

Cityscapes and Modernity: Smyrna Morphing into İzmir¹

Biray Kolluoğlu Kırık

An anonymous contributor to *Blackwood's Magazine* in 1847 wrote that “Smyrna had no earthly right to the title of a Turkish city, except the accident of its happening to be in Turkey.”² This echoes a widespread consensus in travellers’ accounts where visitors routinely expressed their astonishment at the ‘European character’ of the city which made many of them feel that they were not in the ‘real Orient’. Nineteenth-century Smyrna with its gas-lit streets, theatres, cafés, club houses, and department stores, its vigorous social life, its cosmopolitan population, and its urban make-up resulted in a spatial displacement in the foreigners’ mental mapping of this Eastern Mediterranean port: since modernity was something that belonged to Europe, Smyrna appeared to be a European city.³

This vibrant Ottoman Smyrna was burnt down almost completely during the infamous Great Fire in 1922. The İzmir that rose from the ashes was a radically different city, now located within the boundaries of the Turkish nation-state. Differences between the two cities, nineteenth-century Smyrna and twentieth-century İzmir, can be articulated and discussed at different levels. Smyrna was organically linked to a world economy structured under the auspices of British hegemony, twentieth-century İzmir was bounded by the parameters of a nationalized economy; Smyrna was part of an imperial order, İzmir belonged to a nation-state; Smyrna boasted a multi-lingual, multi-confessional population, İzmir’s population was drastically homogenized through *de facto* and *de jure* forced migrations and policies of Turcification; last but not least, Smyrna had a dense and heterogeneous urbanscape while İzmir was a hollow and homogenous city. This paper will be concerned with this last aspect and discuss Smyrna’s and İzmir’s changing patterns of urban development in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The diverse patterns of urbanization of this city will be shown to have been aspects of the different experiences and articulations of modernity in these two periods respectively. The shifting articulations of modernity

will reveal different geographies of Europe structured in contrasting ways appropriate to different temporalities — a Mediterranean Europe shaped by the rhythms and periodicities of British hegemony, a continental Europe encased by the institutional scaffolding of a totalizing nationalisms.

It will be argued that while the modernity materialized and experienced in nineteenth-century Smyrna can be understood as a flexible and more or less impulsive and artless response to the rhythms of the socio-economic world in which the city was situated, the modernity that came to be expressed in twentieth-century Izmir represents a well-structured and rigid totality. Secondly, there is a discrepancy between the temporal perceptions of modernity in these periods. Nineteenth-century modernity was very much concerned with the present and with the management and mediation of the contemporaneous sea change, twentieth-century modernity was directed towards the future and the moulding of future society. Finally, it should be added that this city's varied encounters with modernity were inevitably enveloped by encounters with different centres of influence in Europe or different Europes. While nineteenth-century Smyrna's urban development patterns were organically linked to the dynamics of rapid urbanization that had become prevalent in ports all around the Mediterranean; twentieth-century Izmir, however was looking towards the totalitarian regimes such as Italy, Germany, and the Soviet Union.

Let us begin with a brief contextual and historical background. Izmir, or Smyrna as the Hittites had christened it around 2000 B.C. is located half-way down the Western Anatolian coastline. The waters of the Aegean Sea flow past the Karaburun peninsula and take another turn towards the east to form a large, navigable, and secure gulf, at the tip of which lies the city. While Izmir is most fortunately situated in relation to the sea, it also occupies a central location in the fertile Western Anatolian basin. The city's remarkable transformation from a small town to a major port between the late sixteenth and the early nineteenth centuries represents a phase in the long dialectic between the sea and the land that was so memorably charted by Braudel.⁴ In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Smyrna's trade volume increased remarkably, and in the nineteenth century it reached unprecedented levels as part and parcel of the economic restructuring of the Mediterranean economy under British hegemony. It alone handled about one-third of the entire Ottoman sea-borne trade until the end of the nineteenth century and remained one of the most favoured ports in the Mediterranean.⁵

Janus-faced, Smyrna looked both towards the sea and the continental land mass. Goods and people poured into the city on camels, whose languid motions created a thorough network integrating the Ottoman domains. Produce and commodities from Asia flowed through serpentine caravan trails, arteries of the land. In Smyrna these arteries dissipated into a filigree of densely intermeshed capillaries before they were pumped out again through the arteries of the Mediterranean. Perhaps, an apt pictorial

metaphor to encapsulate Smyrna in the nineteenth century is to conceive of it as an hourglass, connecting Marseilles, London, Ancona, and Trieste, with Usak, Afyon, Bursa, and Ankara. If maritime trade and terrestrial trade represented the two halves of the hourglass, the dense urban topography and the humanscape of Smyrna represented the confluence of trade.

The process of economic growth that Smyrna steadily experienced from the sixteenth century onwards was translated into an increase and diversification of its inhabitants, and also into a greater sophistication and diversification of its urban space and built environment. In the mid-seventeenth century there were sixty to seventy thousand inhabitants, Muslims constituting a bare majority.⁶ The city's thriving economy acted as a magnet for different groups of people such as Greek merchants from Chios with their trade networks, Jews from Salonica and their expertise in textiles, Armenians on the heels of the silk trail, and Levantine merchants with ties to France, England, Italy and elsewhere in Europe. From the late seventeenth century onwards, Muslims began to constitute less than half of the city's population, making Smyrna, along with Istanbul, one of the most cosmopolitan cities of the Empire. In the first half of the nineteenth century the population of Smyrna was nearly 100,000, and had doubled by the end of it. With over 200,000 inhabitants Smyrna was five times larger than the second biggest city in Western Anatolia.⁷ According to Cuinet, in 1890 the population of the city of Smyrna including its suburbs was 229,615⁸ and at the turn of the century non-Muslims amounted to 61.5 per cent.⁹

As Smyrna's population was growing and becoming more cosmopolitan, the urban make-up of the city, especially in the nineteenth century, was also undergoing a notable transformation, becoming more and more "modern". Accounts of the modernization of Ottoman cities in the nineteenth century are usually compounded within the narrative of the *Tanzimat* reforms after 1839 and the overall efforts to modernize the backward Ottoman State. Discussions of *Tanzimat* in Ottoman historiography are deeply rooted in the discourse of imitation and replication of European institutions.¹⁰ This perspective has been so powerful and pervasive that it has infiltrated almost all aspects of Turco-Ottoman history from issues of social history to urbanization.¹¹ For instance Celik's book begins as follows: "During the nineteenth century, a concerted effort was made to transform the Ottoman capital of Istanbul into a Western-style capital, paralleling the general struggle to salvage the Ottoman empire by reforming its traditional institutions."¹² Her account reproduces the generally accepted understanding that change (read modernization) was imported into the Ottoman Empire from Europe. Alternatively, as Jens Hanssen and other young scholars have observed, another salient trend in the urban literature is that modernization (always also understood as Europeanization) of the cities in North Africa and the Arab provinces took place only after the end of Ottoman rule and was initiated by European colonizers.¹³ In other words, the "modernization" of

cities in the Ottoman territories is wrapped in a narrative of change that originated in Europe and was imported to this cartographic quadrant either through the mediation of the Ottoman State, or introduced directly by the European powers themselves through colonization.

