THE *ETHOS* OF ARCHITECTS
TOWARDS AN ANALYSIS OF ARCHITECTURAL PRACTICE IN TURKEY

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

NİLGÜN FEHİM KENNEDY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

SEPTEMBER 2005

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıoğlu
Head of Department

This is to certify that I have read this thesis and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Prof. Dr. Hasan Ünal Nalbantoğlu
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıoğlu (METU-SOC.) _____

Prof. Dr. Hasan Ünal Nalbantoğlu (METU-SOC) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç (METU-SOC) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Selahattin Önür (METU-ARCH) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ahmet Alpay Dikmen (AU-FPOLS-PA) _____

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 : NİLGÜN FEHİM KENNEDY

Signature : _____

ABSTRACT

THE *ETHOS* OF ARCHITECTS
TOWARDS AN ANALYSIS OF ARCHITECTURAL PRACTICE
IN TURKEY

Fehim Kennedy, Nilgün

Ph.D., Department of Sociology

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Hasan Ünal Nalbantoğlu

September 2005, 255 pages

A certain architectural "*ethos*" comes into being as a result of the specific training which architects receive as producers of space, of their dual status as artists and professionals, of the conditions in which they live and of the social status of their profession. This *ethos* is a product of the architects' collective "*habitus*". The attitudes of architects regarding their position in the building industry, their role in society and their self-image (or its lack thereof) as artists determine the transformations within the architectural profession under the impact of the changes in society. This study investigates architects' professional practice by focusing only on those architects working independently and mostly having their own offices. Thirty-one architects were grouped by age, gender, the faculties from which they graduated and province of residence and work. The international influence on architectural discourse, the effects of architects' organisations and their professional ideology were introduced as additional variables for investigating the nature of their *habitus*. The interviews revealed that the architects' "spontaneous professional ideology" (SPI) is the main adhesive of their collective *habitus* and the *ethos*, and it forces architects to think in a

specific way about space, the sovereignty of architecture, its art component, its legitimacy, architects' devotion to their profession, their feelings of superiority over clients and users as well as their overall code of conduct.

Keywords: architect, *ethos*, *habitus*, professional practice, spontaneous professional ideology

ÖZ

TÜRKİYE'DE MİMAR KİMLİĞİ VE MİMARLIK MESLEK PRATİĞİ ÜZERİNE BİR ÇALIŞMA

Fehim Kennedy, Nilgün
Doktora, Sosyoloji Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Hasan Ünal Nalbantoğlu

Eylül 2005, 255 sayfa

"Mekân üreticisi" olarak da düşünülen mimarın hem sanatçı hem profesyonel sıfatıyla aldığı eğitim, yaşadığı koşullar ve mesleğin toplumsal statüsü belli bir mimarlık "*ethos*"u oluşturur. Bu *ethos* mimarların ortak "*habitus*"ları ile şekillenir. Mimarların inşaat sanayindeki konumları, toplumsal rolleri ve kendilerini sanatçı olarak görüp görmedikleri geçirilen toplumsal dönüşümlere bağlı olarak mimarlık meslek pratiğindeki değişimleri biçimlendirir. Bu çalışmada mimarların meslek pratiği incelendiğinden, çalışma serbest çalışan büro sahibi/ortağı mimarlarla sınırlı tutuldu. Otuzbir mimar, yaş, toplumsal cinsiyet, mezun oldukları okullar ve yaşadıkları/çalıştıkları illere göre gruplandırılırken, uluslararası mimarlık söyleminin etkileri, mimarların örgütlenmeleri ve profesyonel meslek ideolojileri de değişken olarak değerlendirmeye katıldı. Yüzyüze yapılan mülakatlar, mimarların çoğu kez 'kendiliğinden' işleyen profesyonel meslek ideolojilerinin, ortak *habitus*larının dolayısıyla *ethos*unun ana birleştiricisi olduğunu ve mimarların mekân, mimarlığın bağımsızlığı, sanat bileşeni, meşruiyeti, mimarın mesleğe bağlılığı, kullanıcı ve müşteri üzerindeki üstünlüklerini algılayışları ve etik kuralları

hakkındaki düşüncelerini belirleyerek meslek pratiğini etkilediğini ortaya koymaktadır.

