ruskin emphasized that there is no justification for intervening those buildings by virtue of they belong to the history and following generations of humankind, not to any person, including their owners or builders (Ruskin, 1849).

For Larkham (1996), this approach is considered as an excessive and inapplicable perspective (Larkham, 1996). At this point, as a counter or broader view, the conservation concept as a way to renewing and enhancing an urban area while producing both a liveable and protected environment. According to Buchanan (1968), conservation is linked with preservation, but more than that, conservation is a process of bringing an urban area back to life (Buchanan C. , 1968). Thus, preservation concept can be taken in hand as a building's or a city's inviolateness with its original physical components, settings etc. On the other hand, conservation has a much more wider and comprehensive understanding with options or

possibilities of renewing, reusing, reshaping, adapting the existing parts while protecting its own historical and cultural values and embracing the existing daily life and current occupants of the building or the city in the meantime. The key issue here is the undeniable fact that cities have more components than only physical elements. Sir Patrick Geddes defined (1968) the city as “*an ecosystem, one that needs to be understood as a living organism that is subject to cycles of birth, growth, blossoming, decline and decay, followed again by rebirth*” (Geddes, 1968). As an evolutionist, Geddes conducted his idea about cities and their spatial growing based on several different disciplines such as biology and sociology. From his point of view, cities will take in hand with its diverse and heterogeneous structure. In order to embrace the complexity and interdisciplinary characteristics of cities, the conservationist approach rather than the preservationist approach is more convenient for this framework.

In order to emphasize the bond between urban conservation and the concept of the past, the argument of heritage comes to the fore. Heritage, with its simple meaning as a word, infers the legacy came from a specific time period, which directly refers the past. Here, in urban conservation context, heritage impresses the conserved or worth conserving value as a part of an urban tissue or as a significant single structure from the built environment.

According to Pendlebury’s assessment, heritage as a conceptual understanding of the “value” obtains its consideration as “valuable” from urban conservation (Pendlebury, 2009). The conservation praxis assigns an urban environment in any scale a physical, social, political and especially a cultural value in order to make “it” worth protecting. This concept, again, highlights the back and forth movement of the urban conservation practice. The back and forth movement in here is emphasized not only in time and past related manner, but also in reciprocal feedback process of the act. The reason Pendlebury persistently underlines and puts primary place the cultural value i.e. heritage is, the valuation state is directly linked with the past and its relation with urban space. Pendlebury highlights the concept of time and past in order to unfold the natural impacts of spontaneity on the valuation process of an

urban environment. Time is the primary factor that directly affects the creation of significant meaning and collection of valuable features for a building, a statue or for an urban area which includes more than one feature engaged to the rest of the city. In his perspective, the usage of the term heritage i.e. cultural value, alludes to the contemporary use of the past (Pendlebury, 2009).

According to Smith (2006), with its direct relation with the past, cultural value and its conservation is a fluid matter of fact, instead of solid-state of protecting specific objects and buildings with their in-sight features. In her perspective, conservation of the values is not a solid, concrete and materialistic phenomenon, it is a social process and a cultural praxis (Smith, 2006). As mentioned in *Chapter 3*, this understanding rebuilds the common time structure and offers a new idea of the time as a moving pendulum (see *Figure 3.1, Figure 3.2* again).

The aforementioned concept of the valuation process makes another notable concept: the selection of worth protecting features among the pool of considerable valuable features from different sections of the city, from different communities. Giving a privilege to some cultural values from the past over another cultural value needs to include a process of selection which built by society. For instance, there are manifold perceptions and claims on accepting a feature as a value to conserve gathered from different social and ethnic communities of the society. Consequently, those communities may have completely different perspectives on what is valuable, how it should be managed and how it should be conserve (Pendlebury, 2009). Specific elements from built environment defined as culturally valuable and worth to conserve, collected its significant features because of the diverse social and physical structure of the city, but this situation also brings another discussion to the theory and precludes the construction a universally consent definition. Therefore, the concept of past, also underlines the importance of former residents and former right holders of a particular urban area in terms of urban conservation.

As mentioned before, Geddes expressed the interdisciplinary nature of town planning, relating it with architecture and design in historical context and spatial

form of social processes (Rodwell, 2007). From this point of view, the next chapter will focus on spatial and partially social aspects of urban conservation and the linkage between urban conservation and urban place to emphasize the cruciality of urban conservation in planning context.

3.2 Urban Conservation and its Relation with Place

The incontrovertible relation between conservation and physical setting was discussed in numerous studies under the context of environmental psychology in terms of its relation with cognition of the place that is worth preserving or includes specific meaning attributed to it. As a context based on the relation between environment and human, environmental psychology context has a minor touch on the conservation concept. According to Günay (2009), there is a significant dialectical relation between nature as a being on its own and cultural beings produced by human beings (Günay, 2009). For Lozano (1974) the human being requires the aggregation of different various inputs to gather from the built environment (Lozano, 1974). From this point of view, Lozano suggested that those inputs can be taken in hand as a balanced built environment with aggregation of two concepts: orientation and variety. Human beings as an observer of the built environment should or need to relate themselves with stimuli around an urban area. This understanding also played a role as a crucial element of urban planning literature. Lynch was one of the prominent actors who put an emphasis on the relation between the built environment and human beings. Lynch's perspective on human perception and perceived image from the built environment produced five main elements of city: districts, nodes, edges, landmarks, paths (Lynch, 1960). This approach also emphasizes Lozano's view on the necessity of 'variety' alongside with the 'orientation'. Diversity of the built environment and its elements can provide more perceptible urban areas and this perception leads the whole concept to a sense of belonging. Sense of belonging in this case, directly related with place attachment and it can be considered as an essential human need. Humankind requires communal membership within the solid sense of

“us” and a strong sense of belonging to culturally defined territory as homelands that give the meaning to life (Breuilly, 1993).

Connecting with the community and the place comes to the inner psychological link within the past. These terms, “past” not only define the idea of acquaintance lied on past experiences that people had in that specific area, it also defines the common history, common heritage and common memory between every single part of the community through the built environment. In addition to this, the complexity and heterogeneous social structure of the cities leads the concept to the variation of cognition of place between different groups from different social and cultural backgrounds.

The globalizing structure of the 21st century brings new challenges and conflicts to the cruciality of conservation. In the face of today’s holistic approach and the requirement of recognition of the specificity of each and every place, urban conservation theory must be seen as a methodology based on critical judgement, and precisely juxtaposed with the planning and decision-making processes (Jokilehto, 2009). Recognition of a place’s specificity does not refer to types of space but to uniqueness and variety of it (Lee, 1997). This understanding refers to the socio-cultural and diverse structure of a historic urban area.

The historic urban context, containing a special character within itself, is actually a cultural artefact, which has been inherited by the process of historical evolution. Therefore, every case has a characteristic featured identity, shaped from its physical, social, cultural and historical aspects such as topography, location, usage, man-made elements, historically valued areas, buildings and so on (Rifaioğlu & Şahin Güçhan, 2007). Therefore, in any particular urban area, understanding and appreciating the identity becomes an important issue in the urban conservation context of its character.

3.3 Urban Conservation in Policy and Praxis: Prelude to Research Methodology

From the discussion on the cruciality and importance of urban conservation in order to preserve and secure the continuity of historical urban landscapes, the question of what makes an urban conservation approach successful in terms of efficiency and implementations will come to the fore. From these pursuits, research will follow and bring the discussion to the surface of global cases and practices in order to propose an objective multi-criterion structure as a colophon for acknowledged as successful urban conservation practices. While examining and evaluating the different urban conservation practices, the relation between urban conservation and urban development policies also will be emphasized in order to examine the third aspect of triangular diagram of urban conservation. Therefore, this part of the study will seek to respond to the problem of what is/is not good conservation.

From that point, this section will pursuit to develop an urban conservation assessment tool within the references from good conservation arguments above and also from the core review of geo-cultural identity and its sustainability. In order to develop that model, the following part of the section will evaluate different praxis and their conceptual frameworks. Moreover, methodological literature review has been conducted based on the aim of using different approaches and tools for an overall urban conservation practice that focused on preserving and sustaining geo-cultural identity.

Based on the discussions in *Chapter 2.3.1*, within the frame of reference of this research, the evaluation of global urban conservation approaches has been conducted according to the geo-cultural identity perspective. In this respect, all deduced concepts and aspects have been deemed appropriate in terms of containing four different theoretical frames; cultural capital, social capital, collective memory and diversity, which also referred by the key components of geo-cultural identity based on literature review of the concept (see Table 3.1). This evaluation will correspond to theoretical frameworks of different urban conservation approaches that will be

discussed in the continuation of this chapter. Therefore, the primary indicator for case selection shaped accordingly to the theoretical backbone of the thesis; with focusing the geographical, cultural, identity-related structure of the case areas that constructed differently urban conservation approaches in order to decrease the socio-spatial outcomes of urban oblivion, rather than the statistical features of the area, such as population, acreage and so on.

Table 3.1 Conceptual evaluation of urban conservation praxis in the context of geo-cultural identity and key components (deduced by the author)

Key component	Deduced factors from global aspects
Cultural capital	The existence of the structures, buildings, remains which are officially registered as cultural heritage value
	Touristic potential of the area with its historical and cultural features
	Ease of access to potential investors for renewal, rehabilitation and restoration projects
	Spatial convenience for conservation implementations
	The existence of local economy or potentials to improve local economy
	The official recognition of spatial cultural heritage values
Collective memory	The existence of shared experiences pertained to a specific ethnic minority
	The existence of representor or delegate for sustaining the specific ethnic group's remainders
Social capital	The existence of social cohesion among current residents of the area
	Community' awareness on the issues referring the urban identity
	Community's willingness for public involvement of regulations considering the area
	Governance at the grassroots level

Table 3.1 (continued).

Diversity	The existence of different civil architecture samples in historical buildings
	Reminiscence of intangible cultural heritage features such as language, daily activities, arts etc.
	The existence of current or past ethnic diversity
	Mixed-use in neighbourhood(s)

By determining the prior existing features from different praxis as shaped above in *Table 3.1*, research will continue to pursue the tools and instruments for good urban conservation in this respect, and will analyse the selected case in order to test their performance.

Rethinking the conservation approaches within the framework of geo-cultural identity summons a holistic and complex perspective for defining the good urban conservation with emphasizing its contribution to the city from micro scale to macro scale, from one single ethnic minority to the whole society.

According to Pendlebury (2009), good conservation is a compelling practice in terms of its complexity. He indicates that designing a good conservation approach from bottom to top, it is compulsory that the internalization of the conservation concept for every single part of the city. He suggests that this internalization process requires to be conveyed simultaneously and reflexively as well as it requires an “in progress” approach (Pendlebury, 2009). By in-progress approach, he alludes to the kinesis of the concept which echoes Castells’ view on production/reproduction processes of urban development practices. As in Castells’ perspective, Pendlebury re-emphasized the importance of urban conservation practices in overall urban development practices.

Another important point that Pendlebury took under his consideration is the requirement of highlighting the importance of social aspect of cultural heritage

structures considered as cultural capital for local economy (Pendlebury, 2009). The social aspect of the concept -as indicated in depth in *Chapter 2.3.1.3*- is an important element for good conservation as well as for sustaining and preserving the geo-cultural identity. As discussed in previous chapters, for ethnically diversified and/or discriminated minor groups, this aspect becomes crucial.

The acknowledgement of the complexity of urban conservation -as a crucial and an inadmissible section of overall urban development practices- also emphasized by activist Jane Jacobs with considering Greenwich Village of Manhattan. She asserts that every city is shaped in multifaceted structure. According to her view, in its complexity and heterogeneity, there are numerous variables but they are intertwined in order to generate a vital totality (Jacobs, 1961). She criticizes this indubitable fact often ignored by planners, policy-makers and other agents who took their part in urban development practices. She adds that even the instructors of planning schools or researchers from the academic field ignored that phenomenon (Jacobs, 1961).

Rodwell (2007), in his well-accepted work from conservationist milieu "*Conservation and sustainability in historic cities*" addressed the same issue. He identifies the city as a complex entity that requires a holistic approach since the twentieth century. He criticized the traditional planning approaches for being stuck top-down theories in praxis, therefore he states them as inadequate to comprehend the complexness of the city. He defends that top-down approaches reflect themselves on city as a failure in terms of not only the physical aspects of the city but also the social conflicts especially in historical urban cores where most minorities have lived in. Socio-spatial solutions of those conflicts are still ambiguous in terms of contemporary planning practices (Rodwell, 2007). Yet, he affirmed top-down theories in certain ways as well as criticizing it. Even though top-down resolutions remained incapable in terms of carrying the theoretical and abstract ideas to the field as a valid input for urban development practices, he expressed that top-down resolutions also provided new methods and instruments to develop bottom-up approaches in urban praxis. According to his perspective, the key instrument of good

conservation is the conjunction of bottom-up and top-down approaches in historic cities (Rodwell, 2007).

Rodwell (2007) emphasized -especially for culturally valued historic urban areas- that, conservation practices require bottom-up resolutions, analysis and examination alongside as a crucial start for overall top-down practices which mostly considers the totality of the city. He states that bottom-up approaches firstly and mainly focuses on examining the cultural identity of a particular historic urban area worth protecting. The crucial point of bottom-up approaches in urban conservation practices is that bottom-up approach not only pursuits the conserving the specific heritage for place identity and for future generations, but it also pursuits the uplifting the quality of life of contemporary residents by considering both cultural capital and social capital together (Rodwell, 2007). This view also supports Jacobs' idea of how culturally valued historical buildings and structure in an urban area are considered as a spatial input for generating more diverse, culturally tolerated and liveable organic urban environment and community.

Thinking of urban conservation of historical and cultural landscapes from bottom to top leads the overall urban development process towards a concrete, holistic and accenting way in terms of specific urban areas of the whole city. Putting the place-based cultural identity i.e. geo-cultural identity at its core, bottom-up solutions seeks the transformation of a micro-scaled complex approach into the comprehensive macro-scaled development approach.

In the bottom-up resolution process and also in the conjunction process, the planner assigns as a negotiator above all other responsibilities (Larkham, 1996). As a complex and versatile process, conservation requires an association of different professions. Alongside the negotiating and leading, planner must consider the components of place-based cultural identity in terms of deciding the issues of what and how to protect. In this sense, planner must consider the socio-economic dynamics with broader way of thinking for the sake of securing the continuity of

local activities and the quality of life as well as geo-cultural identity of the area (Rodwell, 2007).



Figure 3.4. Illustration of the “evil planner’s” approach to the concept and practice of urban conservation (Larkham, 1996) ¹

As in Figure 3.4, Larkham (1996) discussed the role of the planner from different perspective. According to his perspective, the role of the planner in urban conservation practices can be shaped not only around the negotiation, but also around the demolisher and/or re-constructer in terms of historical cities, under the name and the sake for urban conservation plans. He underlines the concepts of “good” and “poor” urban conservation practices from this framework (Larkham, 1996). From Insall (1972)’s viewpoint, good conservation as in good urban planning, directly related with good negotiation and management in historical urban areas (Insall, 1972). According to that perspective, the well definition of the role(s) of the planner in urban conservation approaches is crucial. With supporting Rodwell’s idea on planner’s role, Insall also brings a contribution to bottom-up approach. Alongside

¹ The illustration reproduced by Peter Larkham for his work *Conservation and the City* by the permission of the original author of satirical British magazine *Private Eye* in 1996.

his fellow theorists, he indicates that the bottom-up approach embraces the complexity of that historical area with its both welcomed/unwelcomed physical and social features while proposing a dynamic micro-to-macro scaled implementation in order to conserve the area. For Insall, this is the key issue for protecting geo-cultural identity from consigning into uncertainty (Insall, 1972). This perspective is also significant in terms of embracing the social relations and contemporary socio-economic dynamics of the community. From this point of view, one of the foremost entity for good conservation is shaped around the community itself. This understanding supports Jacobs' idea as underlining the fact that the existence of residents -whether they are successors or invaders- is a necessity for the existence of that specific historical urban landscape.

From this point, research methodology has been shaped around questioning the criteria and principles for assessing "good" conservation in terms of preserving the complex physical, financial and social structure of the culturally valued historical area to preserve. Therefore, research examined the different scholars and their perspectives on approaching the issue and with using which methods in order to generate an empirical evaluation in this sense.

Since a rational study conducted directly specific to geo-cultural identity -word by word- is not included in the urban conservation literature, studies approaching the subject from a wider framework have been examined in this part of the study. In other words, studies that discussed urban conservation approaches from the perspectives of place-based cultural identity and/or cultural identity with different methods have been selected to examine. With this methodological review, how the subject is handled with this method, in which way that method is applied, what are the basic findings and suggestions are analysed in-depth. Thus, it is aimed to design a solid methodology for this research by using and synthesizing the most suitable ones based on this review.

As mentioned, urban conservation with its intensely complex structure in terms of both duration and planning/design, it is consequently depended on the policy makers'

and planner's -as negotiator of the policy making process- attitude. From this perspective, Frey (2003) indicates that with considering conservation issue in terms of cultural aspects, the process becomes governmental responsibility. Therefore, it is prior to emphasize the interventions of government on cultural issues. He considered city as a subject that government should handle with all the intangible features of the society he positioned cultural identity at (Frey, 2003). Therefore, his methodological approach is shaped around the assessment of the government's performance in this sense.

According to Madden (2005) who also took in hand the issue from a similar perspective, for evaluating the good or successful conservation objectively, the prior indicators of the conservation implementations should be taken under consideration which he addressed to governmental evaluation with assessing the policies and implementations (Madden, 2005). For this purpose, in this research, Madden suggested discriminating the indicator according to their scale which are macro, mezzo and micro scaled implementations. He considered the different types and scale of culturally focused conservation policies and implementations by evaluating them according to their statistical data such as how many culturally valued structures have been renewed, how much cultural awareness activities are held by government etc.

As a cultural economist, Rizzo (2007), approached the issue from a theoretically similar but methodologically more empirical angle. She states that the main issue in good conservation is governance and good administration and the definition of roles of involved agents to that process. Her perspective defends the major role assigned to the government even though she embraces the fact that conservation approaches and practices require rigid cooperation and organization between different professions, including different agents and experts (Rizzo, 2007). In her work, she asks the questions of how conservation is carried out and who is involved is an open and crucial question to assess the overall benefits of cultural heritage conservation. She examines the importance of the local community -with its diverse structure- for

achieving a successful urban conservation model, from taking the issue in hand by a governance-based perspective.

She states that when the mere and external conservation understanding is followed in order to preserve as is, it presumably will lose its essence which is roots in its cultural value based on history (Rizzo, 2011). This statement refers the concept of geo-cultural identity loss which is considered as urban oblivion. From this point, she emphasized the necessity of a much more complex and wider approach needs to be conducted on urban conservation practices. As an essential criticism of this research, the concept of “preserve as is” in urban conservation approaches has been widely accepted with a lack of social, cultural and historic emphasis which lays on the core of the geo-cultural identity. Therefore, Rizzo’s methods to evaluate urban conservation approaches based on this statement refers to this research’s methodologic considerations. She suggested that, if we take in hand geo-cultural identity loss (or in most used words, place-based cultural identity loss) from focusing the governance perspective, urban conservation approaches will counter the urban oblivion and will be considered as successful in that sense. She discussed the importance of governance and administration for geo-cultural identity based on successful urban conservation in four criteria as; *finance* which considers the cross-sectoral relations of public and private, investments and so on, *community involvement* which refers to participation, assessing the public demands, increasing the awareness on conservation, promoting the local economic development and so on, *cultural value and identity* which considers the culturally valued capital in an urban area and adaptation, rehabilitation or restoration process of it and lastly the *legislations* which refers the governmental regulations with laws, policies and implementations.

For her inference described above, he conducted a study with focusing on different cultural heritage sites from different Italian cities. In her research for Soprintendenze, she suggested a performance and efficiency assessment with using an economist model which is the *Efficiency Frontier Method*. For this method, she aimed to measure the **efficiency and performance of an urban development approach with**

focusing the conservation issue of the area. According to her theoretical perspective, for preventing urban oblivion, i.e. for preventing the diminution of the local community value which refers to this research's core, determining the administration and governance process, agents, inputs and output are essential. Therefore, she designated a model for determining the indicators of performance and efficiency measurement. For this respect, she examined several topics such as the number of main administrative acts conducted by government for deriving public and private interest, the number of main administrative acts conducted by government for constructing the public involvement and participation, how much public investment have been made for conservation of Soprintendenze, the number of registered historical structures for deriving attraction from stakeholders, what are the public and private sources for financing etc. In this framework, she collected statistical and quantitative data from administrative actors to analyse his pursuits. In this respect, the study used the Data Envelopment Analysis. With DEA, different quantitative decision-making units were converted into inputs and outputs, therefore the DEA calculation deduced the efficiency frontier of each unit and results as performance evaluation.

Efficiency Frontier Method uses data as only if they are quantitative or convertible to the quantitative inputs and outputs, reveals and supports the complex feature of urban conservation approaches. Also, from a governance-based approach, the Efficiency Frontier Method can be useful as it demands quantitative inputs and outputs for analysis. Moreover, measuring the efficiency of different variables of governance-based conservation approach shows that the performance evaluation also shows the importance of feasibility of an urban conservation policy or implementation from any scale. On the other side, method accompanies several gaps. Firstly, Efficiency Frontier Method does not provide a complex weighting assessment with focusing predominately the government pier. Involving the society and their demands requests individual consideration when rethinking the contemporary conservation approaches in terms of its complexity. Because of not providing a complex assessment as required, method is limited to measuring the

capital and value-based decision making units in terms of their efficiency and performance. Also, with focusing only the collectable quantitative data, EFM does not provide the social aspects which is emphasized as an essential component of sustaining the geo-cultural identity and preventing the urban oblivion as Rizzo (2007) self-criticize her research methodology (Rizzo, 2007). Another self-critical inference came as, using only the quantitative data results itself in performance evaluation process as lack of clearly defined objectives. Therefore the public involvement and public demand components are neglected in data analysis process. The existence of qualitative data gathered from questionnaires, interviews are crucial for constructing a complex and holistic methodology for assessment of urban conservation approaches. As Picnataro (2003) indicates, collecting and using the qualitative data such as results gathered from questionnaires, interviews etc. is essential for urban conservation assessment process in terms of understanding the importance of local community involvement for successful urban conservation (Guccio, Pignataro, & Rizzo, 2014).

As mention in previous chapters, urban conservation is a complex praxis which requires holistic, bottom-up approaches to comprehend, analyse and evaluate. As an intertwined pillar of total top-down or bottom-up handled urban development plans or implementations, urban conservation requires a comprehensive case-by-case, bottom-up and from micro scale to mezzo and macro scale approach (Jacobs, 1961; Rodwell, 2009; Rizzo, 2011). From this perspective, multiple criteria gathered from every step of urban conservation process required a holistic, hierarchial and empirical method. Within this scope, *Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) Method* emerged as an assessment and evaluation approach.

AHP Method which is developed in by Thomas Saaty in 1980, is an effective and in position method to determination of different demands and priorities of stakeholders and to leading towards the policy making process of urban conservation approaches with considering multiple of different factors (Saaty, 1980). With using both quantitative and qualitative data together, AHP method provides an opportunity to take uncountable variables into countable and non-fuzzy data to develop scientific

assessment and evaluation. For this reasoning the AHP Method had been using since, especially with increased attention from urban planning context since 2000's.

According to different scholars who used MCDM with AHP or AHP only, there are different usage areas of the method in urban conservation and cultural identity preservation contexts in general. For instance, according to assessment process and findings of Hsieh et al. (2004)'s study on determining the design criteria of public buildings and deciding their site selection criteria, using the MCDM method provides an analytic and rational environment to evaluate. Even if this research taken in hand from more architectural and building-based viewpoint, final evaluation and the efficiency of the usage of MCDM and AHP methods together results itself as well-designated research methodology (Hsieh, Lu, & Tzeng, 2004).

On another hand, Lee and Chan (2007)'s research that focused on urban decay process of Hong Kong and suggested an urban renewal approach. In their research, preservation of culturally valued historical buildings, cultural identity, past experiences and collective memory which manifest themselves on built environment became one of the prominent component of suggested urban renewal approach. As a complex process like urban conservation, urban renewal which involving different stakeholders also required a multi-dimensional Analytic Hierarchy Process as a method in order to determine the different concerns, and determination of priorities of assessed criteria for leading a successful approach. According to their study, using AHP method allows not only the determining the prior component of successful renewal, but also to conducting a pairwise comparison among them objectively (Lee & Chan, 2007).

According to Yau (2009), who mainly focused on architectural conservation and maintenance in his studies in building scale, AHP method is one of the most efficient instrument to evaluating the existing structure objectively with including different agents to the analysis process and also to provide more comprehensive, participated, transparent environment for future implementations with emphasizing the interests, demands and assessments from different agents objectively (Yau, 2009). In one of

his study which is examined within the framework of this research, he suggested the AHP method with integrating it as a part of multi-criteria decision making method which widely used for the decision-making process of both urban scale and building scale conservation approaches. According to this framework, study has conducted 20 in-depth interview with local and historical building experts to propound their views and emphasize the stakeholder importance for decision-making and problem defining.

From another perspective that Turskis et al. (2013) conducted from the perspective from conservation of the cultural heritage site of the city of Vilnius has shown the usage of AHP method for determining the forecasts of possible problematics that may occurred on developing a sustainable conservation approach and preventing possible loss of cultural values which residents of the Vilnius city has been related and attached themselves in local identity level (Turskis, Zavadskas, & Kutut, 2013).

Different researches that used the AHP method to build an evaluation from either only conservation-based perspective or cultural identity perspective singularly. For demonstrating the importance of AHP method in most accruable and relatable way for this research, another related case study will be examined in detail.

Chen et al. (2016) conducted a broad research on Chinese urban conservation approaches with focusing the sustainability of spatial and cultural identity on selected case area which is Wenming. They expressed the prior requirements of culturally valued neighbourhoods and heritage areas with critically reviewing the contemporary urban conservation approach of China from different planning and development practices through history. Thereafter, the investigation of archived plans, projects, reports and literature review indicated the fact that local government's basic approach to the conservation shaped as their approach to many urban redevelopment approaches which is enhancing the quality of visual environment while protecting the identity of the area. In order to conduct this, policies and conservation practices majorly shaped around the strategies for retaining the existing local community with improving their urban living conditions,

promoting local development and enhancement of built environment. The main obstacles for achieving these main strategies and objectives, Chen et al. (2017) developed the prior problematics and also focus-points of successful urban conservation approaches following as; gentrification, poor infrastructure, poor housing conditions, restoration and rehabilitation of vernacular buildings, lack of community involvement, lack of financial budget, conflicts on determining the priorities among conservation stakeholders and so on (Chen, Yoo, & Hwang, 2017). From this perspective, their study focused on Wenming Historic Area and developed a methodology based on *Multi-criteria Decision Making* and *Analytical Hierarchy Process* in order to construct an involvement between community and government in local scale for building a successful conservation approach. In this study, different variables gathered from literature review based on cultural heritage conservation in order to define the criteria and principles for assessing an urban conservation approach analytically. For this purpose, scholars generated four interest groups to identify different stakeholders who related to the process directly or indirectly. Interest groups shaped as residents, experts, government and developers of the case project. Moreover an in-depth interview and a questionnaire has been conducted to collect linguistic data and used AHP method for both converting the linguistic data into quantitative data and also for analysing and assessing the results. Study demonstrated the different interests from different stakeholders who affect the process or who affected by the process of specific urban conservation approach. In-depth interviews also shown their detailed assessment and views on the issue.