While both *Tanzimat* and direct European colonization have left indelible marks on Ottoman and post-Ottoman cities, here I would like to argue that urban development in this region in the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries should not be bound to the framework of *Tanzimat* or European colonization. I shall try to substantiate this argument by discussing the specific case of Smyrna's/Izmir's urban development.

But first let me clarify the difference between urban management and planning. The urban studies literature, especially on urbanization in the nineteenth century, suffers from the common failing of coupling industrialization and urbanization with the development of urban-planning schemes in response to the former. "Classical social theory from Marx to Weber," writes Davis, "of course, believed that the great cities of the future would follow in the industrializing footsteps of Manchester, Berlin and Chicago." Yet a very significant part of global urbanization actually took place without accompanying industrialization.¹⁴ The reasons for this coupling are not difficult to fathom. Rapid industrialization, especially in Western European urban centres, old and burgeoning, created a completely new set of problems: housing shortages, crammed slums, transportation difficulties, lack of proper sewage. Urban centres have always had problems peculiar to dense habitation, but responding to these problems systematically and on a large scale, that is urban planning, developed specifically in response to the conditions fashioned by rapid industrialization. As Benevolo argues, the hardships encountered by urban dwellers in the pre-industrial order were regarded as "unavoidable destiny which had existed since time immemorial", the hardships that the industrial town had fashioned were of a different order of magnitude and "had grown up during a limited period of time under the eyes of those people who were now experiencing its discomforts". The origins of modern town-planning are thus to be sought at this moment in time. Benevolo writes, "This was a unique phenomenon that shook contemporary habits and concepts, but which seemed the reverse of being pre-ordained and inevitable."¹⁵ In other words, the foundational role that industrialization played in the emergence and structuring of urban planning cast a deep shadow on the multiple forms of rapid urbanization that were taking place in different parts of the world in the nineteenth century. The assumed organic connection between industrialization and urban development results in a dual reductionism. Explicitly, it bounds urban development to industrialization; and implicitly, by the latent synchronization of industrialization with modernization and the West, every other line of development becomes either an aberration or a mere emulation void of content.

An urban centre such as nineteenth-century Smyrna was not an industrial or industrializing city. Here, the new institutions and spaces of the nineteenth century took form in response to an expansion of commerce and trade, not of industry. Smyrna's urban-development patterns and processes would be quite different from Paris, London, Manchester – even, for that matter, from Istanbul, but similar to Beirut, Salonica, or Alexandria. Nineteenth-century Smyrna did not have a Haussmann or an Anspach, nor grand schemes of urban planning. Yet this does not mean that this city was not experiencing the advent of modernity in its spatial organization. The organization of urban development in nineteenth-century Smyrna can only be called urban management.

Nineteenth Century Smyrna

The governing aspect of Smyrna's urban management was that it was most notably locally induced, and that it developed in response to the increase in the city's economic activities. Smyrna was not alone in this, of course. Its ascendance in the nineteenth century was part and parcel of the mid-nineteenth century boom which also stimulated the development of other Mediterranean cities.¹⁶ Many other port cities in the Mediterranean were facing similar problems such as inadequate ports, the need for more space for storage and commerce, or improved transportation within the city.¹⁷

From the mid-eighteenth century onwards Smyrna benefited from the growing trade between the Ottoman Empire and Western Europe: "From 1745 to 1789, an average of 34 per cent of the annual exports of the Ottoman Empire passed through Smyrna; the city's percentage of this trade peaked in the last quarter of the century."¹⁸ Following a brief stagnation caused by the Napoleonic Wars and the Greek War of Independence, "the trade of Izmir regained its vitality in the 1830s. Between [sic] 1840s and [sic] 1870s the total volume of trade of Izmir increased by four times, exports by three times, and imports by six times."¹⁹ Hence, in the nineteenth century, Smyrna was the epicentre of the most wide-ranging trade networks within the Ottoman Empire.²⁰ Especially after the building of the Izmir-Aydin and Izmir-Kasaba railways in the 1860s, the structure of the economy took another turn. Indeed, as was observed by a contemporary:

The houses of wood have given place to places of stone erecting in all directions. Smart shops abound with not only the necessities of house keeping and house furnishing, but the comforts and luxuries flow in abundantly from London and Paris... hotels upon hotels, invite the traveller. Not only a printing-press, but presses upon presses, and journals upon journals, French, Greek, Italian, and even English, have familiarized the inhabitants of Smyrna with the politics and literature of Europe.²¹

Smyrna's development exhibited a trajectory of intensification rather than spatial expansion, especially until the quay was built which I shall discuss shortly. The central commercial district of the city, the Frank quarter, began to form in the early seventeenth century towards the north of Kemeralti, the market area around the natural harbour called İç Liman.²² Here Levantine merchants built their residences, trading houses, and consulates along the northern stretches of the shore. These buildings were situated directly on the waterline, with fire-proof stone warehouses attached and "each hav[ing] its separate wharf at the water's edge".²³ The legendary Frank Street, or Rue de Franque, was the city's main artery in the seventeenth century.²⁴ Frank Street, about 8 meters wide and narrowing down to 5 meters at certain points, ran through the Frank district for about 2.4 kilometers.²⁵ The remainder of Smyrna was made up of incredibly narrow and crooked streets, so narrow that when a loaded camel passed through the pedestrians had to seek shelter in doorways and shops to avoid being knocked down.²⁶ In the eighteenth century, the Frank district expanded one block to the west, towards the sea, making the Quai Anglais the border between it and the bay.²⁷