Anahtar kelimeler: mimar, *ethos, habitus*, meslek pratiği, profesyonel meslek ideolojisi

To my sons Barış and Deniz

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I express sincere appreciation to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Hasan Ünal Nalbantoğlu for his guidance and insight throughout the research. I owe a particular debt of gratitude to the 31 architects who agreed to give of their valuable time and be interviewed. Without them, this study would not have been possible. I would also like to thank my friends and relatives for arranging appointments with architects and for welcoming me into their homes in provinces other than Ankara. Finally I would like to thank my spouse Bernard, brother Gürbüz and children Barış and Deniz for being on hand to solve every technical difficulty and for their continuous support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

> Whereas the twentieth century began on a note of optimism with visions of a futuristic utopia, it ends on a note of reflection. Whereas it opened with slogans such as 'Towards a New Architecture', it closes with a 'rethinking' of architecture.
> Neil Leach (1997: xiii)

What is architecture and what is it for? These are vital questions which have been asked ever since the early stages of modernity. Every architect undoubtedly has an answer of his or her own, but it is difficult to find a common denominator among these answers, since individual architects answer the question in accordance with their own world views and preferences. Nevertheless, there are certain factors which affect the subjective taste and world view of individual architects in a specific historical period. By describing these, it is possible to shed light on the common culture of architects who display varying world views and preferences, and also to uncover clues for an investigation of the general relations between society and architecture. As Neil Leach states in the preface to the book *Rethinking Architecture*:

> [t]he discipline of architecture has gone through something of a metamorphosis in recent years. There is evidence of a clear shift both in the nature of debates within architecture and in its relationship with other academic disciplines. Not only are architects and architectural theorists becoming more and more receptive to the whole domain of cultural theory, but cultural theorists, philosophers, sociologists and many others are now to be found increasingly engaged with questions of architecture and the built environment (Leach, 1997: vii).

According to Leach (ibid: xv), this new situation reflects the fact that architecture is the product of a certain way of thinking. If the problems of architecture are to be traced to their roots, then attention needs to be focused on the thinking and considerations that inform its production.

Architecture produces spaces which give shape to the face-to-face relations between people. Unveiling the architectural way of thinking is therefore also a way of understanding social relations. One of the best ways of achieving this is to explain the producers, carriers and implements of this way of thinking - that is, architects.

Accordingly, this piece of research aims at examining the *ethos* of architects in Turkey today, and at the same time to describe the practice of architecture in this country in a sociological way. In other words, the sociological features of a certain group of professionals and their common professional culture in their professional practice will be examined with the help of Pierre Bourdieu's theory of *habitus*. If, as a result, it can make a contribution to the search for answers to questions like "what is architecture in Turkey?" and "who are the architects as professionals?" in this specific historical period, then it may have achieved its objective. For in Turkey, as in the rest of the world, it is time for a "rethinking" of architecture.

Architectural spaces determine the ways in which people carry out their daily lives and at the same time exhibit, consciously or otherwise, their perceptions, attitudes and values. Spatial experiences take on different meanings depending on such social categories as class, gender and ethnicity (David Harvey, 1990). These different meanings lead to different perceptions, different perceptions to different attitudes and different attitudes to different values (the reverse is also true), and this entire process contributes to the internalisation of the social structure. This state of affairs, which can be subsumed under the name *habitus* (Pierre Bourdieu), functions "below the level of consciousness and language, beyond the reach of introspective scrutiny and control by

the will" (Bourdieu, 1989: 466). It is not a question of free will but of choices (choices imply will) and it is also a vehicle for ensuring the continuity of social authority.

As individuals, architects are not independent of this process. Their *habitus* calls on them to earn their livings as architects while reminding them of their essential responsibility for the built environment. However, these demands of the *habitus* are frequently contradictory: for one to be achieved, the other often has to be sacrificed. Moreover, according to Henry Lefebvre (1991), spaces are perceived quite differently by the architect or other experts on the one hand and by the users of those same spaces on the other, with the former constantly tending to displace and marginalise the latter.