Although this method is widely accepted in planning field, for providing a comprehensive and complex assessment alternative, it has some drawbacks. Under current Covid-19 circumstances, it is highly challenging to conduct interviews and questionnaires with stakeholder groups. From same point, using this method with its sub-methods it considerably time consuming in medium level.

With contemporary developments and growing interests in information technologies, approaching culturally valued urban areas has been experiencing methodological changes as well. The collocation of information technologies and

geographical/spatial inputs generated a research methodology field as geographic information approach. In urban conservation planning, the method of “*geo-imagining*” has emerged. Kourtit et al. (2014) describes the concept of geo-imagining as a method focuses on producing visual materials with using geographic information systems in order to both analysing the current spatial structure of an urban area and also to introduce different spatial alternative scenarios for complex decision-making processes which urban conservation approaches widely requires (Kourtit, Macharis, & Nijkamp, 2014). According to Reades and Smith (2014)’s study based on cultural heritage areas in London, geo-imagining method provides both spatial statistical data and also qualitative spatial data with involving the different stakeholders in the process of decision-making with providing them spatial inputs to evaluate based on their own perception (Reades & Smith, 2014).

Graziano and Privitera (2020) approached the issue from more local economy based perspective with using geo-imaging method for enhancing the local tourism and community cohesion of city of Syracuse cultural heritage are which recognized in UNESCO World Heritage List as well. They conducted a multi layered research with including geo-imaging method in every step. Their visual observations and spatial analysis taken in hand from this perspective, moreover they provided suggestions for future urban conservation planning processes with conducting in-depth interviews with stakeholders based on the spatial data produced with geo-imaging method. According to their perspective, using geo-imaging method with multi-criteria approach as joint methods, conservation of a cultural heritage area as a complex process would be handled from more sustainable way and geo-imaging method directly summons this collocation to be considered as an objective research method (Graziano & Privitera, 2020). As mentioned before, as a complex process, urban conservation of culturally valued areas requires complex and multi-layered methods too. From this perspective, Kourtit et al. (2014) conducted a study for *Nederlandsche Dok en Scheepsbouw Maatschappij (NDSM)* district of Amsterdam which considered as one of the important cultural heritage sites of the city. This study aimed to deduce the importance and contribution of geo-imaging method for conservation

approaches for both data collection and data analysis process and also for evaluation process. Their study, differently from others, considered the community involvement and gathering qualitative data from different stakeholders as one of the main pillar of the geo-imaging method. Among spatial visualization for analyses, they produced different “imaginary urban faces” with visualizing the different scenarios on how the cityscape could change after alternative conservation implementations. These imaginary visuals were used for collecting qualitative data from interviewees based on their perspectives and evaluations of imaginary visual scenarios (Kourtiti, Macharis, & Nijkamp, 2014). Therefore, this study underlines the interactive communication between stakeholders in order to construct more complex approach for the issue. Although the method requires a high amount of time on producing the visual materials for conducting in-depth interviews, it unfolds the contribution of the geo-imaging concept to the urban conservation approaches in different steps and also it provides a wide database of visual materials for future urban conservation policies.

As defined intensely in literature review of the research, main hypothesis shaped as urban conservation practices are considered successful and sustainable to the extent that geo-cultural identity exists in urban space. For examination and assessment of that hypothesis, research requires to examine in-depth the key component of geo-cultural identity with detailing them within the concept of its loss which is designated as urban oblivion. As seen in the *Table 3.2* below, all three research methodologies have their own pros and cons in terms of applicability, time consuming, viability and rationality. Thinking the complex literature of conservation of cultural heritage and cultural identity, research methodology summons a complex and holistic approach to conduct. Therefore; as mentioned in related chapter, geo-cultural identity which combines the place-based, cultural-based and identity-based discussions as a whole in urban context, this examination requires a multi-layered and versatile research methodology inherently. With using the multiple criteria from collected quantitative and qualitative data, proposing a broader perspective to the issues and providing an empirical assessment method for examining multiple different variables in same plane objectively, AHP Method has been came to the fore for this research. On the

other hand, the emphasis on “geography” in geo-cultural identity context which refers the place-based identity, calls more comprehensive spatial assessment and evaluation to integrate the analytical hierarchy process. Thus, this study will conduct and AHP method to bring a holistic framework with using quantitative data based on statistical databases and field observations and qualitative data from linguistic inputs gathered from interviews which will be conducted with different interest groups.

Table 3.2 Assessment of methodologic review

	Efficiency Frontier Method	Analytical Hierarchy Process	Geo-imaging Multi-criteria Approach
PROS	- Performance evaluation with quantitative data - Underlining the importance of political and governmental aspects - Empirical basis with using different tools (DEA) - Low time consuming	- Provides a complex weighting assessment - Performance evaluation with quantitative data - Performance evaluation with qualitative data - Direct public and community involvement - Clearly defined objectives - Empirical basis with using different tools (MCDM, survey, questionnaire, interview) - Considering cultural heritage on macro and mezzo scale	- Performance evaluation with quantitative data - Performance evaluation with qualitative data - Contemporary and IT based structure - Providing geographical, analytical and spatial inputs
CONS	- Not providing a complex weighting assessment - Only quantitative data usage - Limited to measuring all decision making units - Lack of quantitative data usage - Lack of clearly defined objectives - Lack of public involvement consideration - Considering cultural heritage only in macro scale	- Medium time consuming - Covid-19 limitations for questionnaires and interviews - Lack of micro scale spatial inputs	- High time consuming - Difficulty on accessing the visual data - Requires advanced software and visualization skills - Covid-19 limitations for site observations

3.4 Global Urban Conservation Context

Planning as an operation requires technical expertise which seeks the public good. Faludi (1973), identified planning discipline as an agent which in simple terms is an organizational unit specialized for the formulation of strategies in order to resolve problematics in the most efficient and ideal way (Faludi, 1973). In the presence of worldwide globalisation and transformation, urban conservation has been progressively featured in urban agendas as a significant issue which considers planning discipline as a resolver and negotiator in the process (Xie, Gu, & Zhang, 2020).




Figure 3.5. Highlights in global urban conservation context through history (compiled and rendered by the author)

Although the cognition of conservation concept as a concern goes back to the 15th century, the time of Italian Renaissance which is the significant era for embracing classical antiquity and creativity, a crucial period in the foundation of these concepts was the Age of Reason, the 18th century (Rodwell, 2007). This is the period of Immanuel Kant, whose contribution has deeply influenced modern thought. There were also other thinkers such as Giovanni Battista Vico, who juxtaposed the concepts of conservation and cultural history, and Johann Gottfried Herder, who further

contributed to the concept of cultural pluralism later in the last quarter of 20th century (Jokilehto, 2009). In following, 19th century emerged within the influence of Romantic Movement with strong impressions from German Romanticism. The concepts such as nationalism, plurality, diversity and identity emerged, transformed and made a contribution in different ways to the modern world view of protection of built environment within the emphasis on historic buildings. The idea of protecting historic buildings as cultural heritage was not only an issue of specific countries, but it emerged rapidly as a worldwide conservation movement in 20th century (Jokilehto, 2009). One of the most significant international conference was Athens Charter organized by International Office of Intellectual Cooperation (later re-established as UNESCO). Athens Charter stated some of the significant principles on the issues restoration, building-base protection and brought the awareness on some fundamental concepts as memory, continuity and cultural value of historical buildings and structures. The 1950s and 1960s were a period of post-war condition after the World War II. In this period, the context of conservation considered in the ways of reconstruction and rehabilitation in building-base scale.

In 1964, with Venice Charter, the issue of restoration and conservation considered again within the emphasis on authenticity, common heritage of humankind and common shared values in socio-cultural perspectives. Discussions on such issues on Venice Charter effected the establishment of ICOMOS. ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) is a non-governmental constitution which focused on enhancing the historical and architectural values of a physical image, protecting the historic sites and built environment, managing the archaeological and protected site areas of the cities holistically and sustaining the social and cultural activities while conserving the spirit of that place (Rodwell, 2009).

In following years, ICOMOS adopted some of the significant international charters and documents including the Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas in 1987, the Charter for the Protection and Management of the Archaeological Heritage in 1990, the International Tourism Charter in 1999 and the

Principles for the Analysis, Conservation and Structural Restoration of Architectural Heritage in 2003.

In 18th and 19th centuries, the main focus in conservation praxis and principles had mainly shaped around the physical ruins of an archaeological site or significant structural objects with historical values. In 20th century on the other hand, the trends on conservation context had been towards the authenticity which directly corresponds to shared values and cultural issues. This emphasis is significant in the ways of embracing the spirit of the place with pointing cultural and social parameters of an urban place. In planning theory, 20th century –especially the second half– considered as a new epoch with formation of a historical and cultural consciousness.

The arguments focused on cultural heritage in conservation context brought recognition of humankind's attachment with its past related with places of memory. Therefore, pursuits of geo-cultural identity in the urban conservation context evaluated as in historical, spatial and political aspects in 21st century.

3.5 National Urban Conservation Context

From the point that different international approaches and global urban conservation practices has shaped, this chapter will be focused on the national framework in order to comprehend the existing conservation attitude and make a comparative assessment between global and national ways of approaching the conservation issue.

The concept of urban conservation has emerged as a pillar or a sub-concept of urbanisation context for Turkish cases. As Harvey (1989) stated, urbanisation considered as a man-made process of social dispositioning occurred in the city. He emphasized that this process is valid as long as it involves the production and reproduction principles and doctrines of its own peculiar to the society (Harvey, 1989). He linked those principles and doctrines with specific ideological positioning which has an essential role in order to reshape the social and spatial relations. For Keleş (2006), urbanization is a process not only kicked by the results of an

ideological influences on production/reproduction conditions of a city, but also by the results or/and initiatives of the changing structure of economic and social relations among society. He emphasized this notion as a mutual interaction and positioned the city as a cause and/or effect of this formation (Keleş, 2006). From another perspective of Ertürk and Sam propounded in 2009, this process of urbanisation has a conversion in its core from the spatial, economic, social and political aspects. They correlated this assumption in a dialectic way, therefore the conversions of transformations that politics or economics have been experienced, it will manifest itself directly on the urban area as a spatial conversion or transformation process per se (Ertürk & Sam, 2009). From this perspective, Turkey's urbanization process has been shaped as a remedy that non-industrialized nations' articulation conflicts to the global economies. Therefore, the causation of the emergence of the urbanisation concept for Turkey must consider differently from global perspectives and cases. This situation has caused the complicated structure of Turkey's urbanization approach that directly linked with such conflicts like unplanned development, lack of political collimating, lack of legislative regulations and so on (Tekeli, 1991). From this point of view, "destructive planning" or "destruction / reconstruction" understandings, as results of the internal contradictions in the peculiar conditions of Turkish urban planning, have been made as the main focus of the contemporary urban conservation debates of Turkey (Gençkaya & Boztaş, 2019).

According to Okyay (2001), the emergence and development of sensitivity through the conservation of cultural and natural values that an urban area has, is a dialectic result of modernism (Okyay, 2001). This understanding has based upon the conservation attitude of modern citizen that has been shaped around the consciousness of the culturally valued assets' importance for sustainable development. Although this understanding has its contrasts in terms of contemporary Turkish conservation approach, the concept of "good conservation" which discussed in previous chapters from different perspectives, comes to the fore as an urgent issue of Turkish conservation praxis too. From this point, the concept of conservation from

national perspective, considered in terms of good/bad, as in the case with global conservation discussions on “good” conservation (Gençkaya & Boztaş, 2019). From this perspective, Tekeli (1991) emphasized the necessity of the examination of the structure of legislative regulations and the conflicts between legislative regulations and praxis (Tekeli, 1991).

From this point, the evolution, transformation and development of the Turkish urban conservation system’s legislative framework will be examined from historical perspective in following chapter. Moreover, the contemporary structure of the legislative framework and the conjunctions will be investigated in order to build the national perspective for a holistic urban conservation assessment.

3.5.1 Historical Evolution of Urban Conservation in Turkey

The development process of the urban conservation understanding in Turkey dates back in late Ottoman era which considered the global period of industrialisation and urbanization epoch. Although the discussions for conservation concept has emerged in that era, the concept of urban conservation and understanding the conservation actions in urban context took place in post republic period for Turkey. Therefore, the historical evolution process will be taken under consideration with putting the proclamation of the Turkish Republic as a milestone in the timeline.

As seen in *Figure 3.6* below, the historical evolution of the Turkish urban conservation institutionalism started in late 19th century which also occurred at the Tanzimat Period of Ottoman Empire. Differently from the global timeline which also has been seen in previous chapters, the highlights of the Turkish urban conservation timeline has majorly shaped with national legislations and regulations. The considerably urban conservation historical periods -which denominated as *awakening, breaking, ascending* and *descending* based on general approaching to the conservation issue- has emerged in 20th century and followed by the foundation of Turkish Republic in 1923. With considering the foundation of the Turkish Republic

as a national turning point, the detailed discussion for national urban conservation context will be examined as pre-republic and post-republic periods chronologically.




Figure 3.6. Highlights in national urban conservation context through history ² (compiled and rendered by the author)

3.5.1.1 Pre-Republic Period

The first emergence of the concept of conservation in the pre-republic period corresponds to the late Ottoman period of the 19th century. As discussed in *Chapter 3.2*, conservation and urbanization arguments have been progressed mutually with both causing and effecting one another. With the Industrial Revolution, especially in European countries of the 19th century, as a reflection of the industrialization, it is seen that the built environment's structure has changed and the cities were exposed to the pressure of the industry, therefore, within the rapid population increase, labourer settlements and deteriorated areas were formed in the cities. Major

² In different research studies which focused on Turkish urban conservation field, different perspectives have emerged according to scholar's way of approaching to the issue. In this research, the historical periods of Turkish urban conservation field will be divided as in *Figure 3.6* based on the perspective of place-based cultural identity which is the core of the study.

transformation in the functional and physical structure of the cities have led to contradictions with the existing urban tissue. Therefore in many European cities there were different urban development actions have took the place under the name of renovation. This adaptation attempts of the city have caused considerable damage to the tangible cultural heritage and cultural values of the specific historic urban areas in the city. Moreover, in major European cities, the cultural heritage sites experienced the urbanization pressure widely and it effected the loss of the cultural heritage along with the cultural identity and spirit of the place (Şahin, 2004). In response to this situation, the concept of conservation has begun to be considered in an intertwined manner with the concept of urbanization for European cities. Therefore, the main concerns has replaced by the comprehensive *urban conservation* instead of individual *monumental conservation* with considering the whole city as a physical stage for the conservation praxis has occurred. With this understanding, the first officially registered urban conservation attempt has emerged in French colonized Moroccan cities in 1912 (Akçura & Çapar, 1973).

In this period, there were a great amount of unique cultural and architectural values peculiar to the different social groups and cultural minorities attached to the Ottoman Empire that considered as cultural heritage. However, these reasons that led European cities to protect and conserve the urban cultural heritage did not reflect itself in the Ottoman society and its successor, the Turkish society, for a long period of time. According to Şahin (1990), the reason for this is that Ottoman society was partially excluded from the Industrial Revolution and its sphere of influence, and did not generate any concerns about protecting and conserving the urban cultural heritage of the cities (Şahin, 1990). But on the other hand, the Europeans' transmission of cultural values from archaeological sites of the Ottoman Empire through the western museums has enlightened Ottoman professionals on the conservation issue. From this point, adopting the concept of conservation has gradually settled in Ottoman society of 19th century as well. Hence, the 1st, 2nd and 3rd Ancient Monument Regulations (*Asar-ı Atika Nizamnamesi*) have been prepared by the officials in order to collecting the movable cultural heritage values from

Greek, Roman and Byzantine periods, preventing them from being smuggled out by Europeans, taking them under the protection and displaying them in Ottoman museums. Later with the last and the most recognizable regulation which is 4th Ancient Monument Regulation in 1906, Turkish/Islamic movable cultural heritage values have also been taken under protection (Çetin, Uzun, Şay, & Saraç, 2019). According to Madran (1996), in the field of Turkish conservation, there have been limited concepts inherited from the pre-republic era to the Turkish Republic such as, legal regulations on museums and museology and certain laws regarding the repair and restoration of public buildings (Madran, 1996). Therefore, the first attempts on conservation field has sprouted and this period is considered as the ***Awakening Period*** in terms of conservation.

As is seen from pre-republic period attempts, although it involved the first concerns in conservation field, the conservation theory and policy in this era only included movable cultural heritage values, movable archaeological values and individual monuments. It is not considerable that a holistic understanding and approach of conservation in urban context existed in this period.

3.5.1.2 Post-Republic Period

Within the proclamation of the Republic and foundation of the Modern Turkish State in 1923, the emphasis on national and cultural heritage became a concern before the emphasis on urban conservation. Therefore, the *Awakening Period* for conservation field has continued along with a new statutory structure. In order to create a society in the level of contemporary civilizations, the establishment of cultural policies came to the fore. From this perspective, establishment of several institutions, e.g. Association of Turkish History, Association of Turkish Linguistics. This approach considered as a reflections of the *nationalism* movement that emerged within the influences from French Revolution which effected the world in 19th century and early 20th century in the political, social and cultural manners (Şahin Güçhan & Kurul, 2009) (See *Figure 3.3* again). Therefore, the conservation discussions continued to

take shape around the legal and theoretical framework from the late Ottoman period until 1930's.

In 1933 the Standing Council of Ancient Monuments and the Directorate of Museums established. These institutes mainly focused on conserving architecturally and culturally valued monuments and structures in order to preserve and sustain the cultural identity. This period also followed the global conservation influence of *monumentalism* which became dominant for half of the 20th century. In early 1930's, Turkey municipalities' responsibilities and authorities were limited. The local and central government's understanding of urban conservation is restricted to plan confirmations and specific building-based restoration and renovation implementations. Later in 1933, a structured urban conservation planning framework has established and every municipality has become obliged to employ an expert team which specialised in urban conservation field.³ Although the foundations of conservation in mezzo scale have been laid, the understanding of urban conservation in that period was still limited to building-base, structure-base or in other words monument-based preservation. But on the other hand, the Act of 2290 also required improving the quality of life with constructing wider highways, building new settlements with wider and monotype plot form for residential areas. As a consequent of this situation, the physical conflicts between cultural landscape and new settlement patterns came from municipality's plans have been emerged. According to Şahin Güçhan and Kurul (2009), this notion kicked the -considerably still ongoing- practical gap between urban planning and urban conservation (Şahin Güçhan & Kurul, 2009). The *Awakening Period* of Turkish urban conservation followed by the several minor acts and legislative regulations until 1950's. The worth-mentioned issue in this era was surely the establishment of the High Council of Historical Artefacts and Museums as a department of Turkish local governments. Although this development considered as an improvement for management of the

³ Municipality Structures and Roads Act (act no: 2290, date: 1933).

urban conservation in municipalities by a wide range of scholars, there is an absence of urban planner employment in High Council departments. Therefore, it is apparent that the theoretical and practical gap between urban planning and urban conservation continued to exist in this period.

1950-1970 period is considered as ***Breaking Period*** in terms of both conservation which remain unchanged nationally during that time and urbanisation which also corresponded to Post-War period globally as indicated in *Chapter 3.1.1*. According to Madran (2009) within the increase in financial sources as a result of transition process of multi-party system, the progressive relations with Europe and the establishment of new legal order, 1950's became a turning point for Turkey in terms of practices has been established on cultural values of built environment (Madran, 2009). In this period, the changing structure of urban conservation approach in terms of cultural emphasis was mainly based on legislative regulations for Turkey. In this regard, one of the important development was occurred in 1951 with the establishment of the High Council of Historical Real Estate and Monuments in accordance with the Law on the Organization and Duties of the High Council of Historical Real Estate and Monuments (Law no. 5805). The Council has been defined to be obliged to determine the principles of prior implementations in urban conservation field within the scope of protecting and renewing cultural values in the city, as well as to maintain, monitor and review those implementations (Kejanlı, Akın, & Yılmaz, 2007). As it is seen in this mission, Law No. 5805 developed a wide perspective for the conservation of the cultural values, yet, it limited to the building-base regulations and conservation attempts such as renewal and restoration. Dişli and Günel (2020) also stated this phenomenon as the decisions have been made by the High Council was generally aimed to single building-base registrations, implementations and suggestions for historical buildings in İstanbul and this process continued until 1970's (Dişli & Günel, 2020). This situation was also parallel to the global conservation approach in the mentioned era which considered as *monumentalism*.

With the establishment of the Land Development Law in 1956 (Law No. 6875), it was aimed to correspond to the problems of spatial development and zoning of rapidly extending cities of Turkey. This law considered as one of the important regulations which raised the issue of conservation, but it was also limited to the regulations that focused on religious historical buildings and monuments as well. The issue of conservation in urban level with focusing on not only the building and the monuments but also the historical and culturally valued built environment around them from much broader perspective has not been addressed (Madran, 2009). This issue also emphasized by Çeçen (1972) with expressing that the Law No. 6875 has included an article states that “new buildings at the same height of the old building –that is not less than 10 meters- cannot be built which distanced on the non-adjacent facades of the old building.” But another article of the same law states that “this distance can be changed by taking the official opinion of High Council.” Therefore the contradictions of the legislative framework has affected even the building-base conservation (Çeçen, 1972). According to Şahin (2004), this understanding of conservation, which aims only to protect the historical and culturally valued buildings and monuments, has caused the danger of destructing the urban heritage around the buildings and monuments (Şahin, 2004).

Another occurrence in *Breaking Period* was establishment of the Squatter Law in 1966 (Law No. 775) which considered as one of the most notable legislative regulations that had an impact on both Turkey’s urban conservation framework and urbanization process. With the enactment of Law No. 775, squatter areas has been legalized by authorities. The direct relation with this act and Turkey’s urban conservation approach was based upon the squatting process of historical urban settlements and urban centres. With the effects of real estate market speculation and under the name of ‘urban conservation’ or ‘urban rehabilitation’, historical settlements and centres were at the risk of lose their own characteristics and identity in this period. From similar perspective, Turan (2007) stated that the enactment of the Squatter Law, the spatial development of Turkey has been dichotomized as regular and irregular settlements with attached to two different legal framework

came from the Squatter Law and the Land Development Law (Turan, 2007). This situation has created a major obstacle in terms of protecting the cultural identity of historical urban areas within the framework of a holistic and comprehensive urban conservation approach.

In this period, the social and financial conflicts has been also emerged within the impacts of rapid urbanization in Turkish cities as well as in many countries worldwide. The concepts of economic viability and public awareness has been founded with such conflicts in that period. According to Günay (1998), this rapid urbanization process has both impacted and caused by the speculations in property rent and public/private investment aimed new development areas in Turkish cities. As a consequent, this domination manifested itself as a legit planning and urbanization approach which affected urban conservation praxis in terms of demolishing the old structures and rebuilding them with new gauges and forms (Günay, 1988). This approaching reflected itself in historical urban cores and neighbourhoods as well and many of the historic cultural buildings were abandoned by owners or sold by authorities.

Even though it witnessed major conflicts which discussed above, in early 1970's there were significant developments, in fact the year 1973 become prominent as the starter of the ***Ascending Period*** for Turkish conservation in terms of recognition of cultural identity. The reason behind such awareness in conservation field is establishment of Historic Artefacts Act No. 1710. Within this turning point, the notions of *Conservation Master Plan*, *cultural heritage*, *urban conservation area*, *natural conservation area* and *archaeological conservation area* has been emerged.⁴ The important factor in here is this significant development is followed by another global turning point in terms of cultural identity which is the establishment of the

⁴ The term of conservation area has been mentioning as “site area” by numerous different scholars and research studies focused on Turkish urban conservation field. This study will give preference the term conservation area.

Amsterdam Charter in 1975. With Act No. 1710 and the emergence of the Conservation Master Plan term, urban planners came to the foreground of the urban conservation praxis field. The establishment of Act No. 1710 also defined as a milestone from different scholars as well. According to Madran (1996), the first attempts of conservation field by nascent Turkish Republic has contained in its roots the aspiration of such establishment in terms of promoting and preserving the cultural identity in a manner of nationalist thinking which have its origins to the multicultural social structure of Turkey based on coexisting with ethnic and minor groups (Madran, 1996). For Şahin Güçhan and Kurul (2009), the collocation of Act No. 1710 in 1973 and Amsterdam Charter in 1975, the viewpoint of Turkish urban conservation has experienced a major transformation (Şahin Güçhan & Kurul, 2009).

One of the important highlight from *Ascending Period* within the influence of Paris Charter of UNESCO in 1982 is, the repeal of the Act No. 1710 and enactment of the Law of the Conservation of Cultural and Natural Heritage (Law No. 2863) in 1983. According to Tan and Arabacıoğlu (2020), beside from the building-base conservation approach of *Breaking Period*, the phenomenon of conservation area has also been defined and the overall scope of conservation activities has been expanded from building-base (*structuralism*) towards the urban context in Turkey. With the Law of the Conservation of Cultural and Natural Heritage, the definition of “Conservation Development Plan” has been specified as an issue of historical environmental protection and also as a planning issue which requires a legislative framework peculiar to conservation areas. Therefore, a holistic and comprehensive urban conservation approach that was not included in the previous regulations has emerged (Tan & Arabacıoğlu, 2020). In 1989, European Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe has sustained 4 years after it was declared globally. Right after, in 1999, European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage has sustained 7 years after it was established by Council of Europe. Those developments has boldly affected by the finalization of the European Union accession process of Turkey. This period was also the period that the concept of *pluralism* has emerged in global conservation field with focusing the

issues as protecting, enhancing and sustaining the cultural identity, promoting the culturally valued urban areas with highlighting the importance of collective and common history. On the other hand, in national context those convention acceptances are stayed weak in terms of legal validity to implementations and practices, rather than the awareness of pluralism. Even so, those conventions, within the intention and influence on EU membership, raised awareness and perseverance on urban conservation issues in community and paved the way for receiving global financial support for local and central governments. Also, based on several articles declared by the conventions, those acceptances brought the more complex issues such as good governance and participation with NGO and local communities in urban conservation processes with emphasizing the every culturally valued heritage considers as socially valued heritages and requires sustainable approaching.