The intensification in the pattern of urban development in pre-fire Smyrna is evidenced by the growing number of *ferhanes*, the dominant form of organization of commercial space in the Frank quarter. *Verhanes* or *Ferhanes* (the contracted pronunciation of Frankhane, "house of Franks") were quite narrow passageways, mostly covered, that usually lay at right angles to the sea and connected the streets running parallel to the shoreline with one another. *Ferhanes*, where businesses, shops, and offices were clustered, can be compared to arcades. The 1886/1887 Izmir official yearbook reports 26 *ferhanes*.²⁸ The 1905 insurance map shows 37 *ferhanes* – a substantial increase – 33 of which were located between Sari Street and the Arapyan Carsisi, streets that lay at right angles to the bay and formed the Eastern and Western boundaries of the Frank district.²⁹ There were no *ferhanes* connecting Cordon, the avenue along the quay, and Rue Parallèle, the avenue that lay immediately parallel to the quay, and only a very few between Rue Parallèle and the Quai Anglais, which ran parallel to Rue Parallèle a little towards the North. This tells us that when the city expanded towards the sea, this spatial form did not continue. The great majority of *ferhanes*, therefore, were located between the Quai Anglais and Frank Street. We can deduce that they began to appear in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries because the Quai Anglais, as mentioned before, was created towards the end of the eighteenth century. The overspill of shops and offices towards the east in the form of this dense network of passageways is an indication of the rapid economic growth experienced by Smyrna in this period. Muller-Wiener writes that the increasing commercialization of space in the nineteenth century drove out residential dwellings in this part.³⁰

After Arapyan Carsisi the street forming the western border of the Frank quarter and towards Kemeralti the organization of commercial space

changed to *hans*. These were used as inns, as well as spaces of storage and commerce. *Hans*, like the *ferhanes*, specialized in specific businesses or lines of trade. For instance, while one *han* would be solely appropriated by shoemakers, another would be taken over by tailors. There were around 25 *hans* in the mid-seventeenth century, and by century's end more than 80.³¹ The 1886/1887 yearbook lists 143 of them, the 1895/1896 volume reports 150, and the 1908 yearbook, 168.³²

Urban design and architecture have primary importance in giving identity to cities and thereby creating their unique profile. Pre-fire Smyrna, especially before the building of the quay, had no open public spaces. The only place that came close to a park was the green area in front of the municipal building in Konak, the area that lies between Kemeralti and the sea, the former İç Liman.³³ More importantly, unlike other significant Ottoman cities - most notably Istanbul, but also Salonica, Bursa, and Manisa - the Ottoman signature was clearly absent in Smyrna. Schiffer notes that European travelers searched in vain for the landmarks of an "Oriental city", such as monumental mosques.³⁴ It must be noted that the multi-confessional make-up of the city was directly reflected in the distribution of the city's places of prayer: in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, there was an equal number of mosques and churches, 22 of each, as well as 11 synagogues.³⁵ Goffman writes:

The fact is that the Ottoman central government had little to do with the creation of seventeenth-century Izmir. It was rather local authorities and Christian-European intruders and their Ottoman Armenian Christian, Greek Orthodox, Jewish, and Muslim partners and sometimes rivals who were the principal architects and engineers of the port city's design and construction.³⁶

American observers described life in the city in the first quarter of the twentieth century as "very liberal". "Indeed, it is almost extravagant. Smyrna is a miniature Paris as far as fashions go."³⁷ This "extravagance" seems to have prevailed for over a century. Indeed, Arundell, the British chaplain who lived in Smyrna between 1821 and 1840, complained about the "increasing love of amusements", such as the passion for gambling and the public theatre.³⁸ Another traveller at the turn of the nineteenth century noted the existence of a casino, "not excelled in Europe".³⁹

The period around Christmas and New Year was known as the carnival season in Smyrna. Cockerell, arriving towards the end of January caught the tail end of it:

To us it was the quintessence of gaiety to meet masques as bad as they were, with their forced hilarity, passing noisily from one Frank house to another. On the last days of the carnival there were processions, than which nothing could be more ridiculous.⁴⁰

Private dinner parties, balls, and visits usually “spilled over from the houses into the streets” in the form of musical shows, theatrical performances, and street festivals.⁴¹ This festive period was also significant in bringing together the various communities of the city. “The carnival at Smyrna is a season of gayety in which all sects appear to unite with equal animation” wrote De Kay, “even the taciturn Turk seems to catch a portion of the general animation”.⁴²

“Cities with ports differ from city-ports”, writes Matvejevic, in “the former they are a means and an afterthought; in the latter, starting point and goal”.⁴³ Indeed, in Smyrna it has been the centrality of its port which has shaped the city’s built environment and human geography. The port itself, therefore, deserves a more detailed discussion. Talking about the building of Smyrna’s quay will serve to elaborate my argument that the nineteenth-century experience of modernity in this city came as a response to the increasing volume of trade and commerce and, more importantly, that it was a locally induced process and an organic part of developments seen also in other Mediterranean ports.

The Frank quarter expanded once more towards the bay with the building of the port facilities in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. As a result of this land reclamation, two new streets running parallel to the Quai Anglais were added to the city’s map: Rue Parallèle and Cordon. By the second half of the nineteenth century, Frank Street had partially lost its prominence to the newly acquired shoreline, which furnished the city with an 18 meter wide avenue, Cordon, which ran about four kilometers along the water’s edge. The land-fill quay, completed in 1875, gave Smyrna not only the much needed new and enhanced port facilities and a promenade that introduced new usages of public space, but also further enhanced the “European” image of the city. The quay straightened out the extremely ragged shoreline. As one French traveller said later in the century, it made one believe that one was still in Europe and henceforth made “Smyrna a façade of European regularity tacked on to Oriental confusion”.⁴⁴

However, this regularity came as a result of intense struggles between the local authorities, Istanbul, foreign capital, and local merchants, which continued for almost two decades.⁴⁵ Zandi-Sayek observes that by the mid-nineteenth century the press had begun to play an important role in formulating urban questions, and it was in the local press that the demand for a new quay began to be voiced at this time. For Istanbul, the jagged wharves of Smyrna represented spaces of smuggling and vice. The local business community was looking for improved port facilities. If there was agreement so far, there was little consensus as to the location and the design of the new quay.⁴⁶ This demand cannot of course be separated from the other significant development: the building of the railways. Planning and building the new harbour for Smyrna began simultaneously with building the railways. As Kutukoglu underlines, improvements and developments in land transportation connecting the port cities with their hinterland were

synchronic with improvements regarding harbour capacity. For instance in Varna, Salonica, and Beirut the construction of new harbours were carried out simultaneously with the building of railways that improved transportation links with their hinterlands.⁴⁷ By the end of the third quarter of the nineteenth century, the Eastern Mediterranean port cities were much better integrated with their hinterlands and had significantly increased capacities to handle the booming trade.