For Theodor Adorno (1997), these contradictions stem from the fact that architecture is directed towards a practical aim but is also an independent art form, and from the impotence which arises due to this ambiguous character. Further, as Charles Jencks (1985) puts it, the architects of today are much more dependent than in the past on the collective patronage of the state, the municipality or the businessmen's committee. In this context, conflicting interests can set up serious obstacles to the architect as he or she seeks to carry out the profession. None of this prevents architects from espousing a "professional ideology" in which architectural practice can be an independent profession and architecture can by itself produce solutions. This ideology in particular leads to different interpretations of how the architect should define him or herself and the profession, and thereby brings to the fore different perceptions of space to which Lefebvre (1991) referred, turning the remaining part of society into the "other". As a result, the architect - however he or she regards himself or herself, whether as artist, politician or any other category – does not tend to question the real status of the profession, and fails to

appreciate the true reasons for apparent the impotence of the construction process.

Architects and the practice of architecture in Turkey are subject to all of the above considerations. At the same time, there are distinct circumstances which stem from the peculiarities of the country itself. Architectural historians Gülsüm Baydar-Nalbantoğlu (1988) and Sibel Bozdoğan (2001) assert that architects in Turkey adopted the ideology of the nation-state during the process of constructing modernity and since they employed architecture towards this end, they remained dependent on the state, resulting in failure to create an independent architectural discipline in the absence of an architectural *avant-garde* in Turkey. This argument is, in fact, a transposition into the field of architecture of the criticisms of the "second republic thought", which developed among certain sections of the society after 1980 and which asserts, briefly, that modernisation in Turkey was carried out by the state in a top-down manner and all the problems encountered today are the outcome of this particular historical experience. However, it is becoming increasingly clear today that the nation-state was the chief protagonist of the history of modernisation in the West as well, and during the process of nation-building all states went through similar process - such as the creation of officialized languages and histories. When this fact is taken into consideration and when, moreover, it is so obvious that in the West, too, architects were among the instruments of the modernisation process - it becomes apparent that to present this phenomenon as something specific to Turkey will create serious problems for evaluating the current state of the architectural profession in Turkey. For this reason, one of the basic tenets of this study will be that the historical development of the architectural profession in Turkey was not entirely dissimilar to its development in the West, and that existing differences are cultural or stem from the different way in which capitalism has been applied. This assumption may constitute an

important input when determining how architects define themselves and visualise their professional practise today.

Frederic Jameson (2002) argues that modernisation is the ways of constructing capitalism, and that it is normal for each country to follow a separate path of its own in line with its own cultural heritage. In other words, the route taken by the West is not the absolute norm for others. The fact that efforts to build capitalism in Turkey have been carried out by the state is not necessarily to be evaluated through western eyes, and all the differences in professional practice cannot be evaluated without taking this into consideration. For example, the small, independent architect's office, somewhat corresponding to the small-scale production which has its place within the capitalist mode of production atelier, is quite widespread in Turkey. The system of public tenders, about which architects frequently and justifiably complain, is one of the main difficulties facing the practice of architecture in Turkey. Economic conditions make it very difficult for architects to obtain individual private commissions, and state tenders are therefore of vital importance for the survival of small architectural offices. However, aggressive price-cutting aimed at winning business at any cost greatly reduces the quality of the architecture produced.

Meanwhile, the great majority of graduates of architecture faculties are employed either as public servants or as technical staff of private construction companies, and in both cases they are by and large excluded from the decision-making process as architects.

Architects in Turkey also suffer from problems related to the recognition of their professional identities. While civil engineers and unqualified contractors produce architectural projects, architects are distanced from control of the construction process. The provision of architectural services by unqualified people in Turkey can have extremely serious consequences, as becomes clearest in the case of earthquakes. In addition, the field of influence of the profession has

been narrowed through the emergence of a series of new design professions such as interior design, landscape architecture and urban design.

The education which architects receive, the conditions in which they live and the social status of the profession and its professional ideology and tradition together constitute a certain architectural "*ethos*". The word *ethos* is taken here to mean the "characteristics of a community or of culture, code of values by which a group or society lives" (Oxford Dictionary). This *ethos* is a collective product of the aforementioned *habitus*. Bourdieu's *reflexive sociology* and the way in which "Bourdieu's *genetic structuralism* develops sociological concepts which link the empirical/historical with the theoretical" (Alan Swingewood, 2000: 211) may serve as a basis for shedding light on the *ethos* of architects in Turkey.