3.5.2 Contemporary Legislative Framework of Turkish Urban Conservation

The contemporary legislative framework of Turkish urban conservation field considered in ***Descending Period*** in terms of the emergence of an apathy for urban conservation praxis which based upon 21st century developments. Although Şahin Güçhan and Kurul (2009) defined the year 2004 as a significant turning point in terms of acceptance and embracement of EU perspective in urban conservation field, in 2005 -which is the same year as Faro Convention's establishment- the concern in urban conservation field began to embody a descending momentum based on segmented legislative framework and ups-and-downs in financial concerns of local authorities which were assigned as one of the important agents for urban conservation of Turkish cities.

The first significant legal regulation in this period was the establishment of the Law on Deteriorating Historic and Cultural Property through Renewal and Re-use enacted in 2005 (Law No. 5366). Although this act has widen the statutory liability of local government and brought the concept of "Urban Renewal Area" to support legal

recognition of urban conservation issue, it considered as a threatening regulation in terms of cultural identity loss of historic urban landscapes. According to Avcıoğlu (2016), in this act, the concept of conservation has been consigned to oblivion by including the concept of renewal instead. Also, this act has positioned a legal basis for unplanned implementations by ignoring the plan hierarchy defined in the Law No. 2863 (Avcıoğlu, 2016). This legal gap that threatened historic urban settlements, neighbourhoods and city centres manifested itself in several well-known and still-polemical urban conservation practices such as Sulukule and Tarlabası Urban Renewal Projects.

In Deteriorating Historic and Cultural Property through Renewal and Re-use Law, the concept of conservation has been dichotomized as urban conservation and urban renewal in a manner of two separate phenomena. Although the concept of ‘conservation’ placed above all interventions, the law does not provide a scientific and rational criterion for the implementations to be made in historical urban areas. Also, contrary to defining the fundamental principles and criteria that ‘Urban Renewal Area’ must include, this law only states the procedural definitions such as the functioning of the renewal project process, which data and documents should be collected and so on. Another worth mentioning difference came with the Law No. 5366 is that the Housing Development Administration has been given the authority to produce spatial projects and implementations in the aforementioned urban renewal areas.⁵ These regulations conducted by the authorities unfolds the retrogression of the Turkish urban conservation approach towards early 20th century perspective which based upon the *structuralism* period of global context that focused on majorly the building-base conservation, restoration, refuction and transformation practices.

⁵ Law on Deteriorating Historic and Cultural Property through Renewal and Re-use (No: 5366, Official Gazette No: 25866). For further details: <https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/MevzuatMetin/1.5.5366.pdf>

Another important regulation enacted in this period is the Statutory Decree No. 648. Within the enactment of this statutory decree, the division of authority between Ministry of Environment and Urbanization and Ministry of Culture and Tourism. These authorities were assigned as major administrative entity that responsible to generating and monitoring the urban conservation practices in previous legislative regulations of Turkey. Considering the global acts and charters, Avcioğlu (2016) states that the Statutory Decree No. 648 will disrupt the existing control and management mechanism, will weaken the conservation practices and therefore will cause irreversible spatial damages to historical and cultural urban areas (Avcioğlu, 2016). From his perspective, it is apparent that this situation, which is completely contrary to the holistic approach advocated by global acts and charters, will create a gap in the national legislative context. Also, with this law, an approach that excludes local governments in the conservation processes has prevailed.⁶

Another highlight in *Descending Period* is the Law on Transformation of Areas under Disaster Risk (Law No. 6306) enacted in 2012. Although this regulation mainly aimed the rehabilitation and reinforcement for built environment which under disaster risk, it is significant in terms of rehabilitation and reinforcement of historical buildings as they attached to the built environment. Within the inclusion of terms as “re-use” and “rebuild” in order to create more liveable and healthy physical environment, the usage of such terms are threatening the conservation and sustainability of historical urban areas, therefore the cultural identity of the area. In addition, the fact that the definition of the “structures/buildings which under disaster risk” has not been made clearly. Therefore, this situation creates an uncertainty and ambiguity in terms of the content and the process of the implementations to be carried out within the framework of the Law No. 6306. Also, this lack of clearance in terminological definitions raises concerns and doubts on the potential of arbitrary

⁶ The Statutory Decree on the Organization of the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization and the Decree on the Amendments of Some Laws (No: 648, Official Gazette No: 28028). For further details: <https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2011/08/20110817-1-1.htm>

or speculative interventions on historical buildings and historical urban areas. Additionally, the law states that the life of the structures will be taken under consideration as well as the physical condition of the existing structure stock during the implementation of possible rehabilitation, renewal or reinforcement projects.⁷ Avcioğlu (2016) criticizes that the life of structures is a relative concept and it depends on several external factors. Besides, the situation in historical buildings has to be taken in hand differently due to their cultural values. Furthermore, the definition of risky buildings has been made with superficial expressions without taking any scientific criteria. Therefore, it unfolds that all buildings that corresponds this definition can be considered as ‘under disaster risk’ in any urban area. This situation undoubtedly paves the way for the demolition and reconstruction of historical buildings with unique and individual cultural identities for invalid reasons such as life of building or building stock (Avcioğlu, 2016). This leads the historical urban areas into obscurity in terms of preserving and sustaining geo-cultural identity. Today, due to the spatial development model based on the construction sector, several urban conservation and urban development practices are being generated that negatively effecting the continuity, the integration and the geo-cultural identity of historical urban areas (Tan & Arabacıoğlu, 2020). In the current period, the conservation and planning practices in the historical urban tissues –which considered as one of the most important determinant of place identity and cultural identity together- are determined by Conservation Development Plans. The most up-to-date legislative regulation in current period is the statement of the necessity to determination of physical and visual conditions of historical areas and unfold their spatial and cultural characteristics, although there is no legislative regulation regarding new construction strategies in conservation plans and implementations (Tan & Arabacıoğlu, 2020).

⁷ Law on Transformation of Areas under Disaster Risk (No: 6306, Official Gazette No: 28309). For further details: <https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2012/05/20120531-1.htm>




Figure 3.7. Overlap of geo-cultural identity and urban conservation approaches in global and national aspects (compiled and rendered by the author)

3.6 Concluding Remarks

The pursuits of geo-cultural identity in urban conservation approaches from global and national perspectives have covered ground throughout history. The conspicuousness of the cultural emphasis in conservative approaching, brings an extensive perception to the urban space in any scale. From the global viewpoint, it is apparent that the process and acknowledgement of the cruciality of the geo-cultural identity emphasis on conservation practices roots back more deeply in comparison with national context. Although making a comparison between the global context and a single country with different inner dynamics may not yield consistent results as certain points, yet it is clear that this understanding for Turkey has been overshadowed by various different national concerns with more prior than the issues emerged in the cities in terms of conservation. From this perspective, *Chapter 3* focused on the discussion and criticism of Turkish urban conservation approaches through a periodical viewpoint, in terms of geo-cultural identity. Turkey's process of improving the awareness on urban conservation issues has been developed considerably in a weak and insufficient way, starting from its first emergence period which is pre-republican and post Ottoman period as mentioned. In this process, the emphasis on geo-cultural identity from the global perspective has begun to emerge with emphasizing the cultural issues. On the other hand, Turkish urban conservation praxis has experienced many ups and downs in terms of not only the geo-cultural identity emphasis but also of the performance and success of urban conservation practices that occurred in this same period.

Nevertheless, the pursuits for “a new nation city” peculiar to “a new national identity” which started with the establishment of the Turkish Republic, led to the realization of some issues regarding urban planning and conservation field. This period of Turkey has improved in parallel with the global context and also at certain points, this process generated a new understanding beyond the global context regarding the pursuits of “nation-state” and “new national identity.” However, it is seen in this chapter that these possibilities were vanished by a number of legal

regulations and legislative changes, before they may pave the way to making progress in planning and conservation practices. This phenomenon evokes the concept of "*passive planning*" argued by Raci Bademli with referring Turkish planning perspective. Therefore, this notion summons the concept of "passive conservation" with pragmatic approaching with the absence of cultural identity emphasis. This understanding also brings the awareness on the absence of community integration and local participation to the conservation processes which can be considered as a material based approach in terms of preservation of the physical environment.



CHAPTER 4

THE CASE FOR URBAN OBLIVION: JEWISH QUARTER OF ANKARA

“It was a neighbourhood with narrow streets without sidewalks, with kind and loving people... It was these people who gave life and identity to the neighbourhood.”

(Bahar, 2003, p.84)

Urban conservation considered as a dynamic and **flexible** -in regard to contemporary approaches- yet **binding** -in regard to legislative framework of a city- tool which requires a comprehensive approaching in terms of integration of multiple disciplines. In the cities of countries such as Turkey, where the concept of urban conservation has settled relatively later than the global aspects which discussed in previous chapters, the pursuits for this dynamism, flexibility and legally cohesiveness still continues today.

The concept of geo-cultural identity in terms of Turkish urban conservation approaches, as discussed before, has been experiencing many conflicts with considering the contemporary multiculturalist perspective of knowledge economy which dominates current cultural geography and urban conservation fields. However, Turkish cities have hosted some developments that beyond their time in the context of urban conservation which will be addressed in following chapter in detail. The most apparent example of this is Ankara, which was built upon the emphasis on "the new capital of the new republic" after the establishment of the modern Turkish State. As a young capital, Ankara sought its identity through early republican urban developments and the process and its reflections are still arguable in terms of the success of urban development practices within the framework of conservation and protection.

Alongside with the importance and meaning of its identity formation process, Ankara also has a diverse and multi-layered socio-cultural background as a result of its pre-republican demographic structure. As discussed in previous chapters, such socio-cultural structure manifests itself in urban space as a diverse, multi-layered urban tissues or historic neighbourhoods which involves historical built environment as cultural capital, cultural consciousness as collective memory of the place and lastly, an integrated community as social capital. The pursuits for such diverse and multi-layered spatial and cultural structure in terms of past, place and policy (3P) has led the study to the Jewish Quarter of Ankara. Thus, following chapters of the study will be focused on an empirical investigation for Jewish Quarter of Ankara. From this point, study will discuss the conservation experience of Ankara throughout time briefly, with comparing and crossing the global developments, then will continue towards in-depth examination of spatial development of the Jewish Quarter of Ankara in terms of geo-cultural identity impression in urban conservation practices.

4.1 Conservation Process of Ankara in the Context of Geo-cultural Identity

Declaring Ankara as the new capital is a revolutionary decision generated with the aim of establishing a new nation state. The capital Ankara is also a spatial symbol of the success of this new and modern form of government. In this framework, the search for spatial organization and formation of the identity has also been shaped around the concepts of the nation state and the modern capital. Therefore, a national memory has been tried to be defined for the formation of the city to be created in the newly established nation-state (Yalim, 2002).

In pre-Ottoman period (which can be considered in Ancient period), the city of Ankara has been the settlement as well as a capital for many different civilizations and has hosted many different cultural layers. The first known settlers were the Hittites. Later the Phrygians has dominated the city and in that period, they defined Gordion as their capital, which is still located inside the provincial borders of Ankara today. In following period, the Roman and Byzantine periods have dominated the

city, and this period came to the forefront as the process where the formation of Ankara's historical and cultural spatial layers were laid. The presence of Roman and Byzantine civilizations in Ankara, which had adopted a sedentary life earlier than most of the global ancient civilizations, has a significant importance in the context of urban conservation literature. For instance, the written artifact on the ruins of Temple of Augustus; "*Monumentum Ancyranum*" which located in Altındağ, Ulus - Hamamönü District, contains informations about public expenses that Emperor Augustus has made for conservation and restoration of the ancient monuments in that period (Sülüner, 2014).

In Ottoman period, the Byzantinian population displaced from Anatolian Peninsula as well as from the city of Ankara. Ottoman period with mostly focusing on the prosperity of the population in capital İstanbul, the city of Ankara considered as underdeveloped and with narrow resources. According to the records of the German traveler Dernschwam, who visited Ankara in the 18th century, Ankara had a cosmopolit social structure which different groups and socieites co-existed together. According to Dernschwam's written and visual records the population of Ankara in this period included Turks, Greeks, Armenians and Jews whom lived and worked together as a total community (French, 2003). Sülüner (2014) also states that in that period, the Bazaar (today's Museum of Anatolian Civilizations) of Ankara was the most important commercial centre, the surroundings of Ankara Citadel was covered with settlements and the Citadel itself was the most important symbol of the city (*Figure 4.1*). In addition, he underlined within the reference from Dernschwam's documents, that diverse and spolia materials are used in the construction of the Citadel (Sülüner, 2014). Hence, the presence of different cultural groups in the city from early periods directly reflected in the built environment and important city landmarks.




Figure 4.1. Ankara Citadel and surroundings in 1839 Von Vincke Map (Source: VEKAM Library Digital Archive: Ankara Map and Plan Collection, coloured by author)

Although Ottoman-Ankara has left various sources that pointed to the existence of several important historical and cultural values from built environment, it has remained weak and neglected in terms of producing and implementing urban conservation approaches. Therefore, in parallel to general national aspect of urban conservation, the Ottoman-Ankara has followed an unconcerned urban-scaled conservation but only monument-based and structure-based preservation.

The foundation of the modern Turkish Republic and the declaration of Ankara as the capital city of the new state, undoubtedly paved the way for Ankara to generate a new representation of the new state and being an epitome for Turkish cities in terms of urbanism and planning. In this period, one of the most important development that should be addressed for Ankara -exclusively from general national context- is enactment of Act No. 583. The discussions held in the Grand National Assembly of Turkey on Act No. 583, and the following significant developments and practices are considered as a milestone for both Ankara and Turkish urbanism. The main framework of this act shaped around the issues such as development on old city or new proposed city and expropriation of the land for new developments (Yavuz, 1952).

This period, as in the parallel ground with the general national context, considered as the ***Awakening Period*** for Ankara in terms of not only the new urbanism and spatial development considerations but also for urban conservation and production of new cultural identity shaped by those spatial attempts. Following this period, the establishment of Lörcher and Jansen Plans for Ankara was also significant for their time in terms of emphasizing the importance of geo-cultural identity with highlighting the nation-state approach for new developing city of Ankara. This phenomenon is also considered as a transcendence attempt within the fact that most of the European countries which lead the global conservation approach did not considered such advanced and urban scale based conservation thinking in that period of time.

In following, structure-based developments in terms of urbanism and urban conservation has been made with several legal regulations and spatial plans such as Uybadin-Yücel Plan and Zoning Floor Order Plan. This period in the context of preserving the geo-cultural identity with urban conservation practices, has evaluated as ***Breaking Period***.

The ***Ascending Period*** has started with comprehensive urban conservation attempts with broader geo-cultural identity consideration as in enactments for preservation in

urban scale and spatial developments such as 1990 Master Plan, Bademli Plan ⁸ for Ulus historical centre and so on.

The following period of ***Descending***, considered with its descending emphasis and focus of geo-cultural identity in urban conservation practices. This period in general national context also evaluated as an unproductive period in terms of “good” urban conservation practices which will be discussed in detail in next chapter.

As can be seen in *Figure 4.2* below, urban conservation practices and/or an urban development practice involves a conservative approaching had affected the morphology of the Ankara and shaped the periodic division in terms of geo-cultural identity consideration from different spatial scopes. Within the pairwise comparison with global urban conservation aspects with geo-cultural identity consideration, the national and -on the parallel ground with it- the city of Ankara followed a more fluctuating and variable historical process. The understanding of urban conservation on a global scale has shown a cumulative development in the context of geo-cultural identity. Also the awareness and emphasis of the issue has gradually increased on both theoretical and practical fields. On the other hand, the city of Ankara has experienced various ups and downs in the historical process when it is analysed by comparing it with global aspects through the national context. This process of urban conservation approach of Ankara has been experiencing is examined in the context of geo-cultural identity, based on the extend of pursuit for geo-cultural identity at the spatial scope; it is divided into four scales as city scale, urban tissue scale, structure-building scale and artefact scale. As can be seen in *Figure 4.2* below, while the pursuit for geo-cultural identity specifically in an urban space has developed cumulatively at the global scale, the national and Ankara scale developments have followed a fluctuating and rough course. With the establishment of Lörcher and

⁸ “Bademli Plan” refers the *1989 Ulus Historical Centre Conservation Plan*’s author Prof. Dr. Raci Bademli. Plan has approved in 1990 and the planning team from METU included; Ömer Kırıl, Baykan Günay, Funda Erkal, Zeki Kamil Ülkenli, Can Kubin, Elvan Gülöksüz, Tülin Özbiçer, Alpay Erkal, Haldun Ülkenli, Neriman Şahin, Ertuğrul Morçöl and Yeşim Nalcioğlu.

Jansen Plans with emphasizing the nation-state, nationalist thinking and a new urban identity production pursuits, the development line has experienced a significant rise. In following period, geo-cultural identity consideration has decreased in urban scale within the impact of subsequent spatial developments which will be discussed in detail in next chapter. Thereafter, the development line has risen again with the effective conservation and cultural identity awareness came with developments such as 1990 Master Plan and Ulus Historical Centre Conservation Plan. However, in the last period which includes current situation as well, within the impacts of both legal regulations in urban conservation plans and the absence of a holistic, complex and urban space oriented approaching from the framework of geo-cultural identity, has decreased the development line.




Figure 4.2. Geo-cultural identity concern in conservation practices of Ankara (rendered by the author)

The planning and conservation practices that took place in these periods in comparison with global perspectives and highlights has been listed in general framework as follows in *Table 4.1* and *Figure 4.3* below.

Table 4.1 Important Spatial and Legislative Regulations for Urban Conservation Developments of Ankara in terms of Geo-cultural Identity

National Period	Global Equivalent	Year	Outcomes
Awakening Period	from Monumentalism to Structuralism	1923	Foundation of the TR
		1925	Act No. 583 for Ankara
	from Structuralism to Pluralism	1924-25	Lörcher Plan
		1932	Jansen Plan
		1933	Act No. 2290
Breaking Period	Structuralism	1951	Act No. 5805
		1956	Act No. 6785
		1957	Uybadin-Yücel Plan
		1961-62	Ankara Zoning Floor Order Plan
		1966	Act No. 775
Ascending Period	from Structuralism to Pluralism	1973	Act No. 1710 for historic artefacts
		1982	1990 Ankara Structural Plan
		1983	Act No. 2863 for conservation
		1985	2015 Ankara Structural Plan of METU
		1990	Bademli Plan for Ulus (Ulus Plan #1)
		2004	Act No. 5226
Descending Period	Structuralism	2005	Act No. 5366
		2007	Hassa Master Plan for Ulus (Ulus Plan #2)
		2007	2023 Master Plan for Ankara
		2014	UTTA Master Plan for Ulus (Ulus Plan #3)




Figure 4.3. Comparison of geo-cultural identity concern of urban conservation practices of Ankara with global context (compiled and rendered by the author)

4.2 Geo-cultural Identity of Jewish Quarter in the Context of Ankara

Ankara, which is the subject of discussions focused on the space of culture and the identity of space, has many precedents regarding the relationship between urban conservation and geo-cultural identity that is the core of this study. Considering the cultural and social capital, collective memory and socio-spatial diversity, which are the main components of the geo-cultural identity concept, the Jewish Quarter of Ankara (*İstiklal Neighbourhood*) in Ulus, which had a multicultural social structure in the past and accordingly has a multi-layered spatial structure now -as a subject of continuing conservation arguments today- comes to the fore.

4.2.1 History and Importance of Jewish Quarter

The existence of the Jewish community in Ankara dates back to the period of B.C (Galanti, 1951). According to Bahar (2003), from 16th century to 20th century, a great majority of the community has live in the Jewish Quarter of Ankara which is located in Ulus, Altındağ (Bahar, 2003). İlter (1996), also stated that the Jewish community of Ankara had stayed as residents in the neighbourhood alongside with the Muslim population until the early period 20th century (İlter, 1996). In Ottoman period, Ankara was a province that has a multicultural demographic structure with including Muslims and non-Muslims as Jews, Armenians and Greeks co-existence as a whole. Based on the observations of Evliya Celebi in his “Travelogue (*Seyahatname*)” there were 12 Jewish quarters in the city in that period. The Jewish Quarter of today’s Ankara, located in Ulus, Altındağ was the largest and the most crowded neighbourhood in terms of Jewish population in that periods (Celebi, 1970; İlter, 1996) (See *Figure 4.4*).

The Jewish Quarter is one of the most significant historical urban tissue with the integrity of civil architecture samples and historical buildings from early Republican period, pedestrian oriented circulation with squares as open gathering areas and so on. In addition, the quarter has managed to remain untouched -except the “1916 Fire”

which slightly effected the northern side of the neighbourhood- while rapid urbanization, rehabilitation and renewal processes which Ankara has exposed lately.




Figure 4.4. Location of Jewish Quarter of Ankara (Source: Google Earth)

The Jewish Quarter of Ankara has an urban tissue which integrates a considerable extent with its historical structures, cultural values from built environment, open spaces and unique structural components that have survived to this day (See *Figure 4.5*). In addition to this, the inviolateness of the physical structure of the neighbourhood carried the Jewish Quarter to an important place as an urban conservation subject among other historical and cultural districts of Ankara (Avcı Hosanlı & Bilgin Altınöz, 2016).

Although the huge amount of the members of Jewish community has left the neighbourhood, the quarter has still memorialize as Jewish Quarter of Ankara. The fact that the neighbourhood has been termed as Jewish Quarter after the migration of

Jewish diaspora, Jewish Quarter considered as identified by its previous dwellers and the identity of the neighbourhood has been produced by its owners. This perception corresponds with the identity discussion and enlightens the importance of cultural differences operate the area's identity at its simplest way: form of commemoration.



Figure 4.5. Cityscape of Jewish Quarter of Ankara (Source: Baykan Günay personal archive, 2013)

4.2.2 Morphogenesis of Jewish Quarter in Planning Practice

To understand the urban conservation process of Jewish Quarter from early Republican era to this day, there is a necessity of comprehending the spatial transformation and urbanization process of Ankara from a broader perspective. From this point, study will continue with evaluating and discussing the planning process of Ankara with focusing Jewish Quarter and its transformation in terms of conservative approaches and preserving the geo-cultural identity of the area. In this respect, study will evaluate the spatial planning and policy transformation of the area through planning studies historically. In order to provide a basic, comparable and

legible structure, past plans and projects will be rendered as in an abstracted and informative graphic presentation technique as a tool for **mapping** method of the research. This maps and graphics were conducted in Adobe Photoshop and Adobe Illustrator software due to the collected archived maps are in ‘raster image’ and ‘vector image’ format. Within this scope, study will be trying to reveal the spatial alteration and morphological transformation of the Jewish Quarter in order to construct a spatial based geo-cultural identity study.

From this perspective, the spatial situation of the city in early Republican era was analysed through the 1924 Ankara Map, which is acknowledged as the first comprehensive and basal cartographic study to express the topographic and spatial structure of Ankara in that period. As Cengizkan (2003) indicates, the 1924 Map of Ankara considered as a base map for future development and planning practices for Ankara, starting with the first plan of the city, Lörcher Plan (Cengizkan, 2003). Therefore, the 1924 Ankara Map will be used as a characteristic base map according to the spatial change, transformation and urban oblivion process that still continues today (See *Figure 4.6*).




Figure 4.6. Location of Jewish Quarter in 1924 Ankara “Şehremaneti” Map (top and bottom left) (Günel & Kılıcı, 2015), spatial organization of Jewish Quarter in 1924 Ankara “Şehremaneti” Map (right) (rendered by author)

The 1924 Ankara Map aimed to reveal the current spatial structure of the city in that period and to be a base for upcoming planning/zoning/design works that focused on the city. In this context, one of the most prominent data from the map is the area defined as the “fire area” near the Citadel and its surroundings which has left blank. In this point, it is accurate to emphasize the *1916 Fire of Ankara* which impacted a large part of the city, including the southwest of the Citadel and the north side of the Jewish Quarter of Ankara (Günel & Kılıcı, 2015).

As can be seen in *Figure 4.6* above, the Jewish Quarter of Ankara in 1924 has an intricate settlement pattern, apart from the “fire area” that was burned and left blank. Also, there is a madrasa and a hammam (Turkish Bath) in the area, and the fifth

street and circulation pattern leads to large gathering areas and squares at intersections. In addition, it is noteworthy that there are both mosques and a synagogue in the neighbourhood where Muslim and non Muslim populations co-exist and live together. In that period, the total non-Muslim population of Ankara constituted 32% of the total population of the city and the ratio of the Jewish population to the total city population was around 2.4% in that period (Aydın et al. 2005; Avcı Hosanlı & Bilgin Altınöz, 2016).

4.2.2.1 Lörcher Period

The following process is the period in which Turkey has adopted a structuralist approach in the context of geo-cultural identity awareness in conservative thinking (See *Figure 4.3* again). However, as mentioned before in national context, this period was also considered as an Awakening Period in terms of geo-cultural identity awareness within the influences of a nation-state approach of spatial production as a new, modern Republic. Therefore, German architect/planner Carl Christopher Lörcher was assigned to produce a spatial plan for capital Ankara in 1924-1925⁹ periods (Cengizkan, 2004).

Although the Lörcher Plan was not approved and therefore not implemented, it was an important outcome that contained numerous of basic, fundamental decisions that affected and influenced next planning practices of Ankara. Cengizkan (2004) summarized the main reasons behind the disapproval of the Lörcher Plan as follows: sharp spatial decisions that are not compatible with the geomorphology of the city, proposed settlements that are produced independently from the existing settlement pattern and the compulsion of the multiple ownership status in the city which is also

⁹ The first plan produced in the year 1924 by Carl Christopher Lörcher was focused on the Old City that includes Ulus area and Jewish Quarter as well. The second plan produced in the year 1925 was focused on the New City that suggested a new settlement near Kızılay and surroundings (Cengizkan, Ankara'nın İlk Planı: 1924-1925 Lörcher Planı, 2004).

a current issue for today's planning and implementation practices as well (Cengizkan, 2004).

As can be seen in *Figure 4.7* below, the Jewish Quarter has divided with a strict vertical axis at the edge of the old city's commercial & public centre and the old city settlements which suggested as a rehabilitation area by Lörcher. In comparison with the existing structure from the 1924 Ankara Map, the proposed circulation system for the Quarter were more clear-cut and shaply defined, compared to the existing intricate and grith circulation pattern that Jewish Quarter has in the year 1924 (see *Figure 4.7*).




Figure 4.7. Location of Jewish Quarter in 1924 Lörcher Plan (top and bottom left) (Cengizkan, 2004; Mıhçıoğlu Bilgi, 2010), spatial regulations of Jewish Quarter in 1924 Lörcher Plan (right) (rendered by author)

Although the Lörcher Plan suggested -which was not implemented- a different spatial layout from the existing pattern, in the light of the debates of global urban conservation developments and when rethinking the national aspect, Lörcher Plan, from a comprehensive perspective of geo-cultural identity context, has also brought several breakthroughs beyond its time at so many different levels.