The detailed analysis by Zandi-Sayek demonstrates that building the quay was an intense struggle within the business community, especially between owners of shore property, owners of sea lots, and the rest.⁴⁸ After a decade of commissions being formed and tentative plans being drawn up, in 1867 a group of British entrepreneurs - John Charnaud, Alfred Barker, George Guarracino - acquired the concession from the Ministry of Public Works to build the new harbour. However, the wharf tax the British company was to impose to finance and profit from the works aroused immense opposition from everyone - owners of sea lots, shore owners, and the rest of the local business elite. The sale of sea lots and their conversion to private ownership in the second quarter of the century too caused unbelievable confusion. As a result, the Quay Company of British entrepreneurs failed to generate the necessary local consent and concomitantly the local capital to finance the giant project, and the Smyrna Quay Company came to the brink of bankruptcy in 1869. It was at this point that the initial French contracting firm owned by the Dussaud brothers took over the project and finished the work in 1875.⁴⁹ What is most striking about this whole story is the inability of the Sublime Porte to impose its will on the local actors. In this arduous and conflict-ridden process, which lasted over two decades, local businesses managed to acquire substantial concessions.⁵⁰

I have mentioned the absence of the Ottoman signature on the city in the pre-nineteenth century period. It must be acknowledged, however, that as the new century got underway the Ottoman State's presence began to be more visible in the built environment. If not the Frank district, the lesser centre of Kemeralti certainly was vulnerable to the interventions of the re-centralizing and modernizing Ottoman administration. Specifically *Kışla-i Humayun*, the military barracks (also locally known as *Sarı Kışla*) and the clock-tower should be considered as markers of Istanbul's presence in nineteenth-century Smyrna. *Kışla-i Humayun* was built at the southern end of the city in late 1820s immediately following the destruction of the janissaries, in order to house the new army. This building can be seen as symbolically introducing the presence of the modern Ottoman army, in an attempt to re-establish its authority in its sovereign domain as well as in this city.

The elegant clock-tower situated very close to the *Sarı Kışla* in today's Konak Square was erected in 1901 in celebration of the 25th anniversary of Abdulhamid's enthronement. As is well-known, after the first clock-tower was built in Istanbul in 1888, others soon followed in various Ottoman cities,

usually marking either the birthday or the coming to power of the Sultan. The one in Beirut was built in 1898 and Tripoli, Aleppo, Jaffa followed suit.⁵¹ The organic relation between clocks as a modern artifact introducing precision, standardization, linearity, and new forms of social control and modernity is well established. The omnipresent tower in the old centre brought about an externalized and objective conception of temporality to this city whose socio-economic rhythm was already synchronized with other shores of the Mediterranean. So, it is no coincidence that the Ottoman State in its effort to adjust to the times would set up clock-towers in its ports - in places, that is, that were already in phase with modernity. We must add, however, that the Smyrna tower was also a local initiative, as is manifest from the mixed composition of the commission formed for its construction, and again from the diverse sources of the revenue generated for its completion. To sum up then, a closed city seems to be an appropriate image for the pre-twentieth century Smyrna's built environment and urban patterns. Economic and social activities and relations were crammed into every nook and cranny of the dark alleyways, *ferhanes*, *hans*, and narrow streets. Ottoman Smyrna consisted of claustrophobic urban forms which contrasted with the city's openness to the amplitude of Mediterranean networks and the liberality and openness of its everyday life and social structure. Its dense Ottoman urban structure was eventually overturned and replaced with the open spaces and boulevards of the post-republican city. Spatially, nineteenth-century Smyrna represented a fractured heterogeneity and an intense density, in contrast to the standardized homogeneity and apparent hollowness of the republican city to which we now turn.

Twentieth-Century Izmir

In the twentieth century, which for our purposes began with the 1920s, Izmir's urban development acquired distinctly new contours. For this period we can talk about (1) urban planning rather than urban management; (2) imposition of the aspirations and designs of Ankara rather than those of local agencies; (3) national capital instead of merchant capital for the realization of urban works; (4) and finally, and perhaps most distinctively, urban development geared towards a more totalitarian and nationalist interpretation of modernity.

As mentioned before, Ottoman Smyrna was destroyed at the end of the Anatolian war with the fire that began on 13 September, 1922, engulfed the Armenian, Greek, and Frank quarters, and became one huge inferno which by the time it had finally burned itself out two days later, had swallowed three quarters of the city. The post-1922 city, an enormous black hole encircled by a thin line of surviving quarters, presented an ideal opportunity for envisioning grandiose urban schemes. With the help of the changes introduced by Ankara in 1925 to the old *Ebniye Kanunu* (building regulations) of 1882, which permitted areas where more than 150 buildings

had burned down to be considered as agricultural land (*tarla*), the municipality to a great extent freed itself from the restrictions of burdensome and complex ownership claims in the fire zone.⁵²

The reconstruction of Smyrna literally meant building a new and drastically different city. Born out of the ashes of Smyrna, Izmir reflected a new understanding of modernity. Post-fire spaces and places expressed a modernity rigorously defined in a national idiom. The early republican years witnessed a monumental effort towards the re-organization of the geography of Anatolia and production of spaces that would form the basis of constructing national spatialities.⁵³ The most spectacular aspect of this project was the designation and creation of the new capital of Ankara in the centre of the new homeland. Anatolia, one of the places of exile in the Ottoman period, known as the dungeon of the Empire, was adorned with a city that was to reflect the future promises of a national existence.⁵⁴ Equally important, if less remarkable facet of the organized effort towards creating national spatialities was the re-centring of Anatolian cities and towns around open expanses named Squares of the Republic and marked by a statue or bust – depending on the scale of the urban formation – of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk; by creating parks or gardens of the republic around the squares or adjacent to them, and naming main streets again after the founder of the republic. It is remarkable that every single urban formation, small or large, shared these features and this repetitive pattern emphasized (especially in the small towns of Anatolia) that all were one and the same territory, all of them intrinsically Turkish.⁵⁵