A study of the *ethos* of the profession in turn requires a sociological analysis of the profession. Necdet Teymur (2000:16) points out that architectural research, publications and conferences have focused on various combinations of issues such as urbanisation, housing, construction, history, philosophy, aesthetics, ecology, culture, creativity and business, while tending to ignore politics and – less understandably – the profession itself. According to Teymur (ibid), much attention is paid to new buildings, the work of famous architects, and the affairs of professional institutions, and major advances have occurred in architectural theory and history in recent decades. But there still exists no comprehensive sociology of the architectural profession.

What Teymur (ibid:15) understands by the sociology of architecture is the scientific examination of what kind of a profession architecture is, the explanation of the differences between architecture as a profession and architecture as a discipline or an art, and the study of the

economics and politics of the profession, its internal and external culture, its discourse and its language.

The main objective of this thesis then is to contribute to a "comprehensive sociology of the architectural profession". The starting point for this study can be the following borrowed statement:

> (…) architects define themselves as professionals. They claim financial rewards for their knowledge and skill in the design of built environments. In addition, they claim the respect due to those who protect the public interest and the needs of those who do not possess this knowledge and skill. Unlike other professional groups, however, they also claim to contribute to the artistic culture of their country (Martin Symes *et.al*, 1995: 4).

The purpose of this study is then to analyse specifically the attitudes of architects vis-à-vis their position in the building industry, their role in society and their self-image (or lack thereof) as artists as well as to establish the role their *ethos* plays in shaping the transformations which seem to be taking place within the architectural profession paralleling the changes in society.

The concept of *habitus* which Pierre Bourdieu invokes in order to explain human practice is a useful instrument for this purpose. *Habitus* is a set of dispositions which governs the ways in which agents are likely to act and react. The attitudes, perceptions and practices associated with these dispositions are regular, although they may not be conscious or determined by any given rule. The dispositions which make up *habitus* are learnable, structured, durable, generative and transposable.

Habitus provides people with a sense of how to act and respond in their daily lives. It directs their actions and inclinations but it does not totally determine them. It gives them a “feel for the game”, a sense of what is “reasonable” and what is not.

In addition to the personal *habitus*, it is possible to speak of the collective *habitus* of a group of people, based on the assumption that the *habitus* may be relatively homogeneous for individuals with similar backgrounds and in similar social situations. For this reason, the concept of *habitus* has been chosen as the theoretical basis of this research. The properties of *habitus* give us an opportunity to understand the *ethos* which is the product of the collective *habitus* of architects.

Research into architecture in Turkey is concerned mainly with the so-called spatial functions and physical characteristics. Similarly, the work that has been done on architectural philosophy is concerned primarily with the position of the architect as the “subject” of a historically determinate practice while also implying the relationship between architecture on the one hand and ideology and technology on the other. Studies, theoretical or otherwise, overwhelmingly do not involve any sociological analysis. Sociological analyses have largely fallen within the scope of departments of city and regional planning, a discipline which is quite different from architecture although the two are often confused. Likewise, research done by sociologists into spatial issues focuses primarily on urban space, architectural spaces being merely used in a general sense as a way of classifying the occupants of urban space - for example, into apartment-dwellers, squatters, and the like. Yet architectural spaces are the very places where social relations are formed face-to-face and shaped on a one-to-one basis. In considering the approach to the space by the discipline of sociology, hierarchical assumptions result in a concentration on large-scale entities like cities to the neglect of architectural space. As a result, while urban planning is subject to examination from the angle of social relations, architecture is usually exempted from any such account.

One interesting attempt to examine the relationships between socio-economic problems and architecture was made in 1969 when the

Turkish Chamber of Architects held a Seminar on Architecture, in which the opening speech was entitled "Towards Revolution in Architecture". Papers were presented not only by architects but also by Turkey's leading social scientists and economists of the day. The political tendencies of the period, their beliefs in planning, rationalisation and science, found clear expression in all of these papers. Particularly striking was the way in which the problems of today's architecture were foreseen and the desire expressed for a socially conscious and responsible architecture. At the closing session of the seminar, Doğan Kuban (1969: 540) noted that there are many trends which affect the architect from beyond his or her control. As examples, he gave the movements of economic data, technological change, the dynamics of urbanisation and the way in which social relations are ordered. He stressed the direct link between architects and the place and importance of construction investments in the economy, but noted that this too was not something which is entirely up to the architect.