According to Cengizkan (2003), Carl Lörcher produced a spatial proposal for capital Ankara with not only focusing on the new settlement areas and potential development axes, he also adopted a conservative approach which he based on his thinking to Renaissance conservationism. This approach can be traced with his attempt to establish a spatial and scale-based balance between the width of the circulation systems and new structures that he proposed (Cengizkan, 2003). Also as can be seen in the top left image from the *Figure 4.7*, plan proposed a “wedge” from the New City to the Ankara Citadel in the Old City. For Cengizkan (2003), this attempt of “wedge”, which reaches from the New City to the Old City’s landmark, is the symbolization of a hierarchical system that reaches from an “individual” to the “collective nation” (Cengizkan, 2003). This concept corresponds to the changing structure of the identity arguments in the literature from *personal identity* to *impersonal identity* which includes geo-cultural identity, based on the contemporary developments of urban conservation approaches around the pluralist and multiculturalist thinking.

According to Cengizkan (2003), the main emphasis in Lörcher Plan is the pursuits of the spatial and cultural meaning and the symbolism of the cultural identity through urban space (Cengizkan, 2003). As in *Figure 4.3*, rethinking the Lörcher Plan from the global approaches of urban conservation, the issue of cultural heritage which has been emphasized in Venice Charter in 1964 and the issue of urban level protection which has been emphasized in Amsterdam Charter in 1975, has already been discussed by Lörcher in 1924-25, through the *spatial context of the reproduction of a new cultural identity* for a newly constructed capital, which is Ankara.

4.2.2.2 Jansen Period

After the Lörcher Plan's disapproval for the reasons mentioned above, preparations for a new capital city development plan were started and German architect/urban planner Hermann Jansen, who came first in the competition held in this context, was selected to design the new city plan for Ankara.

Jansen, with high influences from the Garden City approach, suggested an axis from north and south and located main zones, divided according to their functions with wide green belts (Türkoğlu Önge, 2007). He suggested a New City ("Yenişehir") located the south west of the city centre, in parallel with the Lörcher's proposal. In Jansen Plan, New City was proposed as an extension attached with the old centre which was Ulus (Batuman, 2013). Jansen's conservative thinking was emphasized in his proposal within the context of nation-state concept and the reproduction of the new, modern urban space. Therefore, he underlined the importance of old city centre which considered as a *heart* for the Independent War and he suggested a "worth protecting" traditional centre which will be represent the pre-republic period of the city (Türkoğlu Önge, 2007).

"...we must protect the old city from the pressure and damage over time. The Citadel and the mosaic-like, wooden-framed traditional Turkish houses with stuffed walls shall always remain the apple of the eye for the government." (Jansen, 1937, 7).

In Jansen's perspective, the only conservative way for old settlement of the city located near the Ankara Citadel is to locate the new settlement proposal apart from the old settlements. From this point, he conserved the Ankara Citadel and surrounding area as the traditional centre, but his conservative approach remained limited with this notion. As seen in *Figure 4.8* below, the Jewish Quarter of Ankara was located outside this traditional centre and settlement. From his principles for new settlements near the traditional centre area, the main aim was to completely conserve the Ankara Citadel and traditional centre and to make this area –which

considered as the symbol of the old centre- to be visible from every point of the city with floor limitation in the new settlement areas around it.




Figure 4.8. Location of Jewish Quarter in 1932 Jansen Plan (top and bottom left) (Source: Architekturmuseum der TU Berlin), spatial regulations of Jewish Quarter in 1932 Jansen Plan (right) (rendered by author)

In Jewish Quarter, which is located within these areas, 2-3 storey row blocks were proposed and the existing urban pattern was almost completely reconstructed except for the registered structures (Avcı Hosanlı & Bilgin Altınöz, 2016) (see *Figure 4.9* and *Figure 4.10*). The extensions of the green wedges (or green belts) were included as well as the rest of the newly settled proposed area. Also, he suggested wide gathering areas near the public facilities in the neighbourhood. Located at the edge of the traditional centre, Jewish Quarter's eastern border (Anafartalar Street) decided

as the “old street” that will be protected within the facades of the buildings. Therefore, the conservation within the context of geo-cultural identity and its preservation, Jansen Plan considered as the structure-based conservative approach which refers the structuralist period from the national aspect, in the context of Jewish Quarter.





Figure 4.9. Old City and surroundings with new settlements in Jansen Plan (Source: Architekturmuseum der TU Berlin) (left)

Figure 4.10. 1/500 scaled design study of Hermann Jansen for Jewish Quarter (Source: Architekturmuseum der TU Berlin) (right)

As in *Figure 4.3* again, rethinking the Jansen Plan like Lörcher Plan from the global approaches of urban conservation, the issue of cultural heritage which has been emphasized in Venice Charter in 1964 and the issue of urban level protection which has been emphasized in Amsterdam Charter in 1975, has discussed again by Jansen, through the spatial context of the *reproduction of a new cultural identity* for Ankara.

4.2.2.3 Transition Period and Displacement of Jewish Diaspora

Although the spatial proposals made for the Jewish Quarter in Lörcher and Jansen Plans were not implemented, the spatial framework drawn by these two plans for Ankara in general, continued until the 1950s (Ayhan Koçyiğit, 2019). As a result of both the rapid population growth that Lörcher and Jansen could not foresee, and the changing political and spatial dynamics after WW2, a search for fast and effective, to the point planning practices was begun in Turkey as well. In that period, the emphasis on urban conservation and geo-cultural identity considered were insufficient and pragmatic implementations were made in order to solve the spatial problems came with rapid urbanization and population growth. On the other hand, this period for minority communities of Ankara considered as significant turning point as well. The attempts on generating a national identity throughout the process started with Lörcher Plan to the early 1950s, changed the majority approach to the minority communities among society and Muslim population has starting to exclude the minorities, therefore the population of the Jewish Quarter has started to decline as well (Avcı Hosanlı & Bilgin Altınöz, 2016). Another important factor on this issue is the fact that commerce and industry were mainly conducted by non-Muslim population caused a tension significantly, among society (Bali, 1999). Moreover, in late 1930s, within the living condition difficulties came with World War II, made relocating themselves into New City ("*Yenişehir*") became very difficult for Jewish community alongside the rest of the society. But apart from them, in 1942, with the enactment of the Capital Tax Law regarding non-Muslim community made Jewish community of Ankara discontented in terms of staying, living or working in the neighbourhood as a citizen. Discrimination of tax laws for minorities considered as the key turning point in Jewish depopulation of neighbourhood and Ankara. Bahar (2003) defines the issue as; a large amount of Jewish citizen, alongside with the Greek and Armenian citizens, were forced to leave Turkey in 1940's after the enactment of Capital Tax Law which was intentionally prepared in order to ease the transfer of their property to the government. As a result, the Jewish population of

Ankara was forced to migrate to other cities that considerable multicultural such as İstanbul and İzmir. After the foundation of Israel in 1948, a great amount of Jewish community of Turkey has migrated, unintentionally (Bahar, 2003). Therefore, the urbanization process of Ankara from Lörcher Plan to 1950's has caused a major demographic changes as well for especially Jewish community. The process of social and economic pressures reflect itself on Jewish community of Ankara crossed with the process of depopulation of Jews. With the descended geographically attached minor community, the existence of cultural identity, in both physical and social ways, faced extinction and this process still continues in terms of compulsory migration of the community. Therefore the succession-invasion process for Jewish Quarter of Ankara came as a significant issue.

“...the migration process first started in 1948, with the founding of Israel. There were also many that went to İstanbul with the hopes of finding a more financially promising future or marry their daughters. There were migrations to Yenışehir since most houses were getting old. Kavaklıdere and Çankaya were also popular. The Jewish families spread to different neighbourhoods and it became a rarity to see multiple Jewish families in an apartment building.”
(Ağlamaz, 2015).

One of the past resident of Jewish Quarter of Ankara notes as seen above in a journal interview, that the succession-invasion process has started with Jewish diaspora's relocating themselves in urban space, even so they were the producers of the geo-cultural identity of the neighbourhood from the very beginning, alongside with the Muslim population. This process also commenced the *urban oblivion* in Jewish Quarter of Ankara.

As seen in *Figure 4.3* again, this period also considered as the Breaking Period for national context as well as for the city of Ankara from geo-cultural identity based urban conservation approaches. Although the establishment of the Act No. 5805 for the sake of the conservation of historical assets and monuments, the rapid urbanization and following spatial problems has led the local and central authorities to produce transient solutions, therefore the issues of protecting the cultural values

and cultural identity of an urban areas were neglected among other prior considerations in terms of planning and development.

4.2.2.4 Towards *Urban Oblivion*: Uybadin-Yücel and Zoning Floor Order Period

In 1954, as the winner of the new planning and development competition, the team of Raşit Uybadin and Nihat Yücel was assigned to produce and conduct the new plan of Ankara. Their proposal has been approved and commenced its implementation in 1957 (Ayhan Koçyiğit, 2019). The plan of Uybadin-Yücel aimed to respond rapid urbanism and to counter its results on urban density, squatter areas and unplanned growth. However, as Günay (2012) indicated, for this purpose, the natural and historical features of environment and the cultural values in it have been ignored and neglected. As a result of this *oblivious situation*, the society as the producers of not only the identity of space but also the space itself have started to reshape the built environment as a reflection of their social, economic and cultural background. Therefore, the garden city of Jansen have transformed into an urban texture with high rise apartment blocks, the green belts that designed as planned voids in order to create open spaces in the city, have transformed into squatter neighbourhoods. This process has reflect itself in urban space as a situation that the values which defines the cultural identity of the place have disappeared, a “*chaotic order*” has prevailed and a radical physical transformation has been experienced (Günay, 2012).



Figure 4.11. Location of Jewish Quarter in 1957 Uybadin-Yücel Plan (top and bottom left) (Source: Uybadin-Yücel Plan Report), spatial regulations of Jewish Quarter in 1957 Uybadin-Yücel Plan (right) (rendered by author)

As seen in *Figure 4.11* above, Jewish Quarter in Uybadin-Yücel Plan has divided into building blocks. Except for the protection of the some registered structures such as synagogue, hammam etc. in the area, the facades defines the northern, eastern and southern borders of the neighbourhood were preserved and a new spatial revision was made by widening the road on the western facade of the neighbourhood. In addition, the Uybadin-Yücel Plan proposed new public structures in the area where schools are located and tried to construct a wider public facility area in here. Therefore, apart from building-based conservation, the Uybadin-Yücel Plan does not contain any foresight regarding urban conservation and geo-cultural identity preservation. It is obvious that the division of the neighbourhood into new building

blocks does not bring an arrangement beyond merely proposing a new circulation system and new building block-based urban fabric.

Another significant reform came with the Uybadin-Yücel Plan is the plan decision states that the building order will be preserved in the *existing settlement areas*, which includes the Jewish Quarter as well. However, according to plan decision verdict, in cases where the road width and land ownership conditions are suitable, an altitude of 2/3 of the space to be left on the wide facade of the new building to be built can be given (Uybadin & Yücel, 1957). In line with this decision, it has given rise to an altitude of 2/3 floor increase right in the buildings that have facades to the aforementioned widened road at the southern border of the neighbourhood and to the roads that define the proposed new building blocks in the existing settlements of the neighbourhood. This was the beginning of the floor increase process that would completely change the existing pattern of the Jewish Quarter (Avcı Hosanlı & Bilgin Altınöz, 2016).

In following process, the Zoning Floor Order Plan which had been disapproved several times before, was approved in 1961 and the floor increase process became official and accelerated. Thus, an extensive building stock capacity was created throughout the city without any scientific or viability basis (Altaban, 1978). With a new arrangement made in the Uybadin-Yücel Plan in 1968, the floor right in the whole city was increased officially. Due to the legal gaps in that arrangement, besides the increase in floor heights, this situation also brought along a *deconstruct-reconstruct* process throughout the city of Ankara.

As seen in *Figure 4.12* below, Jewish Quarter is within the borders of the 6 floor height given in the Zoning Floor Order Plan. This situation has led to the construction of higher-rise buildings on the periphery of the neighbourhood, which has an enclaved and compact urban pattern, and a complete change in the spatial structure of the neighbourhood.




Figure 4.12. Jewish Quarter in Ankara Zoning Floor Order Plan ¹⁰ (1961-62) inside the 6-storey structure right given commercial area and commercial axes (Source: Ankara Metropolitan Municipality Maps and Plans Archive)

¹⁰ “Zoning Floor Order Plan” corresponds to “Bölge Kat Nizamı Planı” and the English equivalent of the term has retrieved from Yener Baş’s unpublished doctoral thesis titled *Production of Urban Form as the Reproduction of Property Relations Morphogenesis of Yenişehir-Ankara* (Baş, 2010).



Figure 4.13. Condition of high-rise buildings and their impact (a) High-rise buildings between inner streets of the neighbourhood, *Kargı Street* (b) High-rise buildings between inner streets of the neighbourhood, *intersection of Kargalı Street and Eskicioğlu Street* (c) High-rise buildings between inner streets of the neighbourhood, *Çanakkale Street* (Source: Baykan Günay personal archive, 2005), (d, e) High-rise buildings located on the periphery of the neighbourhood, *intersection of Adnan Saygun Street and İğde Street* (Source: personal archive, 2021)

As seen in *Figure 4.13*, as a result of legal and spatial regulations came with the both Uybadin-Yücel Plan and its revisions and with the Zoning Floor Order Plan, the increase in floor height in the neighbourhood, especially in the buildings located on

the periphery, deconstructed the compact and enclaved spatial order and completely changed the visual and environmental perception.

This process was also a period when the Jewish population in the neighbourhood nearly totally disappeared. Only the synagogue in the neighbourhood was used by the community for certain religious special occasions from time to time (Bahar, 2003). In other words, the minority group that is Jewish community, who are considered as one of the producers of geo-cultural identity of the neighbourhood with all its cultural, spatial and social components, could not have any sanction regarding the process of spatial and visual destruction which considered as an *urban oblivion* in the sense of the absence of the cultural identity producers of an urban space. This process has been a period in which were searching for solutions for decreasing the spatial effects of the rapidly increased population with irregular, pragmatic and fractal regulations in terms of urban planning. This situation which lasted until 1970s, started to transform gradually with some innovations in the light of global-scale conservation and cultural identity debates. With enactments of Act No. 1710 and Act No. 2863 in order to conserve the cultural values in urban scale within the influences from Amsterdam Charter and then Washington Charter, the new perspective for urban conservation and cultural identity preservation has occurred.

4.2.2.5 Structural Plan Period

In 1970s, the pursuits and concerns for metropolitan scale spatial regulations have occurred. From this purpose, the 1990 Ankara Structural Plan ¹¹ (1990 Ankara Master Plan), approved and came into effect in 1982. The projections were

¹¹ 1990 Ankara Master has brought a new planning and process management understanding in the context of creating a guiding framework with detailed analytical studies. Therefore, it has the characteristics of a “structural plan” rather than a master plan (Tekeli, et al., 1987). In this context, study will adopt the term “1990 Ankara Structural Plan” instead of “1990 Ankara Master Plan.”

considered consistent ¹² as the 1990 Structural Plan included a comprehensive preliminary research process spanning a broad period of time from 1970 to 1975.




Figure 4.14. Ankara's planning process in 1970-1990 period (1) 1990 Ankara Structure Plan (Source: Ankara Metropolitan Municipality Maps and Plans Archive), (2) 2015 Ankara Structure Plan of METU (Source: Ankara Metropolitan Municipality Maps and Plans Archive)

¹² For further assessment of 1990 Ankara Structural Plan from Ankara Metropolitan Municipality see: <https://www.ankara.bel.tr/files/6513/4726/6062/2-tarihce.pdf>

The basic approach in the plan was direct the development on the north-south axis to the proposed west corridor. The main purpose here is to reduce the air pollution in the settlements within the bowl-like topographic structure of Ankara and to move the new settlements away from the pollution. This dynamic and functional approach was damaged due to the contradictions experienced as a result of the partial plans and projects developed and approved by different authorities in the process. For this reason, planned developments on the governmental plane yet unplanned developments on the spatial plane were continued.

Another structural plan, which took place in the same period and mainly preserved the decisions of the 1990 Structural Plan was prepared by METU in 1985 within the projection of 30 years. In addition to the 1990 Structural Plan, the 2015 Structural Plan was designed within the framework of the multi-corridor approach instead of mono-corridor approach and the concept of decentralization. Since both the processes and the macro scale decision covering the Jewish Quarter are common, these two plans are interpreted together regarding the case area.

As seen in *Figure 4.14* above, the Jewish Quarter is located in the central business district in both 1990 Structural Plan and 2015 Structural Plan of METU. Since these plans are designed in order to define the development directions and aspects of the urban macroform, they did not bring any specific decisions for the scope of conservation or Jewish Quarter in particular. However, in the light of the fact that they defined a clear and broad research-synthesis-planning process, these plans made an important contribution to the theoretical and practical field in the context of both urban planning and urban conservation planning within the scope of *process management*.

4.2.2.5.1 Ulus Plan #1: “*Bademli Plan*”

The Ascending Period for Ankara started with the enactment of Act 1710 and the following developments which detailed above. Although these plans were considered as an innovative approaching to the urban development issues, therefore the protection and sustainability of the natural and historical environment, an approach that directly focuses on the historical and cultural urban area for the first time, has occurred with Bademli Plan (Bademli, 1989; Çakır, Bilgin Altınöz, & Özüduru, 2019). The Ulus Historical City Centre Conservation Plan of Raci Bademli and his team won the first place in the national competition held for the Ulus Historical City Centre Conservation Area and the proposal of the team was approved by the conservation committee in 1990. Bademli Plan proposed a multi layered organization scheme with including not only spatial regulations from urban scale to building scale, but also economic viability and process management from a conservative perspective which considered as an improvement for Turkish urban conservation planning context.

One of the innovation that came with the Bademli Plan for Turkish urban conservation literature was the planning decisions and analyses on functional attributions as well as on the newly structured buildings, their design and construction criteria and their environmental reflections. In addition, Bademli Plan has suggested a strategic approach to the urban conservation issue with proposing an analytical planning structure with melting the concepts of “*staging*”, “*financing*”, “*organization*”, “*management*” and “*participation*” in the same pot of the conservation process. This phenomenon can be considered as a reflection of the influences from global debates such as the enactment of European Conventions of Architectural Heritage and Archaeological Heritage Protection following the international enactments of them. Also, in Bademli Plan it was considered that which actors will be taking place and how the implementation process could be realized by

them.¹³ Therefore, the global issues that has been discussed such as **urban scale protection**, protection while interfering, **governance and participation** came to the fore through Ulus historical area. In 1990 Bademli Plan, it was aimed to conserve the existing urban gabric and cadastral order, apart from some cadastral arrangements made in the following process of Zoning Floor Order Plan until 1990s. According to Avcı Hosanlı and Bilgin Altonöz (2016), this situation manifests itself in the urban area as a conflicted dual cadastral interface (Avcı Hosanlı & Bilgin Altınöz, 2016). Bademli Plan has suggested different conservation models in building scale for Ulus historical area with dividing them according to their building stock capacity, conservation with pure protection and conservation with rehabilitation. This understanding of conservation with diverse conservation approaches and semblances according to the form and the purpose of the intervention, has been an influential development for both Ulus and Ankara. In addition to the spatial detail, square and gathering area rearrangements, green belts and culturally oriented public uses have been proposed for Jewish Quarter. Plan considered as having an urban scale-based geo-cultural identity concern in terms of its consideration of micro and mezzo scale hierarchially (see *Figure 4.15*).

¹³ For further information see: UCTEA Chamber of City Planners (2019). *Ankara'da Yitmekte Olan Kültür ve Tabiat Varlıkları: Mekan, İnsan ve Kentin Tarihi* (Retrieved from: <http://spoankara.org>)




Figure 4.15. Location of Jewish Quarter in 1990 Ulus Historical City Centre Conservation and Rehabilitation (*Bademli*) Plan (top and bottom left) (Source: Bademli, 1989), spatial regulations of Jewish Quarter in 1990 Ulus Historical City Centre Conservation and Rehabilitation (*Bademli*) Plan (right) (rendered by author)

4.2.2.6 Fragmental Plan Period

In 2005, 1990 Bademli Plan was revoked by Ankara Metropolitan Municipality for necessities of urban transformation and renewal/redevelopment areas in Ulus and surroundings (Avcı Hosanlı & Bilgin Altınöz, 2016). With the adoption of Deteriorating Historical and Cultural Property through Renewal and Re-use Act numbered 5366, which was also considered as the beginning of the “Descending Process” of national urban conservation context (see *Figure 4.3* again), Ulus Historical Conservation Area including Jewish Quarter was declared as “renewal

area”. This situation has caused a large amount of discussions and arguments from both academic and practical fields which considers the Bademli Plan as a legal binding spatial plan which must sustained and is against the legal order (Erkal, Kırıl, & Günay, 2005; Tunçer, 2013). The enactment of the Act No. 5366 considered as a milestone in a damaged manner for the conservation of the historical urban fabric and cultural urban heritage for Turkey (Özçakır, Bilgin Altınöz, & Mignosa, 2018).

This situation has revealed that it is contingent for certain authorities to unlawfully repeal and revoke a plan that its bindingness is certain and clear in the legal plane. This notion creates a question mark and an atmosphere of insecurity regarding possible future urban conservation practices, not only for Ulus and its surroundings but also for Ankara as well. As mentioned above, while the negative effects of the fragmented urban practices in Ankara’s past planning process both in urban space and on the social structure of the city are obvious, such fractal and partial approaches are one of the most important factors in the process of geo-cultural identity loss and its spatial affects for historical areas such as Jewish Quarter where the multiculturalism, socio-spatial diversity and cultural capital are extremely crucial.

4.2.2.6.1 Ulus Plan #2: “Hassa Plan”

Following the revocation of Bademli Plan and enactment of the Act No. 5366, a new planning process has begun for Ulus, which has been converted from a “*Historical Conservation Area*” to a “*Historical Renewal Area*”. The “Ankara Historic City Centre Urban Renewal and Conservation Master Plan” was prepared by HASSA Architecture Firm and approved by the council in 2007. As stated in the plan notes of Hassa Plan, the main purpose was to refunctioning the existing residential areas which were considered as to be improved and rehabilitated areas, with assigning them a new spatial labels such as commercial and tourism areas. In order to conduct this refunctioning, neglected residential areas have consigned to a transformation process and the structures to be renewed, re-used or refunctioned are considered as to be restored or deconstructed-reconstructed (Ayhan Koçyiğit, 2019). As can be

understood from the plan decisions, the historical centre of Ankara which has been considered as valued from the Roman period, was only evaluated as “culturally valued” on the basis of Seljuk, Ottoman and early Republican periods. The exclusion of the previous and later periods from this plan’s conservative approach was criticized as a contradiction in terms of universal and national conservation principles practiced for years (UCTEA Chamber of City Planners, 2019; Ayhan Koçyiğit, 2019). Proposals are also criticized by their potential to jeopardize the cultural significance, uniqueness, diversity and integrity of Ulus historical centre. In conclusion, Hassa Plan has been considered as a spatial complication which provides a flexibility under the name of “renewing” to enable the conservation areas to be opened to new developments and presented an attitude completely disconnected from the universal and national “urban conservation” approach.

According to the analytical field researches of Ankara Historic City Centre Urban Renewal and Conservation Master Plan, the historically and culturally valued buildings located in Jewish Quarter has been demonstrated as “ruins” or “heavy repair or demolition needs”. This assessment is an approach that paved the way for the demolition and reconstruction of the area. Also, as can be seen in *Figure 4.16* below, the new and wide square proposals for the neighbourhood are also will cause the destruction or damage of these cultural values. This understanding considered as an havoc that prevents the protection and sustainability of cultural capital, which is one of the components of the geo-cultural identity and it paves the way for the destruction of spatial diversity. Also, this attempt is antipodes with the geo-cultural identity based urban conservation approach. As can be seen in *Figure 4.16* again, the entire neighbourhood defined as “commercial + tourism area” except for the commercial uses in the northern and southern minor parts of the area. According to the plan notes, in commercial + tourism areas, the minimum parcel size for intervention should be 200 m² and in order to achieve this size, the land

amalgamation can be considered.¹⁴ This is a decision that can be provide a legal basis for the destruction of the existing and intricate cadastral pattern of the neighbourhood. Herewith, although the spatial and visual representation of the plan shows that the existing cadastral pattern continues with even the pedestrianization of inner streets, the statements in the plan decisions and plan notes are directly opposite.




Figure 4.16. Location of Jewish Quarter in 2007 Ankara Historic City Centre Urban Renewal and Conservation Master Plan (top and bottom left) (Source: Günay personal archive), spatial regulations of Jewish Quarter in 2007 Ankara Historic City Centre Urban Renewal and Conservation Master Plan (right) (rendered by author)

¹⁴ Ankara Historic City Centre Urban Renewal and Conservation Master Plan Report, 2006, p. 95.

The 2007 Ankara Historic City Centre Urban Renewal and Conservation Master Plan considered as having an artifact-based geo-cultural identity concern as it only states the conservation of the selected cultural features such as the synagogue, but on the other hand it paves the way to demolition and reconstruction of the cultural buildings and structures with residential status.

Another worth mentioning spatial development for Ankara in the ongoing process was the 2023 Ankara Master Plan which was approved in 2007. Although this plan has been criticized with its potential damages to the natural and cultural environment of the city, the plan included macro-scale decisions and did not bring any spatial decision specific to the Jewish Quarter. Ulus district which includes Jewish Quarter as well has been defined as the central business district and no decision has been made regarding urban conservation or cultural identity preservation in micro or mezzo scale (see *Figure 4.17*). But, from the macro perspective, plan defined the synagogue in Jewish Quarter as “*can be considered as valuable in terms of religion tourism*”.¹⁵



Figure 4.17. Location of Jewish Quarter in Ankara 2023 Master Plan (left) (Source: Ankara Metropolitan Municipality Maps and Plans Archive), spatial decision for Jewish Quarter in Ankara 2023 Master Plan (right) (rendered by author)

¹⁵ Ankara 2023 Master Plan Report: Study and Intervention Forms, 2007, p. 394

4.2.2.6.2 Ulus Plan #3: “UTTA Plan”

The 2007 Ankara Historic City Centre Urban Renewal and Conservation Master Plan’s revocation 2008, the next conservation plan regarding Jewish Quarter and its surroundings has prepared by UTTA Planning Firm in 2014. In the intervening 6 years period, Jewish Quarter and its surroundings has been dominated by the “Transition Period Conservation Principles” which have been determined within the scope of the Law No. 2863 (Tunçer, 2013).