Izmir's post-fire urban development was part of this pattern that reshaped urban settlements of the Anatolian peninsula with republic squares and parks. In Izmir these took the form of the Republic Square and the *Kültürpark* that sprang up over a significant expanse of the fire zone.⁵⁶ An urban plan for Izmir, commissioned by the municipality, was drawn up in 1924 by René Danger and M. Raymond Danger, working under the supervision of the well-known urban planner M. Prost. This grid plan proposed restructuring the fire zone with wide boulevards criss-crossing the city, the main one being named after Mustafa Kemal. The Danger-Prost plan proposed to radically reshape the highly dense and labyrinthine urban make-up of nineteenth-century Smyrna with its narrow winding streets and frequent dead ends, while preserving the centrality of the former Frank district. It pivoted on utilizing the fire zone as the administrative, cultural, and educational centre of the city. The plan was never implemented. The Izmir municipality did not begin any works in the fire zone until the early 1930s, which for over a decade left a huge dark hole at the centre of Turkey's second-largest city during which time the fire zone became an area of public hazard and danger.⁵⁷ Reconstruction finally began with the opening of the Republic Square in 1932, followed by building the *Kültürpark* in the summer of 1936.

The local newspapers welcomed the “cleaning of the fire zone” with great enthusiasm, and scrupulously reported all developments regarding the commissioning and progress of the statue of Atatürk. The work was entrusted to an Italian artist, Pietro Canonica, who also sculpted the statue that stands at the entrance to the Museum of Ethnography in Ankara. The Izmir monument shows Atatürk in full control on a rearing up horse, his hand pointing to the Mediterranean; bas-reliefs on the base represent scenes from the “war of liberation” and the evacuation of the Greek army from Izmir. The monument bestows a powerful presence and a new form of control to the square, and concomitantly to the city at the heart of which the square lies. The dramatic gesture of opening up a white square at the centre of the black hole that nineteenth-century Smyrna was sucked into signifies giving a new identity to this zone as a space for the presentation and exhibition of the symbols of modern Turkey with its modern Turkish citizens.

After opening of the Republic Square, rebuilding of the fire zone progressed with clearing out the area behind the square to create a large park, the *Kültürpark*. While space for a rather humble park in this area had been foreseen by the Danger-Prost plan, the *Kültürpark* exceeded it in every respect. As the name suggests, this “culture park” was not designed merely as a place of relaxation and recreation. Like its Ankara counterpart, the Genclik Parki completed in 1943, the *Kültürpark* was devised as a monument to the aspirations and projections of the new regime. As Bozdoğan observes, in the early years of the republic parks and places of public recreation had become “urban and architectural icons of republican modernity”. She writes: “As in other nationalist contexts of the time, Italy and Germany in particular, early republican culture was permeated by a strong cult of youth and health.” Bozdoğan argues that the idealization and the emphasis on youth and health can be understood in relation to a new regime “that had successfully broken ties with ‘the old empire’ or ‘the sick man of Europe’, as the Ottoman Empire was known in the nineteenth century.”⁵⁸

By way of commenting on this I would like to argue that this fascination with monumental public spaces in the 1930s, which is not only observable in Germany and Italy but also in the Soviet Union, had more to do with the dominant interpretation of modernity in Europe. While the understanding of modernity of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries was inspired by the so-called Industrial Revolution that was anchored in the sphere of production and epitomized in the images of railroads and coal mines, the interpretation of modernity in the 1930s opened up towards the realm of the symbolic. It is no coincidence that Atatürk’s Turkey was “seeking the future in the skies”. Mussolini’s Italy, Hitler’s Germany, and Stalin’s Soviet Union were looking up skywards as well.⁵⁹ This was a period when minds were fascinated with aeroplanes, skyscrapers, and ocean liners. As the futurists had done earlier, fascism, observes Falasca-Zamponi, (and we must add socialism and lesser forms of contemporaneous totalitarianisms),

appropriated the aeroplane as the symbol of a new era.⁶⁰ The 1930s saw a qualitative shift in the orientation of modernity from the present to the future. While the late nineteenth century was very much about organizing the present and controlling the tremendous change that was actually taking place, the end of the World War I signaled the beginning of a new period marked by its future-orientation.

This was especially true in those parts of Europe where the social fabric had disintegrated due not only to the physical destruction of the Great War but more so to the concomitant defeatism in countries like Germany and Italy. As Scott observes the “incapacitated civil society provide[d] the leveled terrain on which to build (dis)utopias... Much of the massive, state-engineering of the twentieth century has been the work of progressive, often revolutionary elites... the great enthusiasm and revolutionary hubris that were part and parcel of high modernism.”⁶¹ For these revolutionary elites in Germany and Italy and also in countries like the Soviet Union and Turkey the inter-war period was a time during which the present itself became only a backdrop against which the future was envisaged and an arena of rehearsal and preparation for the time to come. The fascination was not with the ongoing change, which had ended in massive destruction everywhere, but with the imagined change that the future held in its promise.

A brief look at the sources of inspiration for creating the *Kültürpark* will help us to see the interaction between spatial forms and the future projections and promises of a new regime inspired by the dominant interpretation of modernity. In the summer of 1933 Suat Yurtkoru, the then-head of the Izmir Soccer Association and soon to be appointed as the city's deputy mayor, took a group of Turkish athletes to Moscow. His travel notes published in the daily papers show that he was awed by what he witnessed in the Soviet capital. One place that made an indelible impression on Yurtkoru was the Central Park of Culture and Rest, named after Maxim Gorky.⁶² His notes describe this “culture park as a very important education and health institution” and relate in detail its various “educational and sports facilities” such as stadiums, amphitheatres, swimming pools, a parachute tower, libraries, and the like. One factor that Yurtkoru passionately emphasizes about Gorky Park was that it was built “in only three years”.⁶³

In the 1934 local elections Suat Yurtkoru was elected a representative to the city council, and Mayor Behcet Uz appointed him his deputy. In 1933 all ambitions collided: Yurtkoru's Moscow-inspired plans, coupled with the urgency of the task to develop the fire zone, the pressing need to find an area large enough for the economic exhibition that had been going on intermittently since 1923,⁶⁴ and the continuing hesitation about implementing the 1924 urban plan, all resulted in the creation of the *Kültürpark*. The park epitomized the effort to re-shape, and for that matter re-create, a novel social existence through the mediation of urban space.