These words demonstrate that the dominant approach at the seminar was not to regard architecture as capable of everything, but to distinguish between what the architect could and could not do. Against this backdrop, the architect is seen as having an obligation to carry out social responsibilities. From this point of view, the architect is identified as a technician with a political personality. The issues for the seminar identified by Kuban (ibid) were: first, the economic power to be transferred to the field of architecture; secondly the architect's use of this economic power, starting with education; and thirdly proposals to be made for planning, for the adoption of technology appropriate to Turkey's conditions, for the organisation of the construction and building sector, for the correct definition of goals and for education policies.

In terms both of the influence of the political climate of the period and of the professionalisation of Turkish architects, the seminar might

be regarded as a continuation of the "ideals" later pointed out by Gülsüm Baydar Nalbantoğlu and Sibel Bozdoğan. According to Bozdoğan (2001: 32), the first Ottoman Association of Engineers and Architects (1909-1922), unlike its counterparts in the West, was not concerned to determine professional standards, and was not interested in achieving a monopoly on the construction market. According to Baydar-Nalbantoğlu (1998: 117), this, was because Ottoman engineers and architects at the turn of the century saw their alliance in predominantly idealistic terms – a `technologism` consistent with the politics of the modernist constitutional government and which owed more to political consciousness than to professional consciousness.

Both authors view this phenomenon negatively. In the conclusion of her book, Bozdoğan (ibid: 301) notes that the Chamber of Architects became a voice of opposition in the political arena after the 1960s, and approves of this, regarding it as a part of the reaction to the official cultural norms of the early Republic. However, it appears more plausible to treat the interest of architects in politics in Turkey as a continuous professional tradition.

The architecture seminar of 1969 is the only event of its kind. No similar seminar has been organised ever since, except for the seminar on Architecture and Economy in 1981. The topics of subsequent gatherings have been rather narrowly architectural, such as national architectural styles, architectural education, practical problems of architects etc.

The Chamber of Architects has carried out a number of surveys of architects. Two surveys carried out by the Union of Chambers of Architects and Engineers (TMMOB) must also be mentioned here since they are important for the matter under discussion. The first is a survey concerning architects' social status which the Chamber of Architects embarked upon in 1975. In 1978, TMMOB lent its support to the survey, which was expanded to cover all TMMOB members. According

to Ali Artun, who was in charge of the survey, it was never completed due to the "professionalistic tendency and officialisation process which swelled up in the wake of the military coup of September 12" (1999: 11).

This study was entitled *Mühendisler Mimarlar - Ekonomik İlişki ve Toplumsal Bilinç Göstergeleri, Yüzyıl Ortalarından Sonraki Tezlere Bir Bakış, Türkiye'de Mühendisler-Mimarlar: Hipotezler* (Engineers and Architects - Indicators of Economic Relations and Social Consciousness, An Overview of Second Half of the Century Theses, Engineers and Architects in Turkey; Some Hypotheses). It was reprinted in 1999 under the title of *Fordizmin ve Mühendisin Dönüşümü* (The Transformation of Fordism and of the Engineer[s]). It sought to clarify the class status of architects and engineers on the basis of theses developed in the second half of the twentieth century concerning the restructuring of labour processes. A survey of TMMOB members carried out in 1976 sought to determine in particular the social-political stances of architects and engineers such as their world views, their views on organisation, their participation in the activities of their chambers and their opinions on major national issues. Ali Artun's work is of importance both for the hypotheses which it proposed and as a precursor of another study, *Kapitalizm, İnsanlık ve Mühendislik: Türkiye'de Mühendisler, Mimarlar* (Capitalism, Humanity and Engineering: Engineers and Architects in Turkey), undertaken by Ahmet Haşim Köse and Ahmet Öncü in 1998-1999 with a view to ensuring "the creation of a collective memory at the TMMOB".

The most important conclusion of the work of Köse and Öncü (2002: 175) is that it shows that the status of engineers and architects in terms of their economic class is of decisive importance in determining their professional ideologies and in this sense their organisational preferences. Köse and Öncü (ibid) classify engineers and engineering in terms of their relation to capital in line with Taylor

and Veblen's thesis, and assert that while the Taylorist engineer has an outlook which is in harmony with the existence of capitalism, the Veblenian engineer is a critical engineer who finds himself or herself at odds with his or her existence in the web of capitalist relations.