Figure 4.18. Location of Jewish Quarter in 2014 Ulus Historic City Centre Conservation Master Plan (top and bottom left) (Source: Ankara Metropolitan Municipality Maps and Plans Archive), spatial regulations of Jewish Quarter in 2014 Ulus Historic City Centre Conservation Master Plan (right) (rendered by author)

Although the plan conducted a very comprehensive spatial analysis and data collection process,¹⁶ it is seen that the plan decisions were taken without reinterpreting the collected data from the urban conservation and geo-cultural identity preservation perspectives. As can be seen in *Figure 4.18* above, Ulus Historic City Centre Conservation Master Plan proposed the total transformation of existing residential settlements to an “*entertainment + accommodation area*” with suggesting an establishment for excursionists. It is obvious that this decision was taken without considering or taking into account the fate of the residents who currently living in the neighbourhood, mostly as tenants.¹⁷ In addition, the plan proposed commercial usages on the Anafartalar Street façade (eastern border of the neighbourhood) which was also defined in previous plans as well. In addition to the wide square arrangements seen in the Hassa Plan, indoor parking areas are proposed as well in the southern part of the neighbourhood. However, the plan did not provide any insight into what kind of activity or use would be on the surface of the indoor parking areas. From this point, UTТА Plan considered as having an artefact-based geo-cultural identity concern as it only proposed the synagogue and mosques are worth protecting as they are in a manner of structural basis. The proposal of the transformation of the existing residential units into entertainment and accommodation units paves the way to demolition and/or reconstruction of the culturally valued buildings with residential status and with diverse, unique architectural features. This issue brings back the discussions has been made in the previous chapter with referring Jacobs (1961)’ emphasis on the protection and sustainability of the diversity and heterogeneity in the physical space in order to conserve the geo-cultural identity.

¹⁶ Spatial analyses of the 2014 Ulus Historic City Centre Conservation Master Plan were provided by Ankara Metropolitan Municipality Maps and Plans Archive in 2021.

¹⁷ Although there is no analysis of the ownership status for the neighbourhood, it is based on the fact that all of randomly selected local community interviewees are tenants and they emphasized during the interviews that most of the residents are tenants in the neighbourhood.




Figure 4.19. Geo-cultural identity concern in conservation practices of Jewish Quarter in comparison with global aspect and Ankara (rendered by the author)

As seen in *Figure 4.19* above, the timeline of the Jewish Quarter for geo-cultural identity concerns in spatial plans regarding it, followed a more different and more fractal structure in comparison with Ankara. The Awakening Period of the national and Ankara-based process with Lörcher and Jansen Plans in terms of geo-cultural identity concern, has reflected itself on Jewish Quarter as much more decreasing

perspective due to the different priorities and the existence of different concerns such as the search for “reproducing a new identity” in both spatial and national manners. The following process with Uybadin-Yücel and Zoning Floor Order Plan has been the most destructive process for the Jewish Quarter and the spatial regulations that accelerated the loss of geo-cultural identity the most. With the Structural Plans and Bademli Plan, issues such as urban scale conservation and protecting the geo-cultural identity have been handled in a much more inclusive way and the spatial proposals have approached these issues hierarchically and analytically, the revocations, illegal practices and subsequent implementations such as Hassa and UTTA projects led to the continuation of the decreasing process of the Jewish Quarter in terms of geo-cultural identity and its loss which is considered as *urban oblivion*.

4.3 Urban Space in Peril: Current Status of Jewish Quarter in the Context of Geo-cultural Identity

“Oblivisci tempta quod didicisti (Relearn the forgotten one).”

(Jansen & Sluijter, 2005)

The spatial transformation process of Jewish Quarter with its planning and policy-making process discussed in previous chapter has unfolded that the neighbourhood has been consigned into oblivion until today’s condition. From this perspective, this chapter will discuss the difference and the changin/transforming process of the neighbourhood in comparison with the past status of the area in order to intensify the urban oblivion process that Jewish Quarter has been experiencing apart from the planning and policy-making implementations occurred in the neighbourhood through history.

In the light of the contemporary debates and developments, it is known that the historical centre of Ankara which aims Ulus and surroundings, including Jewish Quarter, is planned to be involved an urban conservation and urban transformation process in the near future (UCTEA Chamber of City Planners, 2017).

As seen in *Figure 4.20* below, within the reference from İstiklal Neighbourhood Conservation and Rehabilitation Project conducted by METU ARCH 505 Studio in 1988, the mass transformation of the neighbourhood demonstrated from the perspectives of the year 1988 and the year 2020 which was conducted by the author with field observation, basemap analysis and GoogleEarth Historical Imagery Database inputs. It is clearly seen that the neighbourhood is in a process of mass decline, regardless of historical/non-historical or registered/non-registered structures. This is the most obvious indication that the unique, significant and intricate urban fabric of the neighbourhood, which has been discussed in detail above, has changed in over 30 years.




Figure 4.20. Structural Change of Jewish Quarter (1988-2020) (Sources: 1988 İstiklal Neighbourhood Conservation and Rehabilitation Project of METU; Google Earth Historical Imagery Database; field study, 2020-21)

As seen in *Figure 4.21* above, while considering the registered/non-registered buildings transition process in spatial context, the same declining process also continued as well.




Figure 4.21. Structural change of registered buildings in Jewish Quarter (1988-2020) (Sources: 1988 İstiklal Neighbourhood Conservation and Rehabilitation Project of METU; Google Earth Historical Imagery Database; field study, 2020-21)

In the context of building conditions from the same two years' perspective, the changing/transforming process reflected itself in the urban area as increasing number of the ruined, burnt or wracked buildings, increasing number of the buildings with poor physical condition and decreasing number of the buildings with good physical condition (see *Figure 4.22* above). This situation clearly reveals the ineffectiveness of the conservation, transformation or any spatial planning project attempt that aimed the neighbourhood's protection and rehabilitation during these 32 years.




Figure 4.22. Structural change of physical conditions in Jewish Quarter (1988-2020) (Sources: 1988 İstiklal Neighbourhood Conservation and Rehabilitation Project of METU; Google Earth Historical Imagery Database; pre-plan analyses retrieved from UTTA, 2014; field study, 2020-21)

The field observations that conducted for this research reveals the current status of the neighbourhood clearly as in *Figure 4.23* below. The number of neglected and abandoned buildings has increased significantly even in the period of February 2020-June 2021, when the field observations were made by the author. As seen in the photographs taken from the different periods of field observations, the neglected and abandoned buildings are under the peril of demolish. The damage of the structures in the event of a possible fire is much higher, especially for registered structures, since the buildings are predominantly built with using wooden materials, as stated in the METU study dated 1988 (İstiklal Neighbourhood Preservation and Rehabilitation Project, 1988).



Figure 4.23. Abandoned buildings of Jewish Quarter in poor physical condition
(Source: various personal field observations from December 2020 to June 2021)

As mentioned above, in the current period, Ulus Historical Centre and its surroundings that includes Jewish Quarter, come to the fore as a subject in upcoming urban conservation and urban transformation projects, not only by the local government but the central government as well. As can be seen in *Figure 4.24* below, different papers, news, reports has been arguing and discussing the public concerns and questionings about the content, implementation / administration and monitoring actors and the possible consequences of the process. It has become more important recently that this possible processes must be handled comprehensively and in line with the principles of “good conservation” which stated in the previous chapters in detail.



Figure 4.24. Collage of the news and reports about Jewish Quarter and Ulus Historical Centre & surroundings in the periods of 2010-2020 ¹⁸

¹⁸ <https://www.hurriyet.com.tr/yerel-haberler/ankara/onceligimiz-bu-olmasa-da-gec-kalmadan-korunmalı-41483263>; <http://www.mimarlarodasiankara.org/index.php?Did=11427>;

4.4 Assessment of Interviews with Analytical Hierarchy Process

As mentioned in before as in ‘Prelude to Research Methodology’ chapter, in order to evaluate the main hypothesis of the research which is shaped as urban conservation practices are considered successful and sustainable to the extent that geo-cultural identity exists in urban space, research requires to examine in-depth the key components of geo-cultural identity with detailing them within the concept of its loss which is designated as urban oblivion. As mentioned in previous chapters, within the fact that the complex and multi layered literature of the urban conservation and cultural studies, research summoned a holistic methodological approach. Therefore; in order to proposing a broader perspective to the issues and providing an empirical assessment method for examining multiple different variables in same plane objectively, AHP Method has been came to the fore for this research, alongside with the spatial and historical assessments.

As Ferretti et al. (2014) indicated, using AHP Method, as a sub context in Multi-Criteria Decision Making Method and cultural based urban conservation, many of the studies in that field considers the literature-based criteria definitions is at the core of the application of the AHP Method (Ferretti, Bottero, & Mondini, 2014). As discussed in detail in research methodology chapter of the study, for this research, this assessment model has been chosen according to the pro/con table which evaluate the potential methods for urban conservation and cultural identity studies with assessing the performance and/or success of the process or a specific project. From this point, study will use the AHP Method with conducting interviews from selected interest groups, collect the qualitative data as a linguistic format which is fuzzy

¹⁸ <https://www.avlaremaz.com/2020/04/03/yahudi-mahallesindeki-kuskulu-yangin/>;
<https://www.milliyet.com.tr/gundem/ankarada-terk-edilmis-tarihi-iki-konak-yandi-6176964>;
<https://www.sabah.com.tr/ankara-baskent/2019/09/01/ankaranin-kalbinde-donusum-basliyor>
(Accessed in June 2020 – March 2021)

inputs, convert the linguistic qualitative data with defuzzification methods into non-fuzzy analytical inputs and then finally evaluate them.




Figure 4.25. Five stages of Analytical Hierarchy Process (adapted from Saaty, 1980).

As Saaty (1980) indicates, The Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) method is a basic and usefull method for clearing the complex structure in order to conduct an analytical decision making, evaluation and/or performance assessing process (Saaty, 1980). As can be seen in *Figure 4.25* which demonstrates an adaptation of Saaty's (1980) theory on the stages of AHP, the first stage is defined as building a structure based on the literature review. This structure has been conducted according to mainly the *Chapter 2* and *Chapter 3* where the study has discussed the different perspectives and theories from literature reviews. Therefore, the fundamental concepts and epitomized criteria, which are stated in the table below have emerged in order to build the structure of the AHP (*Table 4.2*).

Table 4.2 Formation of the AHP Criteria from Literature Review

Deduced concepts and notions from literature review		Key concept	Epitomized criteria	
1	Protection of the historical buildings	Cultural Capital	C01. Historical built environment	
2	Implementation of the restoration and renovation			
3	Reuse of the historical buildings			
4	Adaptation of the old and decaying historical buildings into modern functions			
5	Physical enhancement			
6	Well-structured transformation process in built environment			
7	Preservation of the historical urban pattern			
8	Economic consolidations	Viability regulations	C02. Economic viability	
9	Land value			
10	Regulations on taxes			
11	Determining the economic needs of the area	Financial support		
12	Determining the public and private sponsorships			
13	Considerations of the public and private resources and sustainable usage of the financial resources			
14	Official renovation/restoration funds from the central governmental organizations			
15	Enhancing the tourism potential of the area			
16	Promotive initiatives from local community and public/private institutions			
17	Public and local community awareness on the cultural identity of the area	Collective memory	C03. Local promotion	
18	Promoting the local culture and collective memory of the area			
19	Including media to increase awareness an attraction			
20	Interaction with past residents, interested groups			

Table 4.2 (continued).

21	Protecting the urban identity of the area	Urban identity	C04. Place identity
22	Protection of the artificial attributes of the area		
23	Protection of the symbolic physical features and landmarks of the area		
24	Protection of the diverse spatial assets and conducting a process for local community awareness	Diversity	C05. Cultural identity
25	Protection of the diverse social and cultural (intangible) values of the area		
26	Partnership with minority associations		
27	Protecting and enhancing the local culture	Local and historical background	C06. Quality of life
28	Historical background of the urban area		
29	Archival research and public communion		
30	Improving and enhancing the local community's quality of life	Social capital	C07. Participation
31	Improving and enhancing the infrastructure		
32	Protection of the resident's rights on landownership and tenant ship		
33	Improving the residential living standards		
34	Maintenance the publicly open and transparent process during the decision-making and implementation		
35	Developing public and private initiatives		
36	Sustainability of the social capital		
37	Developing a community and culture-led agenda	Participation	
38	Social interaction between stakeholders		
39	Strengthen community involvement		
40	Taking the pulse of the local community in regular basis with taking into consideration of problems/opinions		
41	Coordination among government (central and local) and NGOs between local community		

Table 4.2 (continued).

42	Well-structured management system by the local government	Management	C08. Governance
43	Well-structured legislative basis		
44	Implementation and construction of the built environment based on the legislative regulations	Legislative framework	
45	Inspections by the local government of the new constructions or renovations according to its compliance with the legal structure		
46	Establishing an expert team and ensuring that the team's work on future projects	Policy making	
47	An expert team structure that comprehend the place and cultural identity of the heritage area		
48	Establishing a teamwork between different disciplines		

Saaty (1980) as the developer of the method also emphasized and recommends for more analytic output, a face-to-face survey with the people who directly involved in the issue and asking their opinions on pairwise comparisons of determined criteria. According to Saaty (1980), even if the interest group/person is not an expert on the subject, they should at least be a person who know or familiar with the subject and can produce a subjective opinion (Saaty, 1980; Kuruüzüm & Atsan, 2001). From this perspective, study developed a research model in order to evaluate the performance and success of urban conservation processes that Jewish Quarter has been experiencing from the perspective of geo-cultural identity concern or lack of geo-cultural identity concern. For this purpose, as Saaty (1980) indicated, study developed three interest groups as *government group*, *local community group* and *the Jewish community group*.

As mentioned in the prelude chapter of the research methodology before, the importance of an in-depth interview for this study is based on the Saaty's work in 1980 on defining the AHP as a rational research method. In-depth interviews provides wide range of a subjective opinions and considers, while AHP generates an

analytical evaluation setup. Another importance of conducting an in-depth interview is the current global pandemic situation. In this circumstances, conducting in-depth interviews has provided less face-to-face interaction with people yet more time consuming with each participant. When thinking the time consuming factor, it is in fact a component of AHP in any case, therefore the time planning does not considered as an issue for this research, although a structured timing plan has been made. From this point, from May and June of 2021, 16 interviews were conducted within the three interest groups although 12 interviews were determined as efficient for evaluation. As Saaty (1980) and Kuruüzüm & Atsan (2001) emphasized, the knowledge and awareness on the subject were the main consideration while defining the participants for each group. Therefore, the informations such as gender, age or the household informations were excluded from interview and the main focus was their involvement and their profession in order define their involvement. In this respect, the government group included participants from Ankara Metropolitan Municipality, Ankara Metropolitan Municipality Department of Cultural and Natural Assets and Altındağ Municipality. Participants' professions were one urban planner, two architect and one landscape architect. The local community group were identified by the support of the members of Ankara Metropolitan Municipality Department of Cultural and Natural Assets and were conducted with 5 (4 are evaluated as efficient) residents. All of the residents' professions were artisan. Three residents were tenants and one resident was landowner. Interviews with the Jewish community were the most challenging part of the interview process in the study. As one of the Jewish community interviewee has defined, today there are only 35 members exist in Ankara as the members of the community's official association. In this context, members of the Ankara Jewish Community were contacted, again with the support of the Ankara Metropolitan Municipality Department of Cultural and Natural Assets. In addition, interviews with Jewish citizens who have already left

Ankara and immigrated to Israel, but who used to live in Ankara, were also used for the study.¹⁹

As Chen et al. (2017) states, due to the fact that making a pairwise comparison is directly based upon the interviewee's subjective opinion on the issue, the collected data is not in the consideration of a rational thinking. Therefore, the fuzzy set theory has been articulated in this method by Buckley (1985) in order to define the proper defuzzification method for collected quantitative data for converting an input for AHP method (Buckley, 1985; Chen, Yoo, & Hwang, 2017). Therefore, the study will use Weighted Average Method (WAM) as one of the most used defuzzification methods for evaluating a survey/interview based collected data (Radhika & Parvathi, 2016).

From this perspective, the interviewees from three interest groups were asked to conduct a pairwise comparison between the epitomized criteria based on the geo-cultural identity concern in urban conservation process and practices. Their pairwise comparison will conducted according to AHP Method's *Standard Scale of Importance* which defined as in between 1 to 9 according to the difference in importance between each pair of criteria (see *Table 4.3*).

¹⁹ The interviews with the Jewish citizens who used to live in Ankara yet immigrated to Israel, were conducted for a joint study regarding the Jewish Quarter of Ankara, which is being prepared in partnership with *UrbanObscura* and The Union of Turkish Israelis. The recordings of the interviews were accessed with the permission and approval of *UrbanObscura* and The Union of Turkish Israelis. For further information: <https://urbanobscura.net/projeler/ankara-istiklal-yahudi-mahallesi/> and <https://www.turkisrael.org.il/>

Table 4.3 Standard Scale of Importance in AHP (adapted from Saaty, 1980: 54; Kuruüzüm & Atsan, 2001; Chen, Yoo, & Hwang, 2017).

Score	Scale of importance
1	Equal importance
3	Moderate importance
5	Strong importance
7	Very strong importance
9	Extreme importance
2,4,6,8	Reciprocal/in-between values

According to their evaluation and comparison, interviewees were asked to define more detailed subjective opinions according to their assessment between the criteria as well as the scoring table and the semi-structured interview questions which can be found in *Appendix B, C, D* and *E* for each three interest group. The interviews and archived recordings of accessed interviews has been defined as in *Table 4.4* below.

Table 4.4 Interview Details

Interest group	Interviewee/ Evaluator ID	Interview date	Interview platform	Age/Gender
#1 Local government	Evaluator #1	May 20, 2021	On-site	52/Male
	Evaluator #2	May 20, 2021	On-site	34/Female
	Evaluator #3	May 20, 2021	On-site	27/Female
	Evaluator #4	May 20, 2021	On-site	30/Female
#2 Local community	Evaluator #1	June 03, 2021	On-site	61/Male
	Evaluator #2	June 03, 2021	On-site	54/Male
	Evaluator #3	June 03, 2021	On-site	23/Male
	Evaluator #4	June 03, 2021	On-site	25/Male
#3 Jewish community	Evaluator #1	February 14, 2021	Zoom (recorded interview)	81/Female
	Evaluator #2	February 19, 2021	Zoom (recorded interview)	84/Male
	Evaluator #3	11 June, 2021	Zoom	63/Male
	Evaluator #4	13 June, 2021	Zoom	31/Female

From this perspective, firstly the defuzzification method which is chosen as the Weighted Average Method (WAM) has been applied for each group. Every single participant's pairwise comparison will be reevaluate in order to converting the fuzzy linguistic data into non-fuzzy data for an analytical research input. This process provided the "best non-fuzzy performance / importance value" for every interest group to conduct an AHP for each group later. In this context, the geometric average method has been calculated in order to define the weight of the each comparison. According to the evaluated values from comparison weights calculated by the geometric average method, the final importance value of the each interest group has been obtained. After calculating the importance value for each interest group, the AHP Method will be used in order to define the priorities for each group. Therefore, three AHP calculation has been made with using an online software that conduct an automatic calculation for AHP oriented researchs. From this perspective, the PHP and SQL based software which was released by Goepel as a part of his research study. The software called "**AHP-OS**"²⁰ has been used from 2014 and provides a comprehensive and simple tool for conducting a AHP based study with multi criteria (Goepel, 2018). Although the software also provides a defuzzificated basis with using Weighted Sum Method (WSM) and Weighted Product Model (WPM), this study used the program Microsoft Excel for Weighted Average Method (WAM) with using the GEOMEAN and SUM tools in order to generate a more diversified methodologic background and to calculate the weighted sums of the values for AHP. The scoring table and the calculations of the prior criteria, criteria values and criteria weights peculiar to every single interviewee from three interest group, can be found in *Appendix E*.

From this point, according to the result of the first interest group (government group)'s scoring and answering, the Analytical Hierarchy Process Method has been

²⁰ For further information and the template of the AHP-OS software generated by Goepel in 2014, see: <https://bpmsg.com/ahp/>

applied with using AHP-OS software has obtained. For this purpose, the weighted sums of the 4 interviewee's scorings has used as an input for the AHP table. As indicated before, the numeric equivalence of the scoring shaped in between 1-9 points (see *Table 4.3* again). As seen in *Table 4.5* below, in the first step, the AHP Analysis provided a decision matrix by calculating the weights (stated in the rows of the matrix) over the eigenvector for each of the 8 criteria.

Table 4.5 Decision Matrix of the AHP Analysis for Government Group

Criteria									
Criteria		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	1	1	0,33	0,25	0,33	0,33	0,33	0,33	0,33
	2	3,00	1	0,50	3,00	3,00	3,00	2,00	0,25
	3	4,00	2,00	1	0,50	0,50	2,00	3,00	0,50
	4	3,00	0,33	2,00	1	0,50	4,00	3,00	0,50
	5	3,00	0,33	2,00	2,00	1	0,50	0,33	0,50
	6	3,00	0,33	0,50	0,25	2,00	1	2,00	0,50
	7	3,00	0,50	0,33	0,33	3,00	0,50	1	0,25
	8	3,00	4,00	2,00	2,00	2,00	2,00	4,00	1

Table 4.6 AHP Result of the Government Group Interviews

Government Group						
Criteria			Priority (%)	Average Weight	Max (%)	Min (%)
Rank	1	C08. Governance	24,10	14,00	38,80	9,40
	2	C02. Economic viability	16,60	10,90	28,00	5,20
	3	C04. Place identity	14,20	9,30	23,90	4,50
	4	C03. Local promotion	13,50	7,80	21,10	5,90
	5	C05. Cultural identity	10,70	8,30	19,50	1,90
	6	C06. Quality of life	9,00	5,00	14,70	3,30
	7	C07. Participation	8,30	7,70	16,40	0,20
	8	C01. Built environment	3,60	1,50	5,60	1,60

As seen in the *Table 4.6* above, the results of the AHP Analysis of the first interest group which is decided as the Government Group, the priorities for achieving more successful urban conservation approaches with focusing the geo-cultural identity of the Jewish Quarter were predominantly piled around the concepts of **governance, management, legislative framework** and **policy making** which epitomized as **Criteria 08: Governance** as shown in *Table 4.2* before.²¹




Figure 4.26. Consolidated results of the AHP Analysis for government group

The priority rate of the **C08. Governance** criteria calculated as **24.10 %** with the highest ranking among other criteria. The maximum level of the priority rate has calculated as 38.80 % and the minimum level of the priority rate calculated as 9.40 %. Therefore, their arithmetic mean (24.10 %) has gave the priority rate of the government group. The average weight of the Governance criteria is determined as 14.00 with the highest weight as well. This resulted the C08. Governance criteria's selection as the most important criteria with the highest value of the priority rate for

²¹ All of the raw results obtained from AHP-OS software were reproduced in Microsoft Excel due to the concerns for the visual structure of the thesis.

government group. According to the AHP Analysis of the government group, following criteria has determined as Economic viability with the 2nd rank, Place identity with the 3rd rank, Local promotion with the 4th rank, Cultural identity with the 5th rank, Quality of life, with the 6th rank, Participation with the 7th rank and Built environment with 8th rank. The summarized weight values have determined in order as Economic viability with 10.90, Place identity with 9.30, Cultural identity with 8.30, Local promotion with 7,80, Participation with 7,70, Quality of life with 5.00 and lastly the Built environment with the numeric value of 1,50. It is understood from this that for the Government Group, the most important criteria for a successful, effective, “good” geo-cultural identity oriented urban conservation approach, is the **Governance**, while the less important criteria has shaped as the **Built environment**.




Figure 4.27. Comparison of the weight value and priority rate of Government Group according to AHP Analysis

In this context, it is apparent that the weight values and priority rates are nearly in the same direction for the government group. Although, as can be seen in *Figure 4.27* above, it is also worth mentioning that there are some differences between weight values and priority rates. It is noticeable that the criteria that makes the difference between priority and weight is the Participation. This means that although the Participation criteria has placed in 7th row of priority, it is the criteria with the highest + or – difference between the other criteria in terms of importance according to the interviewees pairwise comparison.

In this context, in-depth interviews with government officials from Ankara Metropolitan Municipality Department of Cultural and Natural Assets and Altındağ Municipality were deciphered and the views on the Governance criteria which has the highest degree of importance, the Built environment criteria which has the lowest degree of importance and the Participation criteria which created the maximum difference on pairwise comparisons were analysed in more detail.

As a natural consequence of the fact that the group with which the interviews were conducted was directly involved in the concept of governance itself, the interviewees argued that the concept of governance is the most important criteria in improving and developing geo-cultural identity oriented urban conservation practices regarding Jewish Quarter. In addition to the four components of the geo-cultural identity which are discussed in detail in the literature review chapters, the concept of governance - as unfolded in the historical and spatial transformation process of the Jewish Quarter in previous chapter- which considered as is a crucial agent in terms of being “the developer”, “the implementer” and “the controller” at the same time. The key issue in here, as revealed, especially when thinking the revocation of the Ulus Conservation Plans in the past by one single and arguable authority without any scientific or consolidated background, the forcefulness of the governmental effect on urban area, or in this case, Jewish Quarter, is quite clear.

Another important point that unfolded with the in-depth interviews, is the effect of the Participation criteria which considered as the criteria that makes the difference

between priority and weight the most. The interviewees stated that the discussions and opinions produced by different institutions and organizations based on a common concern regarding an urban area which considered as worth protecting, can sometimes create conflicts. They stated that especially NGOs and chambers can be placed in a challenging role in the process from time to time, which creates a difficult process to handle for the local government.

The AHP analysis of the second interest group which decided as the Local Community Group, provided a decision matrix by calculating the weights (stated in the rows of the matrix) over the eigenvector for each of the 8 criteria, as seen in *Table 4.7* below.

Table 4.7 Decision Matrix of the AHP Analysis for Local Community Group

Criteria									
Criteria		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	1	1	5,00	4,00	2,00	2,00	2,00	0,50	3,00
	2	0,20	1	2,00	0,25	0,25	0,20	0,20	0,25
	3	0,25	0,50	1	0,33	0,25	0,20	0,20	2,00
	4	0,50	4,00	3,00	1	1,00	0,33	0,50	4,00
	5	0,50	4,00	4,00	1,00	1	0,33	0,50	3,00
	6	0,50	5,00	5,00	3,00	3,00	1	0,33	3,00
	7	2,00	5,00	5,00	2,00	2,00	3,00	1	2,00
	8	0,33	4,00	0,50	0,25	0,33	0,33	0,50	1

Table 4.8 AHP Result of the Local Community Group Interviews

Local Community Group						
		Criteria	Priority (%)	Average Weight	Max (%)	Min (%)
Rank	1	C01. Built environment	24,70	12,40	37,30	12,10
	2	C07. Participation	19,20	6,70	26,40	12,00
	3	C06. Quality of life	15,70	9,00	22,10	9,30
	4	C04. Place identity	11,70	4,90	16,90	6,50
	5	C05. Cultural identity	11,50	3,70	16,10	6,90
	6	C08. Governance	6,20	4,00	11,20	1,20
	7	C03. Local promotion	4,40	2,99	7,70	1,10
	8	C02. Economic viability	3,60	1,90	6,00	1,20

As seen in the *Table 4.8* above, the results of the AHP Analysis of the second interest group which is decided as the Local Community Group, the priorities for achieving more successful urban conservation approaches with focusing the geo-cultural identity of the Jewish Quarter were majorly based on the key concept of **cultural capital** which epitomized as **Criteria 01: Built environment** as shown in Table 4.2 before. Also, it is notable that the second importance criteria which is **Criteria 07: Participation** and the third importance criteria which is **Criteria 06: Quality of life** were closely followed the highest ranking criteria with high values. For instance, the Quality of life and Built environment criteria have reached noticeable average weight according to the decision matrix shaped accordingly to the interviewee's responses.