About the *Gençlik Parki* in Ankara, Zeynep Uludag writes that this 260,000 square-meter park for a city with a population of only 123,000 was an “incredible monumental undertaking”.⁶⁵ If that was true for Ankara, the 430,000 square-meter park for a city of around 155,000 souls appears even more astonishing. The Izmir *Kültürpark* stands as a national monument at the heart of the city, reclaiming and re-possessing Ottoman Smyrna. It is a blatantly Turkish and republican space. Its five gates are named after the significant dates and foundational treaties in early republican history. Besides sports facilities and amphitheatres, the park includes permanent exhibition halls for State-owned enterprises and museums. It is worth noting that all but two buildings in the *Kültürpark* had a decidedly modernist style. Modern, national, urban public spaces like the *Kültürpark* and the Republic Square were seen as necessary components for the creation of modern habits and new sociabilities of the Turkish citizens, and more significantly for exhibiting the new citizenship. These spaces symbolized a radical break with the pre-fire urban forms, and were both novel and alien to the inhabitants of the early republican Izmir. Where there had been a void, both literal and symbolic, the new revolutionary elites filled it with desire, will, enthusiasm and, equally important, with power that was little challenged. This is why the republican elites chose to look towards the authoritarian States in Europe, rather than to England or France where people were demoralised and pessimistic after World War I, and whose governments were politically too weak to confront the challenges from below. Italy, Germany, and the Soviet Union suited the projections of the new Turkish elites well, who were equally potent, enthusiastic, and determined to shape the future.

This article presented two different ways in which urban modernity has been experienced and articulated in Ottoman Smyrna and Turkish Izmir. Nineteenth-century Smyrna was a dense and heterogeneous city that prospered on trade and commerce. Its formative element was, perhaps, opportunity and initiative, and modernity was experienced as a response to change so as to capture opportunity through initiative. Most importantly, in this period Smyrna was tightly attached to the larger Mediterranean world whose economy was thriving under the British hegemony. Turkish Republic severed the city's links with the Mediterranean and pulled Izmir into the orbit shaped by the national social, economic, and cultural policies. Early twentieth-century Izmir's population was homogenized both ethnically and religiously in the aftermath of the Anatolian war and the population exchange between Greece and Turkey in 1923. Its urban structure was also homogenized with the reconstruction following the Great Fire. Republican modernity was geared towards the rational guidance of change, and the political centre imposed this regulation in blanket fashion. Put differently: while the encounter with modernity in this particular geography was an ongoing process that had taken discernible forms especially in the nineteenth century, we can nevertheless detect significant differences in the ways in

which modernity played itself out in two distinct historical periods. Nineteenth century modernity experienced in Smyrna and other port cities around the Mediterranean was reflexive and dominated by the fascination with the contemporaneous radical changes of the present. Izmir's early-twentieth century modernity, as part and parcel of the shift towards totalitarianism in Europe and elsewhere, was centrally planned and its temporality was dominated by the organization and the design of the future.

Notes

- 1 New temporalities and spatialities structured by the Internet made it possible for me to write this chapter in Berlin as a fellow of the Working Group Modernity and Islam at Wissenschaftskolleg, while drawing on helpful suggestions on earlier drafts offered by Cengiz Kirli in Istanbul and Ravi Arvind Palat in Binghamton. I also would like to thank the support I received from the Bogazici Research Fund number 03HB801.
- 2 Quoted in Reinhold Schiffer, *Oriental Panorama: British Travellers in Nineteenth-Century Turkey*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1999, p. 113.
- 3 This spatial displacement of Eastern Mediterranean ports was not unique to Izmir. See Robert Ilbert, "International Waters", in Robert Ilbert & Ilios Yannakakis with Jacques Hassoun (eds), *Alexandria 1860-1960: The Brief Life of a Cosmopolitan Community* (transl. Colin Clement), Harpocrates Publishing: Alexandria, 1997, originally published in 1992, p. 12.
- 4 Fernand Braudel, *Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, New York: Harper & Row, 1972.
- 5 See Elena Frangakis, "The *Raya* Communities of Smyrna in the Eighteenth Century (1690-1820): Demographic and Economic Activities", in *Actes du Colloque International d'Histoire: La Ville Néohellénique, Héritages Ottoman et état grec*, Athens: Asia Minor Studies I, 1985, p. 29; Bruce McGowan, "The Age of the Ayans, 1699-1812", in Halil Inalcik with Donald Quataert (eds), *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, Vol. II, 1600-1914*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, p. 734; Mubahat Kutukoglu, "Osmanli Dis Ticaretinin Gelismesinde Izmir Limani ve Gumruklerin Rolu", in *Izmir Tarihinden Kesintiler*, Izmir: Izmir Buyuksehir Belediyesi Kultur Yayini, 2000, p. 299.
- 6 Daniel Goffman, "Izmir: From Village to Colonial Port City", in Edhem Eldem et. al. (eds), *The Ottoman City between East and West: Aleppo, Izmir, Istanbul*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, p. 95.
- 7 Resat Kasaba, "Izmir" in Caglar Keyder et. al. (eds), *Dogu Akdeniz'de Liman Kentleri (1800-1914)*, Istanbul: Tarih Vakfi Yurt Yayinlari, 1994, p. 13; Cem Behar, *The Population of the Ottoman Empire and Turkey 1500-1927, Historical Statistics Series Vol. II*, Ankara: State Institute of Statistics, 1996, p. 33.
- 8 Vital Cuinet, *La Turquie d'Asie, géographie administrative statistique descriptive et raisonnée de chaque province de l'Asie Mineure*, III, Paris: E. Leroux, 1894, p. 439.
- 9 Justin MaCarthy, *The Arab World, Turkey and the Balkans (1878-1914): A Handbook of Historical Statistics*, Boston: G.K. Hall, 1983, p. 142.
- 10 The literature on *Tanzimat* is so abundant that it makes any list superfluous. Yet for two very influential examples see Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, London: Oxford University Press, 1968; and Stanford Shaw and Ezel