Köse and Öncü (ibid: 175) note that the majority of Turkish architects and engineers are in paid employment either in the public sector or in the private. These engineers who come from less privileged social and educational backgrounds can thus be regarded as partially proletarianised. Their job satisfaction is low and they aspire to becoming self-employed so as to move up the social scale. Despite their relation to capital in Veblenian sense, they tend largely to have right-wing political views, and in this sense to be in harmony with the system. Engineers of higher social status, such as those in managerial positions in large organisations, have overwhelmingly right-wing views while conforming to the Taylorist model.

These two studies are of importance for demonstrating the class status and political-ideological tendencies of architects and engineers in Turkey. However, they do not distinguish between architects and engineers. The efforts of architects to define themselves and to distinguish themselves from engineers have a long history in Turkey as in all other countries. Even if their working conditions and class situations may be similar to those of engineers, architects have developed an *ethos* based on the specific characteristics of their profession. By examining how they have done so, this thesis hopes to add a new and different dimension to the studies mentioned above.

There are a total of 29,655 architects (as of the end of January, 2004) registered with the Chamber of Architects in the 21 provinces in which it is organised in Turkey. These architects can be classified into self-employed architects, architects employed in the public and private sectors and architects employed in academic capacities. Among academic architects, too, a distinction might be made between those in

the public universities and those in the private ones. However, it was decided to limit the present piece of research to architects working independently since the matters to be examined through the eyes of the architects in question include perceptions of space and the practice of the profession. Architects who own their own offices, either individually or as partners, have been classified according to age, gender and the provinces where they live. The faculty from which the architect graduated has been introduced as an additional variable. Their professional ideology, the effects of their organisations and international influences on their *habitus* have also been taken into consideration. In-depth, face-to-face\ structured interviews were conducted in 2004 with 31 architects (11 women, 20 men) of varying age groups in six different cities (Ankara, Antalya, Bursa, Istanbul, Kastamonu and Konya). The architects interviewed were graduates of seven different faculties of architecture. In this way, each of the variables was represented more or less meaningfully.

The research has been presented in six chapters, in the light of the information obtained from an evaluation of the interviews. Chapter 2 consists of a summary of the literature concerning space, architecture and architects. The methodology employed is detailed in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 sets out the results of the interviews. In Chapter 5, an attempt is made to combine these results with the review of the existing literature, and the *ethos* of architects in Turkey is explained. The final chapter is reserved for conclusions of the present study.

CHAPTER 2

SPACE, ARCHITECTURE & ARCHITECTS: A THEORETICAL OVERVIEW

> Works of architecture do not stand motionless on the shore of the stream of history, but are borne along by it.
> Hans-Georg Gadamer (in Leach, 1997:134)

Architecture can be seen, says Robert Mugerauer, following Heidegger, as a mode of opening – something which precedes the construction of particular buildings and the creation of an urban fabric. According to him, “[t]he opening is not something we can accomplish by wilful exertion. It is *not* something we can *create* all by ourselves” (1992: 217). On the contrary, the city-founding process is shaped and succeeds or fails within a context defined both by local physical and environmental conditions and by an encompassing sacred or secular realm.

Architecture began when the men or women of prehistory made shelters for themselves out of sticks and stalks, or turned caves into shelters. It was architecture because it was an "opening" to reshape nature. It was architecture because in defining their "private" spheres they also defined the "public" (although not in the sense in which we speak of it today). They set out the rules of a social order which prevented others from coming into their own zones and which created the sacred. It is not coincidental that archaeology uses the ruins of ancient settlements in order to understand their social order (true, the archaeologists may recreate the past from the starting point of their own times, and so may inject the values of the present into the past. But this does not prevent architecture from playing a key role in

understanding past reality, for it is the only concrete source along with artefacts). Ever since, all architectural styles have reflected the society which they belong to, and especially the world view of the rulers. Until modernity, prominent architecture had little to do with the vernacular. It was the religion, emperors, kings or sultans who were the patrons of society and of architecture.

In ancient Egypt, the pharaohs, believing in reincarnation, built their tombs strong enough to last forever. The pyramids not only showed the ancient Egyptians how powerful their rulers were, even after death; they also show today's world that architecture is more than a building activity. It carries the ideas of its time from the past into our present and possibly the future as well.