Figure 4.28. Consolidated results of the AHP Analysis for local community group

The priority rate of the **C01. Built environment** criteria calculated as **24.70 %** with the highest ranking among other criteria. The maximum level of the priority rate has calculated as 37.30 % and the minimum level of the priority rate calculated as 12.60 %. Therefore, their arithmetic mean (24.70 %) has gave the priority rate of the local community group. The average weight of the Built environment criteria is determined as 12.40 with the highest weight as well. This resulted the C01. Built environment criteria's selection as the most important criteria with the highest value of the priority rate for local community group.

According to the AHP Analysis of the local community group, following criteria has determined as Participation with the 2nd rank, Quality of life with the 3rd rank, Place identity with the 4th rank, Cultural identity with the 5th rank (which is same with the government group), Governance with the 6th rank, Local promotion with the 7th rank and Economic viability with 8th rank. The summarized weight values have determined in order as Built environment with 6.70, Quality of life with 9.00, Place identity with 4.90, Cultural identity with 3.70, Governance with 4.00, Local promotion with 2.99 and lastly Economic viability with the numeric value of 1,90. It

is understood from this that for the Local Community Group, the most important criteria for a successful, effective, “good” geo-cultural identity oriented urban conservation approach, is the **Built environment** criteria, while the less important criteria has shaped as the **Economic viability**. This shown the sharp difference between the government group and the local community group in general which will be discussed in detail in the comparison section of all the interest groups.




Figure 4.29. Comparison of the weight value and priority rate of Local Community Group according to AHP Analysis

From same perspective, it is apparent that the weight values and priority rates are nearly in the same direction for the government group. Although, as can be seen in *Figure 4.29* above, the average weight value of the Quality of life and Governance criteria differed from the importance priority rate. From this, it understood that the

Quality of life and Governance criteria are the most difference-making criteria according to local community.

The next interest group was identified as Jewish Community, that referring -as previously mentioned- the members of the Ankara Jewish Community Presidency and the immigrated citizens from Ankara to Israel, whom reached within the support and the database of *UrbanObscura* ²² and The Union of Turkish Israelis. As in government and local community groups, the AHP Method has been applied for Jewish community group. The weighted sums of the 2 interviewee's scorings and collected data from already conducted 2 interviews ²³ by The Union of Turkish Israelis has used as an input for evaluation table. As indicated before, the numeric equivalence of the scoring shaped in between 1-9 points (see Table 4.3 again). As seen in *Table 4.9* below, in the first step, the AHP Analysis provided a decision matrix by calculating the weights over the eigenvector for 8 criteria.

Table 4.9 Decision Matrix of the AHP Analysis for Jewish Community Group

Criteria									
Criteria		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	1	1	2,00	2,00	0,22	0,25	2,00	2,00	4,00
	2	0,50	1	0,25	0,25	0,20	1,00	0,50	0,50
	3	0,50	4,00	1	0,20	0,20	2,00	3,00	2,00
	4	3,00	4,00	5,00	1	1,00	3,00	3,00	3,00
	5	4,00	5,00	5,00	1,00	1	3,00	3,00	3,00
	6	0,50	1,00	0,50	0,33	0,33	1	0,50	0,50
	7	0,50	2,00	0,33	0,33	0,33	2,00	1	1,00
	8	0,25	2,00	0,50	0,33	0,33	2,00	1,00	1

²² *UrbanObscura*; –as stated on their website- is an interactive digital archiving project that maps the ecological, architectural, social and cultural status and transformation of cities through relevant data. For further information see: <https://urbanobscura.net/>

²³ From 5 interviews, 2 were selected according to their suitability for this research.

Table 4.10 AHP Result of the Jewish Community Group Interviews

Jewish Community Group						
Criteria			Priority (%)	Weight	Max (%)	Min (%)
Rank	1	C05. Cultural identity	27,50	13,20	41,10	13,90
	2	C04. Place identity	25,50	11,50	37,20	13,80
	3	C01. Built environment	12,80	6,60	19,70	5,90
	4	C03. Local promotion	10,50	5,40	16,20	4,80
	5	C07. Participation	7,10	2,00	9,10	5,10
	6	C08. Governance	6,90	2,20	9,00	4,80
	7	C06. Quality of life	5,30	2,00	7,50	3,10
	8	C02. Economic viability	4,40	1,30	6,00	2,80

As seen in the *Table 4.10* above, the results of the AHP Analysis of the third interest group which is decided as the Jewish Community Group, the priorities for achieving more successful urban conservation approaches with focusing the geo-cultural identity of the Jewish Quarter were majorly based on the key concept of **diversity** and **local and historical background** which epitomized as **Criteria 05: Cultural identity**. Also, it is notable that the second importance criteria which is Criteria 04: Place identity closely followed the highest ranking criteria with strong values.

The priority rate of the **C05. Cultural identity** criteria calculated as **25.50 %** with the highest ranking among other criteria. The maximum level of the priority rate has calculated as **41.10 %** which is the highest rate among all three groups, and the minimum level of the priority rate calculated as **13.90 %**. Therefore, their arithmetic mean (27.50 %) has gave the priority rate of the Jewish community group. The average weight of the Cultural identity criteria is determined as 13.20 with the highest weight as well. Therefore, C05. Cultural identity criteria emerged as the most important criteria with the highest value of the priority rate for Jewish community.




Figure 4.30. Consolidated results of the AHP Analysis for Jewish community group

According to the AHP Analysis of the Jewish community group, following criteria has determined as Place identity with the 2nd rank, Built environment with the 3rd rank, Local promotion with the 4th rank, Participation with the 5th rank, Governance with the 6th rank (which is the same with the local community group), Quality of life with the 7th rank and Economic viability with 8th rank (which also is the same with the local community group). The summarized weight values have determined in order as, Cultural identity with 13.20, Place identity with 11.50, Built environment with 6.60, Local promotion with 5.40, Participation with 2.00, Governance with 2.20, Quality of life with 2.00 and lastly Economic viability with 1.30 (see *Figure 4.30* and *Figure 4.31*). It is understood from this that for the Jewish Community Group, the most important criteria for a successful, effective, “good” geo-cultural identity oriented urban conservation approach, is the **Cultural identity** criteria, while the less important criteria has shaped as the **Economic viability**, same as the local community group. This shown the sharp difference between the government group and the Jewish community group in general and the similarity with the local community group.




Figure 4.31. Comparison of the weight value and priority rate of Jewish Community Group according to AHP Analysis

As seen in *Figure 4.31* above, differently from government group and local community group, the 8 criteria of the AHP Analysis followed a parallel course for Jewish community group. The details from the in-depth interviews conducted with the participants from Jewish community of Ankara and with the Jewish immigrants will be taken into consideration in detail.

After conducting the AHP for all three interest groups, in order to unfold the average evaluation for the research, 4th AHP analysis will be conducted between the average values from every single interest group.

Table 4.11 AHP Result of Interest Groups

	Government Group AHP			Local Community Group AHP			Jewish Community Group AHP			Average AHP		
Criteria	Rank	Priority (%)	Weight	Rank	Priority (%)	Weight	Rank	Priority (%)	Weight	Rank	Priority (%)	Weight
C01. Built environment	8	3,60	1,50	1	24,70	12,40	3	12,80	6,60	3	14,10	10,20
C02. Economic viability	2	16,60	10,90	8	3,60	1,90	8	4,40	1,30	8	3,50	1,10
C03. Local promotion	4	13,50	7,80	7	4,40	2,99	4	10,50	5,40	5	12,20	9,90
C04. Place identity	3	14,20	9,30	4	11,70	4,90	2	25,50	11,50	1	20,70	8,60
C05. Cultural identity	5	10,70	8,30	5	11,50	3,70	1	27,50	13,20	2	20,50	12,30
C06. Quality of life	6	9,00	5,00	3	15,70	9,00	7	5,30	2,00	7	13,20	10,80
C07. Participation	7	8,30	7,70	2	19,20	6,70	5	7,10	2,00	4	13,20	10,80
C08. Governance	1	24,10	14,00	6	6,20	4,00	6	6,90	2,20	6	8,70	6,10

As can be seen in *Table 4.11* above, the average priority rate for all three interest groups is **C04: Place identity** which referred the broadest criteria in the context of geo-cultural identity which is considered as the place-based cultural identity. Criteria 04 has been comprehending the physical and social values of the neighbourhood with considering the cultural background with relating it directly with the physical environment, differently from the Criteria 05: Cultural identity. On the other hand, C05: Cultural identity is close second, while followed by C01: Built environment, C07: Participation, C03: Local promotion, C08: Governance, C06: Quality of life and lastly C02: Economic viability. As seen in *Figure 4.32* below, the highest of the maximum priority values belongs to the C05: Cultural identity, yet the average priority rate of the C04: Place identity is the highest. Therefore, it is apparent that even though the C04 shaped as the highest ranking priority for all the participants, C05 is noticeably close to the first ranking criteria which should be emphasized.




Figure 4.32. Consolidated results of the average AHP Analysis for interest groups




Figure 4.33. Comparison of the weight value and priority rate of interest groups according to AHP Analysis

As seen in *Figure 4.32* and *Figure 4.33* above, the most difference-making criteria is the C02: Economic viability. This criteria is the second ranking for the government group, on the other hand for local and Jewish community members, economic viability is in among the less important criteria of all 8.

As mentioned before, with considering the in-depth interviews for all three groups in more detailed, there are some highlights to emphasize in order to discuss the results of the Analytical Hierarchy Process of the research.

As the most ranking criteria; C04: Place identity and the most scored criteria, C05: Cultural identity according to the average AHP, geo-cultural identity context came to the fore as a crucial and essential concept for the successful and “good” conservation, as stated with the detailed literature background of the thesis.

“After the ‘*aliyah*’,²⁴ the neighbourhood was abandoned, as far as we know no one took care of the place and the whole neighbourhood turned into a pile of ruins with all of the memories.” - *Evaluator #2 of the Jewish community group, migrated from Ankara in 1952.*

“Even if it would be a ruinous neighbourhood for someone else from outside, the situation is different for us. Even the sounds coming from the houses while walking on the streets make us feel safe and belong here.” - *Evaluator #2 of the local community group*

The responses and thoughts of the participants unfolded the fact that the physical structure of the neighbourhood including its historical buildings with bay windows and narrow, intricate streets, has a social meaning beyond its visuality. As discussed by Jacobs (1961), historical buildings and structure in an urban area considered as a spatial input for generating more diverse, culturally tolerated and liveable community (Jacobs, 1961). Although Jacobs (1961) discussed this notion in terms of

²⁴ “Aliyah” is a word that describes the immigration of Jews from the diaspora to Israel.

the diversity that historical and old buildings add to the urban area, she also argued that the existence of such concepts for local people living in that urban area, brings certain components of geo-cultural identity to the fore. This discussion was also enhanced by Newman (1972) in the context of “defensible space” with emphasizing the importance of the sense of urban belonging for urban identity (Newman, 1972). Therefore, the inputs for urban conservation within the respect of geo-cultural identity preservation must be handled in with built environment’s attached components with social capital emphasize.

“I was born and raised in this neighbourhood. Every single street corner is full of memories. For that reason, leaving this neighbourhood would be like being without air for me.” - *Evaluator #2 of the local community group*

Another highlight from the participant responses of the in-depth interview was the discussion of the importance of collective memory which is considered as one of the components of geo-cultural identity previously. As Assmann (1995) indicated, and discussed in the identity concept’s evolution in *Chapter 2*, the transition process of the personal memory into the collective memory which directly relates the cultural identity has been occurred with everyday communication in local community throughout time (Assmann, 1995). In this respect, not only the past memories from the Jewish community of Ankara that has been transitioned into today, the current communication in Jewish Quarter among current residents of the neighbourhood is also an input of this ongoing transition process. Memories are still being collected and they must take under consideration in the future conservation practices, according to the local community participants.

From present to the past, the local community and the Jewish community groups emphasized the importance of geo-cultural identity of the Jewish Quarter with its physical and cultural components from the past owners which are the Jewish community of Ankara. Their significant statements are given below in this regard.

“I still remember my grandfather's (*Aaron Araf*) magnificent mansion, after they sequestered it by the Capital Tax Law in 1940s. The walls were blank, the carpets, chandeliers were gone and they only had left two empty beds. The fact that I spent my life as a Jew in Turkey never bothered me, but when we lost everything after the Capital Tax, he suffered a trauma. Not only were our family, but all Jewish families in Ankara were shattered by this incident.” - *Evaluator #2 of the Jewish community group, age: 84, migrated from Ankara in 1952*

The cultural capital of the neighbourhood as a heritage from the Jewish community of Ankara has reflected its value and importance on current residents of the neighbourhood as well. The participants from local community group also indicated the architectural and cultural significance of the historical buildings has an essential impact on the neighbourhood's identity. Therefore, the cultural significance component which stated in Burra Charter, also recognized by the current residents.

“Generations before us have lived with Jews for years and there was never been a problem between them. Even the differences between them have added great means to the people of this neighbourhood.” - *Evaluator #2 of the local community group*

“The fact that Jews lived here before us provides great importance for the neighbourhood, the details of their houses and their architecture are very different than ours. Lots of windows and high ceilings in houses, these are very valuable for us.” - *Evaluator #4 of the local community group*

“The existence of the historical, old buildings from different historical layers of Ankara is significantly important for sustainability of the urban identity as well as for cultural identity.” – *Evaluator #1 of the government group, age: 27, urban planner*

The important factors to consider in possible future conservation approaches aiming Jewish Quarter are also included among the issues discussed by local community group during interviews. As seen in the AHP results, the importance of participation for the process is emphasized. The participants expressed that they do not desire the project under the name of “urban conservation” or “rehabilitation” that may cause displacement of them or a succession/invasion process as experienced by the Jewish community of Ankara in the past. In addition, they stated that they have crucial concerns and distrust on the government and the administrative authorities regarding this possibility. According to their responses and thoughts on the issue, local community’s everyday life is also a part of the current geo-cultural identity of the neighbourhood now and this should not be consigned into oblivion.

“If we are to preserve history, there should be elder people who look out of their window to the street, children play in front of their door. If the government is to restore these buildings and use them for themselves, it will not be preserving the history.” - *Evaluator #4 of the local community group*

“The end of this neighbourhood should not be like Hamamönü, things should not be done to displace us. Most of us cannot adopt to living in an apartment or in a site.” - *Evaluator #3 of the local community group*

As discussed before, there are plans and forecasts for conducting an urban transformation project aiming Jewish Quarter and surroundings. The important criteria in here to discuss is the consideration of geo-cultural identity with all of the components from different layers of the city. These layers refer not only the built environment, historical buildings with diverse architectural values or the current residents’ lifestyle and living conditions, they also refer and summon a comprehensive handling within the consideration of layers from the past, place and policy.

From this perspective, it is arguable that the produced geo-cultural identity of Jewish Quarter by past owners which was the Jewish community of Ankara can be evaluated as first subjects of socio-structural change of the area. Urban planning and urban conservation as the legible tool of spatial transformation, took the foremost place in that changing process. The acknowledgement of materialistic and pragmatic approach manifested itself in Jewish Quarter as the trigger for geo-cultural identity loss. As emphasized by many scholars like Augé, Plate and different others, the absence of geo-cultural identity, its cultural destruction and the existence of *forgotten memories*, paved the way for construction of new cultural identities, and therefore, new spaces that are the spatial reflections of them.

Planning and conservation have adopted different approaches in different periods of Ankara. As seen in this chapter, some attempts that were implemented ignored the inherited cultural value, on the other hand, some strategic approaches were experienced by the neighbourhood which can be considered as successful in terms of acknowledging the diversity and multi-layered cityscape as a value. This is indisputably an indication that urban space is the scene that this displacement and replacement cycle occurred and is the most legible entity for observing its results.

CHAPTER 5

FINAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

The concept of geography as a broad discipline involves the spatial, morphological and geographical components of an area from the physical perspective. Culture on the other hand combines the accumulation of the knowledge, experience, memory and heritage as a value. In this respect, the research has placed the concept of *geo-cultural identity* in its core and unfolded that every *cultural being* that belongs or feels attached to a *place* is one of the component that define that *place's identity*, through urban conservation theory.

Conservation theory and practice tends to elaborate the cultural emphasis with proposing physical regulations or transformations in an urban area, city centre or in an intricate, old neighbourhood. As manifested in this study, this attempt usually failed as a result of unfinished process, unsuccessful approaching or conflicts between the enforcer and the executer. The places where the reflections of this loop of political struggles and power conflicts on the urban space can be observed most clearly are, undoubtedly the conservation areas.

Therefore, this chapter will construct an abridged structure of the research and try to provide a critical assessment. Finally, from the perspective of the critical assessment, proposals and the need for rethinking urban conservation will be emphasized.

5.1 Synopsis of the Research

Following the introduction, the research deals with the relationship between *identity* and *place* in the cultural context. Therefore, the emergence of the *geo-cultural identity* has been positioned at the core of the research, as mentioned before.

The second chapter from this perspective, discussed the paradigm shift of the identity context from historical and conceptual viewpoints. From “I”, to “we” and from “we” to “all” is the simplest definition of this paradigm shift. The personal identity with ontological perspective has been transformed into the impersonal identity with sociological perspective. In the light of the contemporary discussions regarding this issue has been shaped around the understanding of *multiculturalist identity* within the framework of knowledge economy. From this point, the selection of the case area brings another important cruciality with its diverse, multicultural background and the *oblivion* process of this background in today’s circumstances.

After revealing the relationship between geo-cultural identity and urban space, the issues such as securing the geo-cultural identity’s sustainability or preserving and conserving the cultural identity of a geographical territory (which also refers the same issue) came to the fore. This research defined this issue as a reflection of geo-cultural identity loss and searched its results in urban area. From this point *urban oblivion*, as a new concept and identification emerged for this research.

The discussions has been made accordingly to the concept of urban oblivion, the criticism of the urban conservation practices, as both cause and remedy of the urban oblivion, has been brought to the fore. In this respect, the third chapter of the research discussed the urban conservation field, both theoretically and practically. The historical evolution process has been discussed in global and national contexts in order to provide a holistic comprehension of the field. At this point, study submitted a prelude chapter for methodological framework within the reference from global cases and literature reviews. Thereafter, as an introduction to the case study, the national context has been discussed in more detail within the considerations of legislative regulations, current circumstances and the conceptual changes throughout history.

The fourth chapter shaped as the case study chapter that focused on Ankara and its spatial transformation process within the framework of urban conservation policy and praxis. This chapter provided a broad and detailed discussions on Jewish

Quarter's spatial transformation process within the pursuits of geo-cultural identity scope for each plan, project or implementation from a historical perspective. After this detailed discussion, the comparisons of Jewish Quarter and Ankara with the global context has been revealed. This unfolded the difference not only between global cases and the city of Ankara, but also between Ankara and Jewish Quarter as well. For instance, Jansen Plan as an essential and significant development for Ankara at several points, manifested itself in a destructive way and caused the considerably first de-identification.

In following, in order to reveal the current physical status of the neighbourhood, several spatial analyses and field observations has been discussed in detail. From this point, for a further assessment the method of Analytical Hierarchy Process has been used in order to provide an evaluation of urban conservation performance regarding Jewish Quarter and also to establish a multi-layered perspective for assessing the issue with bringing different interest group's opinions and discussions to the fore.

5.2 Proposals: A Call for Rethinking of Urban Conservation

"Passive" planning approach's result focused applications instead of pragmatic and process focused applications create unrecalable impacts on conservation areas more so than the rest of the urban areas. It can clearly be observed that top-down political decisions did not create positive improvements in the Jewish Quarter which currently goes through disappearance and loss of cultural value. It seems impractical to assume that such singular and harsh transformation approaches to conservation unlike many successful transformation examples that have been completed in Ulus and surrounding area, will evolve in a positive direction.

Based on this, it is clearly seen that contemporary pluralist, comprehensive and diverse approaches belonging to cultural context instead of singular and standardized approaches that are being left behind since the 18th century should be realized. This study, combines *place* and *identity* contexts with this contemporary approach and

shapes *good conservation* understanding through this overlap. As Larkham (1996) states, a planner's role as the mediator and creator of the process is quite essential. The planner is required to create a framework independent from the power struggles and conflicts. The situations where the planner cannot sustain this environment and acts as the "evil planner" similar to *Private Eye*, the results will have direct impacts on urban space and the price will be paid by the identity of space and the space itself (Larkham, 1996). This will be an inevitable outcome when the components of the urban identity are not included in the planning process since the beginning.

Jewish Quarter which has stood as a living proof of incorrect scenarios is not the focal conservation area in this context, simply to prove the hypothesis of the study but more so, a standpoint of the framework of the literature in the real world. Jewish Quarter stands in the heart of the historical centre of this capital city, as a place where its pictures are getting ancient in the archives and its urban structure values are getting demolished or burned. In addition to its cultural heritage value through past memories and collective realities, this area continues to culturally grow through the existing population's new memories. Physical, social and cultural diversity created by different ethnic groups transforms through the creation of memories by new groups. Through this transformation process as Augé (2004) states, while some of the past values of an area is being forgotten, some new values take their place (Augé, 2004). This circulation points to the fact that urban conservation is in fact similar to the pendulum's swing rather than a linear timeline. For this reason, it will be meaningful to consider the reflection of *oblivion* on urban space as *keeping the new on its place while remembering what has been lost*.

In this context, "identity" and "space" should not simply be taken into consideration as simple keywords used in future conservation plans. This study offers the following as a tool to incorporate these terms as tangible components of the planning process:

- Transformation and change of passive planning understanding
- Using bottom-up approaches instead of top-down approaches

- Redefinition of legal and political decisions as “conservation” and “ensuring the sustainability” instead of “transformation” tools
- Continuation of conservation approaches with focus on the process rather than the end result
- Development of a strategic perspective and usage of strategic planning principles
- Incorporation of a historical and geographical approaches into conservation
- Inclusion of the components of space identity throughout the conservation process

These principles are globally and also nationally -even within certain short periods- applied. For this reason, these principles should be undertaken as approaches that are not experimental but rather rational through the collective results and feedbacks.

When Ankara through Ulus and Ulus through Jewish Quarter is considered, it is obvious that the planner’s role in conservation decision is incredibly important. It can be said that the success of the planning practices will go hand in hand with the ability of the planner to internalize the principles above and to resist outside influences. It should also be noted that legal framework is quite essential. The legal framework has the ability to promote a disposition similar to what has been experienced by the Jewish population of the quarter through Capital Tax Law, or the ability to secure the existence of intangible terms such as identity-culture-memory. A correct and complete definition of component tools and application of these tools with a pluralist, inclusive and holistic perspective, can ensure the future of cultural values.

Furthermore, clearly the most essential reality in this is the space itself. The cycle of value change in terms of capital, takes place in the urban space (*Figure 5.1*). Hence, space is where identity is created, defended and forgotten. For this reason, it should be noted that urban space is and always will be the scene of the cycle above and is the main component of all possible policy applications, decisions and laws.



Figure 5.1. The cycle of value in geo-cultural identity

As seen in *Figure 5.1* above, the cycle of value in terms of geo-cultural identity refers the previous theoretical discussions on urban oblivion which addressed the dialectic relationship between remembering and forgetting as Plate (2016) indicated (Plate, 2016). From the same perspective, as a spatial output of this relation, *urban oblivion*, encounters the relation with resulting constructing and reconstructing process in urban space. In this sense, the concept of *displacement* and *socio-structural change* considered as neutral components when it comes to the value loss or value gain. This neutrality also refers the Augé (2004)'s perspective on oblivion and it both positive and negative outcomes. As in the case of Jewish Quarter of Ankara, decayed members of Jewish community and their inherited geo-cultural identity has consigned into oblivion, while new members of the local community are reconstructing their own. This, again, brings a further questioning on the counter arguments on inherited and constructed geo-cultural identities and their spatial outputs.

As mentioned before, this whole cycle of value loss and value gain in urban area considered as a spatially and politically produced process by the government. In that point, the discussions on good conservation and the role of the planner as Larkham (1996) emphasized, comes to the fore again. As in several cases from both Ankara and Jewish Quarter, conservation planning should be handled by embracing the diversity and significance on both socio-cultural and spatial levels. For this comprehension, instead of enforcing top-down pragmatic and materialistic planning approaches, more subtle, detailed and refined analysis process in every level should be carried out. The importance of local involvement, transparent process and in overall, strategic approaching must be placed at the core of conservation planning.

5.3 Recommendations for Further Studies

This research provided a broad discussion and evaluation of geo-cultural identity based urban conservation approaches executed in Ankara and Jewish Quarter. The methodological structure for further studies may be carried out with broader sample group in order to construct much more diverse, rational and objective algorithm. At this point, this research can be considered as limited due to pandemic conditions.

From the theoretical structure of the research, the possible future study will be addressed in the context of multiculturalist thinking and multi-layered conservation practices. As Sandercock (1998) stated, multiculturalist thinking has a profound effect on the shaping of the cities and regions of the next millennium and leading to the central importance of a new *cultural politics of difference* (Sandercock, 1998). Therefore, as an open and on-progress field, the relation between the cultural geography and urban conservation will be taken under the consideration from the multiculturalist perspective. In a manner of spatial terms, the multiculturalist thinking brings the concept of *cosmopolis* and the *cultural spaces* with emphasizing the spatial diversity in cities. The truth is, in today's conditions, it is inevitable for urban conservation literature to continue the discussions within the emphasis on "socio-spatial diversity" and "cultural geography" progressively.