- Kural Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey, Vol. II: Reform, Revolution, and Republic: The Rise of Modern Turkey, 1808-1975*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- 11 For a critical perspective on Ottoman modernization in the Hamidian period see Selim Deringil, *The Well Protected Domains: Ideology and the Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1909*, London: I. B. Tauris, 1999. For another insightful conceptualization of Ottoman modernization see Huri Islamoglu, "Property as a Contested Domain: A Re-evaluation of the Ottoman Land Code of 1858", in Roger Owen (ed.), *New Perspectives on Property and Land in the Middle East*, Harvard Middle-Eastern Monographs, 2000, pp. 3-63.
 - 12 Zeynep Celik, *The Remaking of Istanbul: Portrait of an Ottoman City in the Nineteenth Century*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993, p. xv.
 - 13 See Jens Hanssen, "'Your Beirut is on My Desk': Ottomanizing Beirut under Sultan Abdulhamid II", in (eds) Peter Rowe and Hashim Sarkis, *Projecting Beirut: Episodes in the Construction and Reconstruction of a Modern City*, Prestel: 1998, pp. 41-67; Jens Hanssen, Thomas Philipp, Stefan Weber (eds), *The Empire in the City: Arab Provincial Capitals in the Late Ottoman Empire*, Beirut: Orient-Institut der DMG Beirut, 2002.
 - 14 Mike Davis, "Planet of Slums: Urban Involution and the Informal Proletariat", *New Left Review*, 26, March-April 2004, p. 10.
 - 15 Leonardo Benevolo, *The Origins of Modern Town Planning*, (transl. Judith Ladry), M.I.T., 1971, p. 31.
 - 16 Resat Kasaba *et. al.*, "Eastern Mediterranean Port Cities and Their Bourgeoisies" *Review*, Vol. X (1), Summer 1986, pp. 121-35.
 - 17 Alexandria's population quadrupled between the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century, and doubled again in the course of the latter, reaching 231,396 by 1882. Beirut's population rose from 10,000 early in the early nineteenth century to over 100,000 by the century's end. The Tunis's expansion, similar to Izmir's, began in the seventeenth century, and although it did not take part in the boom of the nineteenth century to the extent of the other Mediterranean cities, it retained its pivotal role. Towards the end of the nineteenth century Tunis had a population of around 80,000. See Michael J. Reimer, "Ottoman-Arab Seaports in the Nineteenth Century: Social Change in Alexandria, Beirut and Tunis", in Resat Kasaba (ed), *Cities in the World-System*, New York: Greenwood Press, 1991, p. 137 and 139. Salonica is the city that showed the greatest similarities with Smyrna/Izmir in its rise and decline. With the migration of the Sephardic Jews to the Ottoman lands towards the end of the fifteenth century and at the end of the seventeenth century it became a bustling commercial center. By the eighteenth century Salonica was a port-city *par excellence* with a very mixed population of 50,000; by the turn of the century the city's population had reached 130,000. Apostolos P. Vacalopoulos, *A History of Thessaloniki*, (transl. T. F. Carney), Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1972, pp. 74-80, 93-98.
 - 18 Elena Frangakis-Syrett, *The Commerce of Smyrna in the Eighteenth Century (1700-1820)*, Athens: Centre for Asia Minor Studies, 1992, p. 119.
 - 19 Resat Kasaba, *Peripheralization of the Ottoman Empire*, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, State University of New York at Binghamton, 1985, p. 242.
 - 20 Frangakis, "The *Raya* Communities of Smyrna", op. cit. fn 5, p. 29. In comparative terms, in the second half of the 1880s Izmir's foreign trade volume was 35 to 40 per cent more than that of Salonica. In the 1890s, its trade volume surpassed that of Beirut by a similar margin. See, Mubahat Kutukoglu, "Osmanli Dis

- Ticaretinin Gelismesinde”, op. cit. fn 5, p. 299.
- 21 Francis Vyvyan, Jago Arundell, *Discoveries in Asia Minor*, Vol. I, London: Richard Bentley, 1834, pp. 418-419.
 - 22 Cinar Atay, *Tarih İcinde İzmir*, İzmir: Tifset Basım ve Yayın Sanayi, 1978, p. 27.
 - 23 John Fuller, *Narrative of a Tour through Some Parts of the Turkish Empire*, London: Murray, 1830, p. 42.
 - 24 It was also called Via dei Franci or Strada Franca. The multiple naming of streets in Smyrna was not limited to the Frank Street. Almost all major streets had at least two names, like quai Anglais, alias İngiliz Iskelesi. The 1914 trade almanac reports that each of the 1100 streets in Smyrna had signs both in Turkish and in French, and this was true even for the “exclusively Muslims areas upon which no foreigner has ever set foot”. Huseyin Rifat, *İzmir 1914, Aydın Vilayeti 1330 Sene-i Maliyesi Ticaret Rehberi*, (transcribed and edited by Erkan Serce), İzmir: Akademi Kitabevi, 1997, p.19.
 - 25 Cevat Sami and Huseyin Husnu, *İzmir 1905: Aydın Vilayeti Celilesinin Ahval-i tabiiye, Ziraiyye, Ticariye ve İktisadiye Vesair Ahvalinden Bahis, 1321 Sene-i Maliyesine Mahsus Nevsal-i İktisat*, (transcribed by Erkan Serce), İzmir: İzmir Buyuk Sehir Belediyesi Kultur Yayini, 2000, p. 62.
 - 26 Charles Swan, *Journal of a Voyage up the Mediterranean; Principally among the Islands of the Archipelago, and in Asia Minor, Vol. I*, London: Rivington, 1826, p. 128; and John Cam Hobhouse, *A Journey through Albania and Other Provinces of Turkey in Europe and Asia, to Constantinople, during the Years 1809 and 1810, Vol. II*, (London: Cawthorn, 1813), p. 617.
 - 27 Cinar Atay, *Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e İzmir Planlari*, İzmir: Yasar Egitim ve Kultur Vakfi, 1988, pp. 7, and 43. This must have been rather late in the century, because Richard Chandler in 1764 still describes the houses on the Frank Street as “extend(ing) from the street backward to the beach.” See Richard Chandler, *Travels in Asia Minor and Greece*, (New Edition with Corrections and Remarks by Nicholas Revett), Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1825, p. 70.
 - 28 Erkan Serce, (transcribed and edited), *İzmir ve Çevresi Resmî, Özel Binalar İstatistikî 1918*, İzmir: Akademi Kitabevi, 1998, p. 49.
 - 29 Charles E. Goad, *Plans D'Assurance de Smyrne: Explication des Signes Employés*, 1905.
 - 30 Wolfgang Muller-Wiener, “Der Bazar von İzmir: Studien zur Geschichte und Gestalt des Wirtschaftszentrums einer ägäischen Handelsmetropole”, *Mitteilungen der Fränkischen Geographischen Gesellschaft*, vol. 27-28, 1980-1981, p. 432.
 - 31 Suraiya Faroqhi, *Towns and Townsmen of Ottoman Anatolia: Trade, Crafts, and Food Production in an Urban Setting, 1520-1650*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984, p. 116; and Resat Kasaba, “İzmir”, op. cit. fn 7, p. 7.
 - 32 Serce, *Binalar İstatistikî*, op. cit. fn 28, p. 49.
 - 33 John Kingsley Birge, (Chairman of the Committee), *A Survey of Some Social Conditions in Smyrna, Asia Minor*, “General Information”, typescript, May 1921, “Recreation”, p. 4.
 - 34 Schiffer, *Oriental Panorama*, op. cit. fn 2, p. 126.
 - 35 Serce, *Binalar İstatistikî*, op. cit. fn 28, p. 49.
 - 36 Goffman, “İzmir: From village”, op. cit. fn 6, p. 83.
 - 37 Birge, *A Survey of Some Social Conditions*, “General Information”, op. cit. fn 33, p. 1.
 - 38 Arundell, *Discoveries in Asia Minor*, op. cit. fn 21, p. 422.
 - 39 T. Macgill, *Travels in Turkey, Italy and Russia during the Years 1803 to 1806*, London: 1808, p. 97.
 - 40 C. R. Cockerell, *Travels in Southern Europe and the Levant, 1810-1817, The Journal of C. R. Cockerell*, R. A. (ed.) Samuel Pepys Cockerrell, London: Longmans, Green,