Gothic architecture, which was powerful in the 12th century, shows how western societies lived under the rules of the Kingdom of Christianity, i.e. the Catholic Church. The architecture of the time sought to demonstrate the power of the divine and, by contrast, the weakness of the human being. To build a cathedral as high as possible implied that human beings were only a tiny speck in the order of things. Everything was for God. People as worldly creatures had to be made to feel their unimportance in the cathedral. Even today, when you enter a Gothic cathedral, the proportions of the building can surprise you. Horror movies tend to use Gothic buildings as sets because they make it easier to express the influence of forces beyond human control.

While a pyramid may be said to define eternity on a horizontal line - in other words, in time - Gothic seems to define eternity on a vertical line - i.e. in terms of space from earth to sky. Renaissance architecture, popular between the 14th and 16th centuries, is quite different, reflecting the shift of power towards the worldly creatures, particularly the merchants and bankers. Ferneaux Jordan (1993: 167) explains that while the Gothic style was created for the Abbot of St Denis, counsellor of the kings of France, the Renaissance was designed for the

merchants and bankers of Florence. Although Gothic, born in France, was employed in many palaces and castles, it remained primarily ecclesiastical. By contrast, the Renaissance, born in Italy, was primarily royal and mercantile, and accordingly many churches were built in this style.

It is apparent here again that changes in society - this time in the direction of secularisation - found their reflection in architecture. When we consider the most famous architects of the period, Leonardo da Vinci and Michelangelo, it was also the beginning of the period of "universal man" who created these buildings as human beings for human beings. This proved the "triumph of humanism", says Furneaux Jordan (ibid: 172).

He goes on to state that (ibid: 249) the 17th and 18th centuries were the period of grand empires and the glory and despotism of these empires is reflected in Baroque architecture, characterised by exuberant decoration, expansive curvaceous forms, a sense of mass, a delight in large-scale and sweeping vistas and a preference for spatially complex compositions. For Furneaux-Jordan (ibid), this sort of architecture was regarded by some as somewhat immoral. It introduced an element of sensuality and sensation into a religion of austerity and humility, and it made use of every art and device, merging painting, sculpture, music and architecture into a single riotous glory.

The Enlightenment brought onto the scene Rococo decoration, distinguished by its lightness in colour and weight. The use of naturalistic flowers, branches, trees and whole rustic scenes emphasises the importance of nature and the control of it by rational man, not by divine forces. The architectural style of the Enlightenment has also been called neo-classicism or romanticism. In the words of Furneaux Jordan:

> [t]he development of rationalism in philosophy and of regularity in music and poetry with the elevation of the Greek and Latin classics as

> models in literature and with the general tendency towards clear rules and principles in all the arts. Classical architecture was at once the most rational, the most Roman and the most clearly defined of all styles (ibid: 259).

However, it was this rationalisation of art that led the architect to a dilemma. On the one hand, as an artist, he might have felt that the terrain under his feet was beginning to move. He was losing his privileged position and becoming, in Kant's terms, a "cog in a machine" (1784). On the other hand, he had to show his distinctiveness, and architecture was also a tool for the architect to show his own power.

One of the elements of Romanticism, explains Furneaux Jordan (ibid: 280), is the "divine discontent" of the artist, which prompts a flight away from reality and towards what is distant and strange. Both the snobberies of the eighteenth century and the subsequent onslaught of industrialism encouraged such a flight. All Classical architecture is to some extent Romantic as it represents a kind of nostalgia for antiquity. But following the Enlightenment, the French Revolution and the Romantic Movement, the nostalgia was accentuated. People felt the need to express their nostalgia in literature and the visual arts. Good design - proportion, scale, symmetry, harmony etc. - was no longer enough. The qualities of “charm, novelty, light, escape, the picturesque and, above all, historical association needed to be invoked”.

However this search for distinctiveness failed to bring back the privileged days of the architect. Society was changing, and this change was an opening to our modern era.

According to Lucien Goldman (1999), the Enlightenment is an important step in the history of the bourgeoisie. Thus it is important to understand the relationship between the development of the free market economy and the ideas of the Enlightenment. For example, individuality supposes the so-called rational and autonomous individual who makes his or her decisions and acts according to his or her own

needs in a free market economy. As for the architect, until now he had enjoyed the privilege of performing his art as a result of the patronage of a certain kind of benefactor; now he had to compete in the market for survival. According to Alan Colquhoun (1990: 29), in a fluid situation where decisions on basic issues appeared to be beyond the architect's control, the architect was inclined to escape into irrelevant symbolism. The problem lay not in the desire for symbolism itself, since there can be no architecture without symbolism. However much society needed an architecture which expressed its own ideals and spoke to people's spirits, the danger was that its own economic instruments would make such an architecture impossible.