REFERENCES

- Aboutorabi, M. (2018). Culture, Space, and Place: An Inquiry into the Urban Landscape of Multicultural Cities. *Journal of Engineering and Architecture*, 6(2), 7-19.
- Ağlamaz, L. (2015, October 26). Şalom. (D. Niyego, Interviewer) Retrieved December 12, 2020, from Political and Cultural Newsweekly: <https://www.salom.com.tr/arsiv/haber-96861-once-upon-a-time-there-were-jews-in-ankara.html>
- Akçura, T., & Çapar, M. (1973). İmar Planlarında Tarihi Kent Dokusu ve Tarihi Eserlerle İlgili Tutumların İncelenmesi. *Mimarlık Dergisi*, 11(8), 8-11. Retrieved from <http://dergi.mo.org.tr/dergiler/4/462/6798.pdf>
- Altaban, Ö. (1978). Cumhuriyet'in Kent Planlama Politikaları ve Ankara Deneyimi. In Y. Sey (Ed.), *75 Yılda Değişen Kent ve Mimarlık* (pp. 41-64). İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Ashworth, G. J. (2005). *Senses of Place: Senses of Time*. (B. Graham, Ed.) Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Ashworth, G. J., Graham, B., & Tunbridge, J. E. (2007). *Pluralising Pasts: Heritage, Identity and Place in Multicultural Societies*. London: Pluto Press.
- Assmann, J. (1995). Collective Memory and Cultural Identity. *New German Critique*, 65, 125-133.
- Atkins, P., Brian, R., & Ian, S. (2014). *People, Land and Time. An Historical Introduction to the Relations Between Landscape, Culture and Environment*. New York: Routledge.
- Augé, M. (2004). *Oblivion*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Avcı Hosanlı, D., & Bilgin Altınöz, G. A. (2016). Ankara İstiklal (Yahudi) Mahallesi: Tarihi, Dokusu ve Konutları. *Turkish Academy of Science Journal of Cultural Inventory (TÜBA-KED)*, 14, 71-104.
- Avcıoğlu, S. (2016). Tarihi Çevrelerde Kentsel Koruma ve Kentsel Yenileme Eğilimleri: Yasal ve Yönetmelik Çerçeve. *Journal of Urban Studies*, 7(20), 698-719.
- Avrami, E., Mason, R., & De la Torre, M. (2000). *Values and Heritage Conservation: Research Report*. Los Angeles, CA: Getty Conservation Institute.
- Aydın, S., Türkoğlu, Ö., Emiroğlu, K., & Özsoy, E. D. (2005). *Küçük Asya'nın Bin Yüzü: Ankara*. Ankara: Dost Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Ayhan Koçyiğit, E. S. (2019). A Tale of Ulus Square: Emergence, Transformation and Change. *Journal of Ankara Studies*, 7(1), 27-73.
- Bademli, R. (1989). *Ulus Historical City Centre Conservation Plan*. Ankara: METU Faculty of Architecture Project Team Archive.
- Bahar, B. L. (2003). *Efsaneden Tarihe: Ankara Yahudileri*. İstanbul: Pan Yayıncılık.
- Bali, R. N. (1999). *Cumhuriyet Yıllarında Türkiye Yahudileri: Bir Türkleştirme Serüveni (1923-1945)*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Balibar, É., & Wallerstein, I. (1991). *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*. London: Verso.
- Bandarin, F., & van Oers, R. (2012). *The Historic Urban Landscape: Managing Heritage in an Urban Century*. West Sussex: Wiley & Blackwell.
- Barker, C., & Jane, E. A. (2016). *Cultural Studies: Theory and Practice*. London: SAGE Publications.

- Baş, Y. (2010). *Production of Urban Form as the Reproduction of Property Relations Morphogenesis of Yenışehir-Ankara*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Ankara.
- Batuman, B. (2013). City profile: Ankara. *Cities*, 13, 578-590.
- Beel, D., & Wallace, C. (2020). Gathering together: social capital, cultural capital and the value of cultural heritage in a digital age. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 21(5), 697-717.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bhabha, H. K. (2006). Cultural Diversity and Cultural Differences. In B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths, & H. Tiffin (Eds.), *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader* (pp. 155-157). New York: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241-1258). Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Boyer, M. C. (1994). *The City of Collective Memory: Its Historical Imagery and Architectural Entertainments*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Breuilly, J. (1993). *Nationalism and the State*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Buchanan, C. (1968). *Bath: a Study in Conservation*. London: HMSO.
- Buchanan, R. D. (2005). Preserving the Family Album in Letargo by Perla Suez. In M. Agosin (Ed.), *Memory, Oblivion and Jewish Culture in Latin America* (pp. 131-146). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Buckley, J. J. (1985). Fuzzy hierarchial analysis. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 17(3), 233-247.
- Calhoun, C. (1994). *Social Theory and the Politics of Identity*. Oxford: Cambridge Mass.

- Casey, E. (1998). *The Fate of Place*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Castells, M. (1996). *The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Castells, M. (1997). *The Power of Identity*. West Sussex, UK: Blackwell.
- Celebi, E. (1970). *Evliya Çelebi Seyahaatnamesi* (Vol. 4). (Z. Danışman, Trans.) İstanbul: Zuhuri Danışman.
- Cengizkan, A. (2003). Ankara 1924 Lörcher Planı Raporu. *BELLETEREN*, 67(248), 153-192. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/ttkbelleten/issue/58388/843967>
- Cengizkan, A. (2004). *Ankara'nın İlk Planı: 1924-25 Lörcher Planı*. Ankara: Ankara Enstitüsü Vakfı.
- Chen, F., & Romice, O. (2009). Preserving the cultural identity of Chinese cities in urban design through a typomorphologicla approach. *URBAN DESIGN International*, 14, 36-54.
- Chen, Y., Yoo, S., & Hwang, J. (2017). Fuzzy Multiple Criteria Decision-Making Assessment of Urban Conservation in Historic Districts: Case Study of Wenming Historic Block in Kunming City, China. *Journal of Urban Planning and Development*, 143(1).
- Choudhary, B. K. (2014). Formation and (Re)Formation of Spatial Identities Under Globalization. *Journal of Regional Development and Planning*, 3(1), 35-49.
- Collier, M. J. (1998). Researching cultural identity: Reconciling interpretive and post-colonial perspectives. *International and Intercultural Communication Annual: Vol. 21. Communication and identity across cultures*, 122-147.
- Collier, M. J., & Thomas, M. (1988). Identity in intercultural communication: An interpretive perspective. (B. W. Young Yin Kim, Ed.) *Theories of intercultural communication, International and Intercultural Communication Annual*, 12, 99-120.

- Çakır, Z. G., Bilgin Altınöz, G., & Özüduru, B. H. (2019). Evaluation of the Spatial Development and Current User Profile of Ankara Khans Region. *Turkish Academy of Science Journal of Cultural Inventory (TÜBA-KED)*, 20(2019), 175-202. doi:10.22520/tubaked.2019.20.010
- Çeçen, B. (1972). Kentleşme Açısından Eski Eser ve Çevre Korunmasında İmar Mevzuatı. *Mimarlık*(10), 47-50.
- Çetin, C., Uzun, K., Şay, S., & Saraç, E. (2019). Türkiye'de Kültür Varlıklarını Koruma ve Onarım: Başkent Meslek Yüksekokulu Örneği. *Güzel Sanatlar Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1(1), 99-141. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/866897>
- De Vos, G. (1990). Conflict and accommodation in ethnic interactions. In G. D. Vos, & M. Suárez-Orozco (Ed.), *Status inequality: The self in culture* (pp. 204-245). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Dişli, G., & Günel, G. (2020). Türkiye'de Gayrimenkul Eski Eserler Anıtlar Yüksek Kurulunun Oluşumu, Gelişimi ve Kararlarının Günümüz İlke Kararlarıyla Kıyaslanması. *GRID Architecture, Planning and Design Journal*, 3(1), 2-27.
- Erkal, F., Kırıl, Ö., & Günay, B. (2005). Ulus Tarihi Kent Merkezi Koruma Islah İmar Planı: 1986-2006 Koruma Planından YENİLEME Planına. *Planlama Dergisi*(4), 34-50.
- Ertürk, H., & Sam, N. (2009). *Kent Ekonomisi*. Bursa: Ekin Yayınları.
- Ferretti, V., Bottero, M., & Mondini, G. (2014). Decision making and cultural heritage: An application of the Multi-Attribute Value Theory for the reuse of historical buildings. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 15(6), 644-655.
- Fichte, J. G. (1871). Facts of Consciousness. *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, 5(2), 130-143.

- Fogle, N. (2009). *Social Space and Physical Space: Pierre Bourdieu's Field Theory as a Model for the Social Dynamics of the Built Environment*. Thesis (PhD). Retrieved from <https://scholarshare.temple.edu/>
- Foucault, M. (1982). The Subject and Power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8(4), 777-795.
- Freidine, Y. (2012). Urban Planning in Conflict Society. *48th ISOCARP Congress Proceedings*. Perm: ISOCARP.
- French, D. (2003). *Roman, Late Roman and Byzantine Inscriptions of Ankara: A Selection*. Ankara: The Museum of Anatolian Civilizations.
- Frey, B. (2003). Public support. In R. Towse (Ed.), *Handbook of Cultural Economics* (pp. 389-398). Glos: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Friedman, J. (1994). *Cultural Identity and Global Process*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Galanti, A. (1951). *Ankara Tarihi. Birinci Kısım*. İstanbul: Tan Matbaacılık.
- Geddes, P. (1968). *Cities in Evolution*. London: Ernest Benn.
- Gençkaya, Ö. F., & Boztaş, F. (2019). The Problem of Conservation Planning: Destruction / Reconstruction Paradox in İstanbul's Conservation Planning. *Strategic Public Management Journal*(9), 15-27.
- Goepel, K. (2018). Implementation of an Online Software Tool for the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP-OS). *International Journal of the Analytical Hierarchy Process*, 10(3), 469-488.
- Graziano, T., & Privitera, D. (2020). Cultural heritage, tourist attractiveness and augmented reality: insights from Italy. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 15(6), 666-679.
- Greig, J. M. (2002). The End of Geography?: Globalization, Communications, and Culture in the International System. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 46(2), 225-243.

- Griffiths, D. (2017). Martin Heidegger's principle of identity: On belonging and Ereignis. *South African Journal of Philosophy*, 36(3), 326-336.
- Guccio, C., Pignataro, G., & Rizzo, I. (2014). Evaluating the efficiency of public procurement contracts for cultural heritage conservation works in Italy. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 38(1), 43-70.
- Günay, B. (1988). *Our Generation of Planners, The Hopes, The Fears, The Facts: Case Study Ankara*. Salzburg: Scupad SS, 20th Anniversary Congress.
- Günay, B. (2009). Conservation of Urban Space as an Ontological Problem. *METU Journal of the Faculty of Architecture*, 26(1), 123-156.
- Günay, B. (2012). AESOP 26th Annual Congress, July 11-15. *Special Plenary Session: The Spatial History of ANkara*. Ankara. Retrieved from https://crp.metu.edu.tr/en/system/files/ankara_spatial_history.pdf
- Günel, G., & Kılıcı, A. (2015). Ankara Şehri 1924 Haritası: Eski Bir Haritada Ankara'yı Tanımak. *Journal of Ankara Studies*, 8(2), 78-104.
- Halbwachs, M. (1980). *The Collective Memory*. (F. J. Ditter Jr., & V. Y. Ditter, Trans.) New York: Harper & Row.
- Hall, S. (1994). Cultural Identity and Diaspora. In P. Williams, & L. Chrisman, *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory* (pp. 222-237). London: Routledge.
- Harvey, D. (1982). *The Limits of Capital*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Harvey, D. (1989). *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry in the Origins of Cultural Change*. Cambridge: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (1989). *The Urban Experience*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2001). *Spaces of Capital: Towards a Critical Geography*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- Hayden, D. (1991). The Potential of Ethnic Places for Urban Landscapes. *Places*, 7(1), 11-17.
- Heidegger, M. (1957). *Identity and Difference*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Heidegger, M. (1973). *The End of Philosophy*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. (2006). Bourdieu, the media and cultural production. *Media, Culture & Society*, 28(2), 211-231.
- Hobson, E. (2004). *Conservation and Planning: Changing values in policy and practice*. London: Spon Press.
- Hsieh, T.-Y., Lu, S.-T., & Tzeng, G.-H. (2004). Fuzzy MCDM approach for planning and design tenders selection in public office buildings. *International Journal of Project Management*, 22(7), 573-584.
- Hubbard, P. (2005). Space/Place. In *Cultural Geography* (pp. 41-48).
- İlter, F. (1996). *Ankara'nın Eski Kent Dokusunda Yahudi Mahallesi ve Sinagog*. Ankara: TTK Basımevi.
- Insall, D. (1972). *The Care of Old Buildings Today: A Practical Guide*. London: Architectural Press.
- İstiklal Neighbourhood Preservation and Rehabilitation Project*. (1988) Graduate Program of Restoration, Faculty of Architecture. Ankara: METU Faculty of Architecture Publications.
- Jacobs, J. (1961). *The Death and Life of Great American Cities: The Failure of Town Planning*. New York: Random House.
- Jakobi, Á. (2009). Diverse Approaches to the Importance of Geography: the Death of Geography or Geography Matters in the Information Age! Retrieved from <http://www.herodot.net/conferences/Ayvalik/papers/geog-05.pdf>

- Jameson, D. A. (2007). Reconceptualizing Cultural Identity and its Role in Intercultural Business Communication. *Journal of Business Communication*, 44(3), 199-235.
- Jansen, H. (1937). *Ankara İmar Planı*. İstanbul: Alaeddin Kırıl Basımevi.
- Jansen, M., & Sluijter, A. (2005). Consign to Oblivion "A New Age Dawns" - Part III [Recorded by Epica]. Wolfsburg, Germany.
- Jokilehto, J. (2002). *A History of Architectural Conservation*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Jokilehto, J. (2009). Conservation principles in the International Context. In A. Richmond, & A. Bracker (Eds.), *Conservation: Principles, Dilemmas and Uncomfortable Truths* (pp. 73-84). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Keith, M., & Pile, S. (1993). Towards New radical Geographies. In M. Keith, & S. Pile (Eds.), *Place and the Politics of Identity* (pp. 217-223). London: Routledge.
- Kejanlı, T., Akın, C., & Yılmaz, A. (2007). Türkiye’de Koruma Yasalarının Tarihsel Gelişimi Üzerine Bir İnceleme. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 6(19), 179-196. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/esosder/issue/6133/82249>
- Keleş, R. (2006). *Kentleşme Politikası*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Kim, Y. Y. (2007). Ideology, Identity and Intercultural Communication: An Analysis of Differing Academic Conceptions of Cultural Identity. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 36(3), 237-253.
- Korucu, S. (2017, March 15). “Ankara’daki Yahudi Mahallesi Hamamönü Gibi Olmamalı”. Retrieved from Avlaremoz: <https://www.avlaremoz.com/2017/03/15/ankaradaki-yahudi-mahallesi-hamamonu-gibi-olmamali-serdar-korucu/>

- Kourtit, K., Macharis, C., & Nijkamp, P. (2014). Planning for Urban Historical-Cultural Heritage: A Geo-Imaging Multicriteria Approach. *Built Environment*, 40(4), 521-534.
- Krase, J. (2004). Italian American Urban Landscapes: Images of Social and Cultural Capital. *Italian Americana*, 22(1), 17-44.
- Kundera, M. (1971). *Jacques and his Master*. (S. Callow, Trans.) New York: Harper Collins.
- Kuruüzüm, A., & Atsan, N. (2001). Analitik Hiyerarşi Yöntemi ve İşletmecilik Alanındaki Uygulamaları. *Akdeniz Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1, 83-105.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lang, J. (1987). *Creating architectural theory: the role of the behavioural sciences in environmental design*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Larkham, P. (1996). *Conservation and the City*. London: Routledge.
- Lee, G. K., & Chan, E. H. (2007). The Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) Approach for Assessment of Urban Renewal Proposals. *Social Indicators Research*, 89(1), 155-168.
- Lee, M. (1997). Relocating Location: Cultural Geography, the Specificity of Place and the City Habitus. In J. McGuigan (Ed.), *Cultural Methodologies* (pp. 126-142). London: SAGE Publications.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lewis, J. (2002). *Cultural Studies – The Basics*. London: Sage Publications.
- Lozano, E. E. (1974). Visual Needs in the Urban Environment. *The Town Planning Review*, 45(4), 351-374.

- Lynch, K. (1960). *The Image of the City*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Madden, C. (2005). Indicators for arts and cultural policy: a global perspective. *Cultural Trends*, 14(55), 217-247.
- Madran, E. (1996). Cumhuriyet'in İlk Otuz Yılında (1920-1950) Koruma Alanının Örgütlenmesi. *METU Journal of the Faculty of Architecture*, 16(1), 59-97.
- Madran, E. (2009). Tarihi Çevrenin Tarihi: Osmanlıdan Günümüze Tarihi Çevre: Tavrılar-Düzenlemeler. *Dosya Dergisi*, 14(1), 6-15.
- Martin, J. (2005). Identity. In D. Atkinson, P. Jackson, D. Sibley, & N. Washbourne (Eds.), *Cultural Geography: A Critical Dictionary of Key Concepts* (pp. 97-103). London: I.B.Tauris & Co.
- Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Massey, D. (1995). *Spatial Divisions of Labour: Social Structures and the Geography of Production*. New York: Routledge.
- Mihçioğlu Bilgi, E. (2010). *The Physical Evolution of The Historic City of Ankara between 1839 and 1944: A Morphological Analysis*. Unpublished PhD Thesis.
- Mitchell, D. (2000). *Cultural geography: a critical introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mumford, L. (1938). *The Culture of Cities*. Orlando: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Neill, W. (2004). *Urban Planning and Cultural Identity*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Newman, O. (1972). *Defensible space*. New York: Macmillan.
- Okyay, İ. (2001). *Fransa'da Kentsel Sit Alanlarının Korunması: Malraux Yasaları*. İstanbul: Yapı Endüstrisi Merkezi Yayınları.

- Orbaşlı, A. (2000). *Tourists in Historic Towns: Urban Conservation and Heritage Management*. London: E & FN Spon.
- Özçakır, Ö., Bilgin Altınöz, G., & Mignosa, A. (2018). Political Economy of Renewal of Heritage Places in Turkey. *METU Journal of the Faculty of Architecture*, 35(2), 221-250. doi:10.4305/METU.JFA.2018.1.10
- Pendlebury, J. (2009). *Conservation in the Age of Consensus*. London: Routledge.
- Plate, L. (2016). Amnesiology: Towards the study of cultural oblivion. *Memory Studies*, 9(2), 143-155.
- Radhika, C., & Parvathi, R. (2016). Defuzzification of intuitionistic fuzzy sets. *Notes on Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets*, 22, 19-26.
- Reades, J., & Smith, D. A. (2014). Mapping the ‘Space of Flows’: The Geography of Global Business Telecommunications and Employment Specialization in the London Mega-City-Region. *Regional Studies*, 48(1), 105-126.
- Rifaioğlu, M. N., & Şahin Güçhan, N. (2007). The Concept of Identity and Its Identification Process in Urban Conservation Projects. *An International Conference of CSAAR on Regional Architecture and Identity in the Age of Globalization*. 3, pp. 1099-1111. Tunis: CSAAR (The Center for the Study of Architecture in the Arab Region).
- Rizzo, I. (2007). The economics of conservation: the role of government and policy issues. In F. Niccolucci (Ed.), *Digital Applications for Tangible Cultural Heritage. Report on the State of the Union. Policies, Practices and Developments in Europe* (pp. 83-94). Budapest: Archaeolingua.
- Rizzo, I. (2011). Economic evaluation of the performance of cultural heritage conservation policies: some methodological and empirical issues. *6th International Seminar on Urban Conservation: Measuring Heritage Conservation Performance* (pp. 109-119). Recife: ICCROM.

- Rodwell, D. (2007). *Conservation and Sustainability in Historic Cities*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Rodwell, D. (2009). Urban morphology, historic urban landscapes and the management of historic cities. *Urban Morphology*, 13(1), 78-79.
- Ruskin, J. (1849). *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*. London: Smith, Elder & Co.
- Saaty, T. (1980). *The Analytic Hierarchy Process*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Sandercock, L. (1998). *Towards Cosmopolis. Planning for multicultural cities*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Sauer, C. O. (1969). The morphology of landscape. In J. Leighly (Ed.), *Land and Life: Selection From the Writings of Carl Ortwin Sauer* (pp. 315-351). California: University of California Press.
- Seamon, D. (2020). Physical and Experiential Aspects of Place Attachment: Environmental Ensemble, People-in-Place, and Common Presence. In L. C. Manzo, & P. Devine-Wright (Eds.), *Place Attachment: Advances in Theory, Methods and Applications* (pp. 11-22). New York: Routledge.
- Sennett, R. (1973). *The Uses of Disorder: Personal Identity and City Life*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Smith, P. (2001). *Cultural Theory: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Stenbekk, K. (2017). Concrete Landscapes [Recorded by Kalandra]. On *Beneath the Breaking Waves*. Oslo, Norway: Kalandra, & T. Draper.
- Sülüner, H. S. (2014). Roman and Byzantine Ankara Observed by Foreign Travellers. *Journal of Ankara Studies*, 2(1), 11-21.
- Şahin Güçhan, N., & Kurul, E. (2009). A History of the Development of Conservation Measures in Turkey: From the Mid 19th Century Until 2004. *METU Journal of the Faculty of Architecture*, 26(2), 19-44.









- Şahin, İ. (1990). *Türkiye'de Taşınmaz Kültür ve Tabiat Varlıklarını Koruma Olayı ve Halkın Korumaya Katılımı Konusunda Yardımcı Bir Araştırma*. İstanbul: İstanbul Technical University, Institute of Science and Technology.
- Şahin, İ. (2004). *Türkiye'de Kentsel Koruma Politikalarının Gelişimine Yardımcı Bir Yöntem Denemesi, Örnekleme: İstanbul Tarihi Yarımada*. İstanbul: İstanbul Technical University, Institute of Science and Technology.
Retrieved from <https://polen.itu.edu.tr/handle/11527/10530>
- Talukder, M. H. (2019). "Geo-Cultural Identity" in Multiculturalism: Can it be a social contract? *Cogito*, 12(2), 177-186.
- Tan, B., & Arabacıoğlu, F. P. (2020). Tarihi Çevrede Mimari Tasarım: İstanbul Yenileme Alanları. *MEGARON*, 5(2), 204-216.
- Taylor, C. (1989). *Sources of the Self*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, C. (1994). The Politics of Recognition. In A. Gutmann (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition* (pp. 25-73). New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Tekeli, İ. (1991). *Kent Planlaması Konuşmaları*. Ankara: TMMOB Mimarlar Odası Yayınları.
- Tekeli, İ., Altaban, Ö., Güvenç, M., Türel, A., Günay, B., & Bademli, R. (1987). *Ankara 1985'ten 2015'e, Kent Makroformu Çalışması*. Ankara: Ankara Büyükşehir Belediyesi EGO Genel Müdürlüğü.
- Throsby, D. (2005). On the Sustainability of Cultural capital. *Macquarie economics research papers*, 10.
- Torring, J. (2005). Poststructuralist Discourse Theory: Foucault, Laclau, Mouffe and Žižek. In R. A. Thomas Janoski, *The Handbook of Political Sociology* (pp. 153-171). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, 96(3), 506-520.
- Tunçer, M. (2013). Ankara Historic City Centre Restoration Site Conservation Plan, its Characteristics and Rationales for its Revocation. *Journal of Ankara Studies*, 1(2), 10-34.
- Turan, M. (2007). Başkentin Gecekonduları: Kentsel Dönüşüm Projelerinin Arka Bahçeleri. In A. Mengi (Ed.), *Kent ve Planlama: Geçmişini Korumak Geleceğini Tasarlamak* (pp. 389-404). Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Turskis, Z., Zavadskas, E. K., & Kutut, V. (2013). A model based on aras-g and ahp methods for multiple criteria prioritizing of heritage value. *International Journal of Information Technology and Decision Making*, 12(1), 45-73.
- Türkoğlu Önge, S. (2007). Spatial Representation of Power: Making the Urban Space of Ankara in the Early Republican Period. In J. Osmond, & A. Cimdina (Eds.), *Power and Culture: Identity, Ideology, Representation* (pp. 71-94). Pisa: Pisa University Press.
- Tweed, C., & Sutherland, M. (2007). Built cultural heritage and sustainable urban development. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 83(1), 62-69.
- UCTEA Chamber of City Planners. (2019). *Ankara'da Yitmekte Olan Kültür ve Tabiat Varlıkları: Mekan, İnsan ve Kentin Tarihi*. Ankara. Retrieved from <http://spoankara.org/>
- Uybadin, R., & Yücel, N. (1957). *Ankara Nazım İmar Planı Raporu*. (Plan Report).
- Waldron, J. (2000). Cultural Identity and Civic Responsibility. In W. Kymlicka, & W. Norman (Eds.), *Citizenship in Diverse Societies* (pp. 156-174). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Wan, C., & Chew, P. Y.-G. (2013). Cultural knowledge, category label, and social connections: Components of cultural identity in the global, multicultural context. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 16(4), 247-259.
- Weir, A. (2009). Who are we? Modern identities between Taylor and Foucault. *Philosophy and Social Criticism*, 533-553.
- Xie, S., Gu, K., & Zhang, X. (2020). Urban conservation in China in an international context: Retrospect and prospects. *Habitat International*, 95(102098).
- Yalım, İ. (2002). Ulus Devletin Kamusal Alanda Meşruiyet Aracı: Toplumsal Belleğin Ulus Meydanı Üzerinden Kurgulanma Çabası. In G. A. Sargın (Ed.), *Başkent Üzerine Mekan Politik Tezler: Ankara'nın Kamusal Yüzleri* (pp. 9-40). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Yau, Y. (2009). Multi-criteria decision making for urban built heritage conservation: application of the analytic hierarchy process. *Journal of Building Appraisal*, 4(3), 191-205.
- Yavuz, F. (1952). *Ankara'nın İmarı ve Şehirciliğimiz*. Ankara: Güney Matbaacılık.
- Zancheti, S., & Jokilehto, J. (1997). Values and Urban Conservation Planning: Some Reflections on Principles and Definitions. *Journal of Architectural Conservation*, 3(1), 37-51.
- Zelinsky, W. (1991). Seeing Beyond the Dominant Culture. *Places*, 7(1), 32-35.
- Zittoun, T., & Gillespie, A. (2016). *Imagination in Human and Cultural Development*. London: Routledge.
- Zukin, S. (1982). *Loft Living: Culture and Capital in Urban Change*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.

APPENDICES

A. Overlap of Planning Practices Regarding Jewish Quarter

plan	spatial scope of gc identity concern	year
 UTTA	 artifact-based protection	2014
 HASSA	 artifact-based protection	2007
 BADEMLI	 urban level protection	1990
 FLOOR ORDER	 building-based protection	1961 1962
 UYBADIN & YÜCEL	 building-based protection	1957
 JANSEN	 building-based protection	1932
 LÖRCHER	 building-based protection	1924
 1924 MAP		1924

B. AHP Scoring Table

With respect to AHP priorities, which criterion is more important, and **how much more** on a scale 1 to 9? Please make a **pairwise comparison with scoring the following criterion binaries with each other in the range of 1-10**. If the importance is equal, please specify them based on their importance with **equal score**.