- and Co., 1903, p. 134.
- 41 Rauf Beyru, "Social Life in Izmir in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century", in Virginia Taylor-Saclioglu (ed.), *Three Ages of Izmir: Palimpsest of Cultures*, Istanbul: Yapi Kredi Yayinlari, 1993, p. 148.
- 42 James Ellsworth De Kay, *Sketches of Turkey in 1831 and 1832 by an American*, New York: J.&J. Harper, 1833, p. 477.
- 43 Predgrad Matvejevic, *Mediterranean: A Cultural Landscape*, (transl. Michael Henry Heim), Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999, p. 14.
- 44 L. de Launay, *La Turquie que l'on voit*, Paris: Levant Herald, 1913, p. 245, quoted in Sibel Zandi-Sayek, "Struggles Over the Shore: Building the Quay of Izmir, 1867-1875", *City and Society*, vol. XII, no. 1, p. 55.
- 45 *Ibid.*, p. 56.
- 46 *Ibid.*, p. 64.
- 47 Mubahat Kutukoglu, "Izmir Rihtimi Insaati ve Isletme Imtiyazi", *Izmir Tarihinden Kesintiler*, Izmir: Izmir Buyuksehir Belediyesi Kultur Yayini, 2000, pp. 201, and 202.
- 48 Zandi-Sayek, "Struggles Over the Shore", op. cit. fn 44, pp. 55-74.
- 49 Kutukoglu, "Izmir Rihtimi," op. cit. fn 47, p. 211-212. The Dussaud brothers had already undertaken similar large-scale projects, such as building the ports in Cherbourg and Marseilles, and they were involved in the construction of the Suez Canal. *Ibid.*, p. 211.
- 50 Zandi-Sayek, "Struggles Over the Shore", op. cit. fn 44, pp. 69-74.
- 51 Hanssen, "Your Beirut Is on My Desk", op. cit. fn 13, p. 56.
- 52 These changes were significant for the urban development of many Anatolian towns burnt down at the dusk of the war. The changes made to the former regulations were formulated by the Izmir municipality and offered to Ankara. See, Erkan Serce, *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Izmir'de Belediye (1868-1945)*, Izmir: Dokuz Eylul Yayinlari, 1998, p. 172.
- 53 For a discussion of spatiality see, Edward W. Soja, *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Theory*, London: Verso, 1989, p. 129.
- 54 Much has been written on the importance of moving of the capital from Istanbul, a city with a long tradition of functioning as an imperial center, to Ankara, a place without rooted traditions. See Ugur Tanyeli, "Turk Modernlesmesinin Kentsel Sahnesini Yeniden Dusunmek", *Arredamento*, 1997 (03); Ilhan Tekeli, "Turkiye'de Cumhuriyet Doneminde Kentsel Gelisme ve Kent Planlamasi", in Yildiz Sey (ed.), *75 Yilda Degisen Kent ve Mimarlik*, Istanbul: Tarih Vakfi Yayinlari, 1998, pp. 1-24.
- 55 This repetitive fashioning of national spatialities can be likened to the "mallng" of America – the frenzied growth of retail spaces in shopping malls on the outskirts of towns that have led to the decay of 'Main Street USA'.
- 56 For a more detailed discussion of the post-fire reconstruction of Izmir see Biray Kolluoglu-Kirli, "The Play of Memory, Counter-Memory: Building Izmir on Smyrna's Ashes", *New Perspectives on Turkey*, No. 26, Spring 2002, pp. 1-28.
- 57 Fazil Baskin, *Eski ve Yeni Devirlerde Izmir Belediyesi*, Izmir: Marifet Matbaasi, 1941, p. 7.
- 58 Sibel Bozdogan, *Studies in Modernity and National Identity: Turkish Architectural Culture in the Early Republic*, University of Washington Press, 2001, p. 75.
- 59 See Robert Wohl, *A Passion for Wings: Aviation and the Western Imagination, 1908-1918*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.
- 60 Simonetta Falasca-Zamponi, *Fascist Spectacle: The Aesthetics of Power in Mussolini's Italy*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997, p. 70.

- 61 James C. Scott, *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989, pp. 89 and 90.
- 62 The Gorky Park and six hundred others built in its image across the former Soviet Union were regarded as significant landmarks in the building of socialist cities that were expected to offer to the new Soviet citizens rest combined with “wholesome, rational recreation”. See K. Ivanova, *Parks and Culture and Rest in the Soviet Union*, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House, 1939, p. 12.
- 63 July 31, 1933, *Yeni Asir*.
- 64 It would be interesting to note the space cleared out for the 1923 rural trade exhibition held in Moscow prepared the ground works for the development of the Gorky Park which itself was completed in 1928. See Stephen V. Bittner, “Green Cities and Orderly Streets: Space and Culture in Moscow, 1923-1928”, *Journal of Urban History*, vol. 25, no. 1, November, 1998.
- 65 Zeynep Uludag, “Cumhuriyet Doneminde Rekreasyon ve Genclik Parki Ornegi” in Yildiz Sey (ed.), op. cit. fn 54, Istanbul: Tarih Vakfi Yayinlari 1998, p. 69.