CRITERION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
C01. Conservation of the historical built environment (physical, building-base conservation, restoration, renewal projects)										
C02. Economic viability of the urban conservation plan and projects (The applicability of the urban conservation projects in terms of financial concerns)										
C03. Public/private investment and local promotion (External financial supports from public and private investors, sponsorships, EU funds + local promotion of the historical area via media in order to increase the attraction of the potential investors)										
C04. Sustainability of the place identity (Protecting the urban identity of the neighbourhood with enhancing and promoting the social, cultural, historical and environmental components of the identity concept)										
C05. Protecting and enhancing the local culture and cultural identity (Protecting the intangible cultural values of the neighbourhood -such as the usage of the term of "Jewish Quarter"- + informing local community on cultural background of the area, increasing the awareness of local community on cultural identity + importance of Jewish community existence in the neighbourhood)										
C06. Improving and enhancing the local community's quality of life (improving the urban infrastructure of the neighbourhood with rehabilitations and spatial regulations + consideration of local community's physical and social concerns and demands in urban conservation process)										
C07. Community involvement, social interaction and participation (participation of local community, NGO's external sources, Jewish diaspora who attached to the neighbourhood in a manner of geo-cultural identity + conducting a transparent process + including the community, diaspora and governmental concerns on urban conservation)										
C08. Governance, management and legislative regulations (conducting a solid management structure + conducting a binder legal structure + monitoring and controlling the process by local and central government + well-defined legislative structure)										

		SCORE		SCORE
1	C01. Built environment		C02. Economic viability	
2	C01. Built environment		C03. Investment	
3	C01. Built environment		C04. Place identity	
4	C01. Built environment		C05. Local culture	
5	C01. Built environment		C06. Rights and QoL	
6	C01. Built environment		C07. Participation	
7	C01. Built environment		C08. Management	
8	C02. Economic viability		C03. Investment	
9	C02. Economic viability		C04. Place identity	
10	C02. Economic viability		C05. Local culture	
11	C02. Economic viability		C06. Rights and QoL	
12	C02. Economic viability		C07. Participation	
13	C02. Economic viability		C08. Management	
14	C03. Investment		C04. Place identity	

15	C03. Investment		C05. Local culture	
16	C03. Investment		C06. Rights and QoL	
17	C03. Investment		C07. Participation	
18	C03. Investment		C08. Management	
19	C04. Place identity		C05. Local culture	
20	C04. Place identity		C06. Rights and QoL	
21	C04. Place identity		C07. Participation	
22	C04. Place identity		C08. Management	
23	C05. Local culture		C06. Rights and QoL	
24	C05. Local culture		C07. Participation	
25	C05. Local culture		C08. Management	
26	C06. Rights and QoL		C07. Participation	
27	C06. Rights and QoL		C08. Management	
28	C07. Participation		C08. Management	

C. Interview Questions for Interest Group 1: Governance

Q01. The role fulfilled within the department of the municipality or institution

Q02. Main responsibilities of the assigned role

Q03. If any training, education or course is taken in urban conservation field?

Q04. If any personal research or project has been accomplished?

Q05. If participated to any urban conservation plan or project during working period?

Q06. If any, what are the ongoing/future urban conservation plans or projects regarding Ankara?

Q07. If any, what are the ongoing/future urban conservation plans or projects regarding Ulus?

Q08. If any, what are the ongoing/future urban conservation plans or projects regarding Jewish Quarter?

Q09. How the decision-making process of mentioned urban conservation projects is done in mentioned municipality or institution?

Q10. If any, how does the community involvement and participation process of mentioned urban conservation projects is done in Ankara, Ulus and/or Jewish Quarter?

Q11. What main factors are involved in the preparation process of mentioned urban conservation project?

Q11. What are the current problems of Jewish Quarter in a manner of urban conservation?

Q12. If any, what are the significant features of Jewish Quarter in terms of urban conservation and cultural value?

Q10. What are the current problems of Jewish Quarter in a manner of urban conservation?

Q11. Are there any community participation or future strategies in order to conduct a community participation during any urban conservation project that may occur regarding Jewish Quarter?

Q12. What are the political and legislative challenges that the municipality or institution have been experiencing?

Q13. What are the social and spatial challenges that the municipality or institution have been experiencing?

Q14. Are there any conservative strategy regarding the preservation of cultural identity? What are the existing or future strategies of the municipality or institution based on the subjects such as protecting the place identity, cultural identity, collective memory, social intertwine and diversity? Please specify in detail.

Q15. Where does your municipality or institution put existing Jewish community during any conservation or planning project which related with Jewish Quarter?

D. Interview Questions for Interest Group 2: Local Community

Q01. Age

Q02. Educational status

Q03. Area of profession

Q04. How long have you been living in Jewish Quarter (İstiklal Neighborhood)?

Q05. What is your residential unit's ownership status?

Q06. What is your residential unit's current physical condition?

Q07. Do you have any information about ongoing urban conservation projects for Ulus and Jewish Quarter? How do you feel about them?

Q08. Did/do you participate in any urban conservation plan or project conducted by AMM or Altındağ Municipality? If yes, what were/are the personal experiences about participation process?

Q09. Are you willing to any urban transformation project aiming Jewish Quarter? What are the personal reasons?

Q10. Are you planning to relocate your resident to any other neighbourhood? What are the personal reasons?

Q11. How do you feel about the current physical state of the neighbourhood? How do you feel about the demolished/burnt historical buildings?

Q12. Do you think, the Jewish community's current existence in the neighbourhood would affect the current physical state and how?

Q13. How do you feel about the remains of Jewish community and their past/present impact on neighbourhood's cultural identity?

Q14. Do you think the neighbourhood is at risk of losing its cultural identity? What are the personal opinions on that issue?

Q15. If Q14 answered as "Yes", what are your suggestions to preventing the Jewish Quarter from its cultural identity loss process?

E. Interview Questions for Interest Group 3: Jewish Community

Q01. Age

Q02. Educational status

Q03. Area of profession

Q04. Do you have any information about the Jewish Community of Ankara and their activities?

Q05. Do you have any information about ongoing urban conservation projects for Ulus and Jewish Quarter? How do you feel about them?

Q06. Did/do you participate in any urban conservation plan or project conducted by AMM or any other Municipality? If yes, what were/are the personal experiences about participation process?

Q07. How do you feel about the current physical state of the neighbourhood? How do you feel about the demolished/burnt historical buildings?

Q08. Do you think, the Jewish community's current existence in the neighbourhood would affect the current physical state and how?

Q09. How do you feel about the remains of Jewish community and their past/present impact on neighbourhood's cultural identity?

Q10. Do you think the neighbourhood is at risk of losing its cultural identity? What are the personal opinions on that issue?

Q11. If Q14 answered as "Yes", what are your suggestions to preventing the Jewish Quarter from its cultural identity loss process?

F. Evaluation and the Calculation of the Interest Group’s Importance Values for AHP Analysis

GOVERNMENT																								
EVALUATOR 1 Architect					EVALUATOR 2 Architect					EVALUATOR 3 Urban Planner					EVALUATOR 4 Landscape Architect					GOVERNMENT GROUP				
	CRITERIA		equal	score		CRITERIA		equal	score		CRITERIA		equal	score		CRITERIA		equal	score	criteria	weight	value		
1	C01. Built environment	C02. Economic viability		2	1	C01. Built environment	C02. Economic viability		3	1	C01. Built environment	C02. Economic viability		4	1	C01. Built environment	C02. Economic viability		2	C02	2,6321	3		
2	C01. Built environment	C03. Local promotion		5	2	C01. Built environment	C03. Local promotion		4	2	C01. Built environment	C03. Local promotion		5	2	C01. Built environment	C03. Local promotion		2	C03	3,7606	4		
3	C01. Built environment	C04. Place identity		4	3	C01. Built environment	C04. Place identity		2	3	C01. Built environment	C04. Place identity		4	3	C01. Built environment	C04. Place identity	•	1	C04	2,3784	3		
4	C01. Built environment	C05. Cultural identity		4	4	C01. Built environment	C05. Cultural identity	•	1	4	C01. Built environment	C05. Cultural identity		3	4	C01. Built environment	C05. Cultural identity		2	C05	2,2134	3		
5	C01. Built environment	C06. Quality of life		3	5	C01. Built environment	C06. Quality of life		3	5	C01. Built environment	C06. Quality of life		3	5	C01. Built environment	C06. Quality of life		3	C06	3,0000	3		
6	C01. Built environment	C07. Participation		4	6	C01. Built environment	C07. Participation		2	6	C01. Built environment	C07. Participation		4	6	C01. Built environment	C07. Participation		2	C07	2,8284	3		
7	C01. Built environment	C08. Governance		2	7	C01. Built environment	C08. Governance		3	7	C01. Built environment	C08. Governance		5	7	C01. Built environment	C08. Governance		2	C08	2,7832	3		
8	C02. Economic viability	C03. Local promotion		2	8	C02. Economic viability	C03. Local promotion	•	1	8	C02. Economic viability	C03. Local promotion		3	8	C02. Economic viability	C03. Local promotion		2	C03	1,8612	2		
9	C02. Economic viability	C04. Place identity		2	9	C02. Economic viability	C04. Place identity		3	9	C02. Economic viability	C04. Place identity		3	9	C02. Economic viability	C04. Place identity		2	C02	2,4495	3		
10	C02. Economic viability	C05. Cultural identity		2	10	C02. Economic viability	C05. Cultural identity		2	10	C02. Economic viability	C05. Cultural identity		3	10	C02. Economic viability	C05. Cultural identity		3	C02	2,4495	3		
11	C02. Economic viability	C06. Quality of life		2	11	C02. Economic viability	C06. Quality of life		2	11	C02. Economic viability	C06. Quality of life	•	1	11	C02. Economic viability	C06. Quality of life		3	C02	1,8612	2		
12	C02. Economic viability	C07. Participation		2	12	C02. Economic viability	C07. Participation		5	12	C02. Economic viability	C07. Participation		5	12	C02. Economic viability	C07. Participation		5	C02	3,9764	4		
13	C02. Economic viability	C08. Governance	•	2	13	C02. Economic viability	C08. Governance		5	13	C02. Economic viability	C08. Governance		8	13	C02. Economic viability	C08. Governance	•	1	C08	2,9907	4		
14	C03. Local promotion	C04. Place identity		2	14	C03. Local promotion	C04. Place identity		3	14	C03. Local promotion	C04. Place identity		2	14	C03. Local promotion	C04. Place identity		2	C04	2,2134	2		
15	C03. Local promotion	C05. Cultural identity		2	15	C03. Local promotion	C05. Cultural identity	•	1	15	C03. Local promotion	C05. Cultural identity		2	15	C03. Local promotion	C05. Cultural identity		2	C05	1,6818	2		
16	C03. Local promotion	C06. Quality of life	•	1	16	C03. Local promotion	C06. Quality of life		2	16	C03. Local promotion	C06. Quality of life		3	16	C03. Local promotion	C06. Quality of life		2	C03	1,8612	2		
17	C03. Local promotion	C07. Participation		2	17	C03. Local promotion	C07. Participation		4	17	C03. Local promotion	C07. Participation		3	17	C03. Local promotion	C07. Participation		2	C03	2,6321	3		
18	C03. Local promotion	C08. Governance	•	1	18	C03. Local promotion	C08. Governance	•	1	18	C03. Local promotion	C08. Governance	•	1	18	C03. Local promotion	C08. Governance		3	C08	1,3161	2		
19	C04. Place identity	C05. Cultural identity		4	19	C04. Place identity	C05. Cultural identity	•	1	19	C04. Place identity	C05. Cultural identity		2	19	C04. Place identity	C05. Cultural identity		2	C05	2,0000	2		
20	C04. Place identity	C06. Quality of life	•	1	20	C04. Place identity	C06. Quality of life		2	20	C04. Place identity	C06. Quality of life		7	20	C04. Place identity	C06. Quality of life		5	C04	2,8925	4		
21	C04. Place identity	C07. Participation		3	21	C04. Place identity	C07. Participation		3	21	C04. Place identity	C07. Participation		2	21	C04. Place identity	C07. Participation		4	C04	2,9130	3		
22	C04. Place identity	C08. Governance		3	22	C04. Place identity	C08. Governance	•	1	22	C04. Place identity	C08. Governance		2	22	C04. Place identity	C08. Governance		3	C08	2,0598	2		
23	C05. Cultural identity	C06. Quality of life		2	23	C05. Cultural identity	C06. Quality of life		2	23	C05. Cultural identity	C06. Quality of life		2	23	C05. Cultural identity	C06. Quality of life		2	C06	2,0000	2		
24	C05. Cultural identity	C07. Participation		3	24	C05. Cultural identity	C07. Participation		3	24	C05. Cultural identity	C07. Participation		2	24	C05. Cultural identity	C07. Participation		2	C07	2,4495	3		
25	C05. Cultural identity	C08. Governance	•	1	25	C05. Cultural identity	C08. Governance		2	25	C05. Cultural identity	C08. Governance		2	25	C05. Cultural identity	C08. Governance		3	C08	1,8612	2		
26	C06. Quality of life	C07. Participation		2	26	C06. Quality of life	C07. Participation		2	26	C06. Quality of life	C07. Participation		3	26	C06. Quality of life	C07. Participation		2	C06	2,2134	2		
27	C06. Quality of life	C08. Governance	•	1	27	C06. Quality of life	C08. Governance		2	27	C06. Quality of life	C08. Governance		2	27	C06. Quality of life	C08. Governance	•	1	C08	1,4142	2		
28	C07. Participation	C08. Governance		2	28	C07. Participation	C08. Governance		4	28	C07. Participation	C08. Governance		3	28	C07. Participation	C08. Governance		5	C08	3,3098	4		

LOCAL COMMUNITY

EVALUATOR 1				
	CRITERIA		equal	score
1	C01. Built environment	C02. Economic viability		4
2	C01. Built environment	C03. Local promotion		4
3	C01. Built environment	C04. Place identity		2
4	C01. Built environment	C05. Cultural identity		2
5	C01. Built environment	C06. Quality of life	•	1
6	C01. Built environment	C07. Participation	•	1
7	C01. Built environment	C08. Governance		3
8	C02. Economic viability	C03. Local promotion	•	1
9	C02. Economic viability	C04. Place identity		3
10	C02. Economic viability	C05. Cultural identity		3
11	C02. Economic viability	C06. Quality of life		4
12	C02. Economic viability	C07. Participation		4
13	C02. Economic viability	C08. Governance		2
14	C03. Local promotion	C04. Place identity		3
15	C03. Local promotion	C05. Cultural identity		3
16	C03. Local promotion	C06. Quality of life		5
17	C03. Local promotion	C07. Participation		4
18	C03. Local promotion	C08. Governance		2
19	C04. Place identity	C05. Cultural identity	•	1
20	C04. Place identity	C06. Quality of life		2
21	C04. Place identity	C07. Participation		2
22	C04. Place identity	C08. Governance		2
23	C05. Cultural identity	C06. Quality of life		2
24	C05. Cultural identity	C07. Participation		2
25	C05. Cultural identity	C08. Governance		3
26	C06. Quality of life	C07. Participation	•	1
27	C06. Quality of life	C08. Governance		3
28	C07. Participation	C08. Governance		3

EVALUATOR 2				
	CRITERIA		equal	score
1	C01. Built environment	C02. Economic viability		6
2	C01. Built environment	C03. Local promotion		2
3	C01. Built environment	C04. Place identity	•	1
4	C01. Built environment	C05. Cultural identity		3
5	C01. Built environment	C06. Quality of life		3
6	C01. Built environment	C07. Participation		2
7	C01. Built environment	C08. Governance		5
8	C02. Economic viability	C03. Local promotion	•	1
9	C02. Economic viability	C04. Place identity		5
10	C02. Economic viability	C05. Cultural identity		5
11	C02. Economic viability	C06. Quality of life		4
12	C02. Economic viability	C07. Participation		6
13	C02. Economic viability	C08. Governance		5
14	C03. Local promotion	C04. Place identity		2
15	C03. Local promotion	C05. Cultural identity		7
16	C03. Local promotion	C06. Quality of life		4
17	C03. Local promotion	C07. Participation		6
18	C03. Local promotion	C08. Governance		3
19	C04. Place identity	C05. Cultural identity	•	1
20	C04. Place identity	C06. Quality of life		5
21	C04. Place identity	C07. Participation		3
22	C04. Place identity	C08. Governance		5
23	C05. Cultural identity	C06. Quality of life		4
24	C05. Cultural identity	C07. Participation		2
25	C05. Cultural identity	C08. Governance		2
26	C06. Quality of life	C07. Participation		3
27	C06. Quality of life	C08. Governance	•	1
28	C07. Participation	C08. Governance		2

EVALUATOR 3				
	CRITERIA		equal	score
1	C01. Built environment	C02. Economic viability		3
2	C01. Built environment	C03. Local promotion		5
3	C01. Built environment	C04. Place identity	•	1
4	C01. Built environment	C05. Cultural identity	•	1
5	C01. Built environment	C06. Quality of life	•	1
6	C01. Built environment	C07. Participation	•	1
7	C01. Built environment	C08. Governance		1
8	C02. Economic viability	C03. Local promotion		2
9	C02. Economic viability	C04. Place identity		4
10	C02. Economic viability	C05. Cultural identity		4
11	C02. Economic viability	C06. Quality of life		6
12	C02. Economic viability	C07. Participation		6
13	C02. Economic viability	C08. Governance		7
14	C03. Local promotion	C04. Place identity		2
15	C03. Local promotion	C05. Cultural identity		2
16	C03. Local promotion	C06. Quality of life		3
17	C03. Local promotion	C07. Participation		3
18	C03. Local promotion	C08. Governance		2
19	C04. Place identity	C05. Cultural identity	•	1
20	C04. Place identity	C06. Quality of life		2
21	C04. Place identity	C07. Participation		2
22	C04. Place identity	C08. Governance		2
23	C05. Cultural identity	C06. Quality of life		3
24	C05. Cultural identity	C07. Participation		2
25	C05. Cultural identity	C08. Governance		3
26	C06. Quality of life	C07. Participation		2
27	C06. Quality of life	C08. Governance		5
28	C07. Participation	C08. Governance		3

EVALUATOR 4				
	CRITERIA		equal	score
1	C01. Built environment	C02. Economic viability		5
2	C01. Built environment	C03. Local promotion		4
3	C01. Built environment	C04. Place identity		2
4	C01. Built environment	C05. Cultural identity		2
5	C01. Built environment	C06. Quality of life		3
6	C01. Built environment	C07. Participation		2
7	C01. Built environment	C08. Governance		4
8	C02. Economic viability	C03. Local promotion		3
9	C02. Economic viability	C04. Place identity		5
10	C02. Economic viability	C05. Cultural identity		4
11	C02. Economic viability	C06. Quality of life		4
12	C02. Economic viability	C07. Participation		5
13	C02. Economic viability	C08. Governance		2
14	C03. Local promotion	C04. Place identity		4
15	C03. Local promotion	C05. Cultural identity		4
16	C03. Local promotion	C06. Quality of life		6
17	C03. Local promotion	C07. Participation		5
18	C03. Local promotion	C08. Governance	•	1
19	C04. Place identity	C05. Cultural identity		2
20	C04. Place identity	C06. Quality of life		2
21	C04. Place identity	C07. Participation		2
22	C04. Place identity	C08. Governance		6
23	C05. Cultural identity	C06. Quality of life		3
24	C05. Cultural identity	C07. Participation		2
25	C05. Cultural identity	C08. Governance		5
26	C06. Quality of life	C07. Participation		4
27	C06. Quality of life	C08. Governance	•	1
28	C07. Participation	C08. Governance	•	1

LOCAL COMMUNITY GROUP		
criteria	weight	value
C01	4,3559	5
C01	3,5566	4
C01	1,4142	2
C01	1,8612	2
C01	1,7321	2
C07	1,4142	2
C01	2,7832	3
C02	1,5651	2
C04	4,1618	4
C05	3,9360	4
C06	4,4267	5
C07	5,1800	5
C08	3,4398	4
C04	2,6321	3
C05	3,6002	4
C06	4,3559	5
C07	4,3559	5
C03	1,8612	2
C04	1,1892	1
C06	2,5149	3
C07	2,2134	2
C04	3,3098	4
C06	2,9130	3
C07	2,0000	2
C05	3,0801	3
C07	2,2134	3
C06	1,9680	3
C07	2,0598	2

JEWISH COMMUNITY																						
EVALUATOR 1					EVALUATOR 2					EVALUATOR 3					EVALUATOR 4					JEWISH COMMUNITY GROUP		
	CRITERIA		equal	score		CRITERIA		equal	score		CRITERIA		equal	score		CRITERIA		equal	score	criteria	weight	value
1	C01. Built environment	C02. Economic viability	•	1	1	C01. Built environment	C02. Economic viability		3	1	C01. Built environment	C02. Economic viability		2	1	C01. Built environment	C02. Economic viability		3	C01	2,0598	2
2	C01. Built environment	C03. Local promotion		2	2	C01. Built environment	C03. Local promotion		2	2	C01. Built environment	C03. Local promotion		2	2	C01. Built environment	C03. Local promotion		2	C01	2,0000	2
3	C01. Built environment	C04. Place identity	•	1	3	C01. Built environment	C04. Place identity		2	3	C01. Built environment	C04. Place identity		4	3	C01. Built environment	C04. Place identity		4	C04	2,3784	3
4	C01. Built environment	C05. Cultural identity		3	4	C01. Built environment	C05. Cultural identity		3	4	C01. Built environment	C05. Cultural identity		4	4	C01. Built environment	C05. Cultural identity		5	C05	3,6628	4
5	C01. Built environment	C06. Quality of life		2	5	C01. Built environment	C06. Quality of life		3	5	C01. Built environment	C06. Quality of life	•	1	5	C01. Built environment	C06. Quality of life		2	C01	1,8612	2
6	C01. Built environment	C07. Participation	•	1	6	C01. Built environment	C07. Participation	•	1	6	C01. Built environment	C07. Participation		2	6	C01. Built environment	C07. Participation		3	C01	1,5651	2
7	C01. Built environment	C08. Governance		4	7	C01. Built environment	C08. Governance		8	7	C01. Built environment	C08. Governance		3	7	C01. Built environment	C08. Governance		2	C01	3,7224	4
8	C02. Economic viability	C03. Local promotion		5	8	C02. Economic viability	C03. Local promotion		3	8	C02. Economic viability	C03. Local promotion		4	8	C02. Economic viability	C03. Local promotion		2	C03	3,3098	4
9	C02. Economic viability	C04. Place identity		4	9	C02. Economic viability	C04. Place identity		4	9	C02. Economic viability	C04. Place identity		5	9	C02. Economic viability	C04. Place identity		4	C04	4,2295	4
10	C02. Economic viability	C05. Cultural identity		4	10	C02. Economic viability	C05. Cultural identity		5	10	C02. Economic viability	C05. Cultural identity		5	10	C02. Economic viability	C05. Cultural identity		5	C05	4,7287	5
11	C02. Economic viability	C06. Quality of life	•	1	11	C02. Economic viability	C06. Quality of life	•	1	11	C02. Economic viability	C06. Quality of life	•	1	11	C02. Economic viability	C06. Quality of life	•	1	EQUAL	1,0000	1
12	C02. Economic viability	C07. Participation	•	1	12	C02. Economic viability	C07. Participation	•	1	12	C02. Economic viability	C07. Participation		2	12	C02. Economic viability	C07. Participation		3	C07	1,5651	2
13	C02. Economic viability	C08. Governance		3	13	C02. Economic viability	C08. Governance		2	13	C02. Economic viability	C08. Governance	•	1	13	C02. Economic viability	C08. Governance		2	C08	1,8612	2
14	C03. Local promotion	C04. Place identity		4	14	C03. Local promotion	C04. Place identity		4	14	C03. Local promotion	C04. Place identity		4	14	C03. Local promotion	C04. Place identity		6	C04	4,4267	5
15	C03. Local promotion	C05. Cultural identity	•	1	15	C03. Local promotion	C05. Cultural identity		4	15	C03. Local promotion	C05. Cultural identity		5	15	C03. Local promotion	C05. Cultural identity		8	C05	3,5566	5
16	C03. Local promotion	C06. Quality of life	•	1	16	C03. Local promotion	C06. Quality of life		2	16	C03. Local promotion	C06. Quality of life		2	16	C03. Local promotion	C06. Quality of life		2	C03	1,6818	2
17	C03. Local promotion	C07. Participation		5	17	C03. Local promotion	C07. Participation		2	17	C03. Local promotion	C07. Participation		2	17	C03. Local promotion	C07. Participation		2	C03	2,5149	3
18	C03. Local promotion	C08. Governance	•	1	18	C03. Local promotion	C08. Governance		2	18	C03. Local promotion	C08. Governance		3	18	C03. Local promotion	C08. Governance	•	1	C03	1,5651	2
19	C04. Place identity	C05. Cultural identity	•	1	19	C04. Place identity	C05. Cultural identity	•	1	19	C04. Place identity	C05. Cultural identity	•	1	19	C04. Place identity	C05. Cultural identity	•	1	EQUAL	1,0000	1
20	C04. Place identity	C06. Quality of life		3	20	C04. Place identity	C06. Quality of life		3	20	C04. Place identity	C06. Quality of life		4	20	C04. Place identity	C06. Quality of life		3	C04	3,2237	3
21	C04. Place identity	C07. Participation	•	1	21	C04. Place identity	C07. Participation		2	21	C04. Place identity	C07. Participation		3	21	C04. Place identity	C07. Participation		4	C04	2,2134	3
22	C04. Place identity	C08. Governance		3	22	C04. Place identity	C08. Governance		3	22	C04. Place identity	C08. Governance		3	22	C04. Place identity	C08. Governance		4	C04	3,2237	3
23	C05. Cultural identity	C06. Quality of life	•	1	23	C05. Cultural identity	C06. Quality of life		3	23	C05. Cultural identity	C06. Quality of life		4	23	C05. Cultural identity	C06. Quality of life		5	C05	2,7832	3
24	C05. Cultural identity	C07. Participation		3	24	C05. Cultural identity	C07. Participation		3	24	C05. Cultural identity	C07. Participation		2	24	C05. Cultural identity	C07. Participation		3	C05	2,7108	3
25	C05. Cultural identity	C08. Governance		2	25	C05. Cultural identity	C08. Governance		2	25	C05. Cultural identity	C08. Governance		3	25	C05. Cultural identity	C08. Governance		3	C05	2,4495	3
26	C06. Quality of life	C07. Participation	•	1	26	C06. Quality of life	C07. Participation		2	26	C06. Quality of life	C07. Participation		2	26	C06. Quality of life	C07. Participation		2	C07	1,6818	2
27	C06. Quality of life	C08. Governance	•	1	27	C06. Quality of life	C08. Governance	•	1	27	C06. Quality of life	C08. Governance		2	27	C06. Quality of life	C08. Governance		3	C08	1,5651	2
28	C07. Participation	C08. Governance	•	1	28	C07. Participation	C08. Governance	•	1	28	C07. Participation	C08. Governance	•	1	28	C07. Participation	C08. Governance	•	1	EQUAL	1,0000	1