Now it is possible for us to understand the nostalgia of the Enlightenment architects and to see how the "economic instruments" of society prevented them from creating an architecture expressive of society's ideals and people's spirits. The bourgeoisie had begun to use architecture in much the same way as it had previously been used by religion and emperors. And from this point on, the architect has faced the dilemma of either being "a cog in a machine" or "escaping into irrelevant symbolism". This is the pay-off of being "modern".

The term "modern" derives from the late fifth century Latin term *modernus*, used at the time to distinguish the officially Christian present from the pagan past. The term subsequently came to be used to situate the present in relation to the past of antiquity. It surfaced at times when Europeans became aware that a new epoch was coming into being, defined by a renewed relationship to the ancients (Barry Smart, 1990: 17).

The use of the term modernity, however, describes a period which was, again in Smart’s words, "a distinctive and superior period in the history of humanity" (ibid) - a period which began with the Enlightenment. The historical concept of modernity refers to a particular

time and place - it is dated and localised. The analytical concept of modernity refers to a new social order.

We can also define modernity as a new experience of the world. As Ron Eyerman puts it:

> [m]odernity referred to a world constructed anew through the active and conscious intervention of actors and new sense of self that such active intervention and responsibility entailed. In modern society, the world is experienced as a human construction, an experience that gives rise both to a sense of freedom and possibility and to a basic anxiety about the openness of the future (1992: 37-8).

Thus modernity was an escape from the traditional community. It started in Europe after the Enlightenment in the eighteenth century. It created a new social order with its economic and social changes - with secularisation, and with its science and technology.

If modernity was an escape from traditional community, its roots were inevitably in the cities. For Zygmunt Bauman, "not all city life is modern, but all modern life is city life. For life to turn modern means to become more like life in the city" (1998: 126). Georg Simmel had explained this modern city life as early as 1903: According to Simmel, characteristics of urban existence such as punctuality, calculability and exactness were imposed by the complexity of metropolitan life – and not just by its money economy and intellectualistic character. These characteristics tend to suppress irrational, instinctive, traits and impulses aiming to determine the mode of life from within, in favour of “receiving the general and precisely schematised form of life without" (2000: 177-8).

If modern life is city life, we can also say that modernity is related to the emergence of capitalism. In particular, the new social and spatial order associated with modernity derives its new form of appropriation and distribution from capitalism.

If we can add the shift from agricultural production to industry as the core sector of the economy, the concentration of labour in factories and the concentration of economic production in cities, we complete the picture of industrialisation, urbanisation and capitalism as a result of the British industrial revolution which provided the economic foundation of modernity (Eyerman, 1992).

When we look at the political, institutional framework of modernity, we see the constitutional democracy, the rule of law, and the principle of sovereignty of nation-states provided by the American and French revolutions. An important implication is the growing role of the state, which takes up new functions in regulating and coordinating production, redistributing wealth, protecting economic sovereignty and stimulating expansion to foreign markets (Eyerman, 1992).

“When the first factory-made brick was first taken across England by train,” comments Furneaux Jordan (1993:283), “the old vernacular craft-building of Europe was doomed.” Since then, he argues, architecture has been in the hands of either the speculative builder or of the professional architect, “the latter so trained that he could draw upon any of the styles of history, but seeming never to know that buildings are where life is lived” (ibid). Moreover, the many political, social, religious and technical changes of this period have dramatically altered the function and purpose of architecture has been transformed. According to Furneaux Jordan (ibid), aristocratic patronage has vanished, industrial cities have grown up overnight and places like Chicago, Essen and Manchester became huge cities; most people have begun to live in slums and iron has replaced stone. For him, architects continued to agonise about style however, failing to acknowledge all these changes. Engineers have proved better at keeping up with the times and have increased their importance and influence.

Architects may have lost the battle to engineers, but architecture has retained all of its significance. As Pierre Bourdieu (1977) notes, spatial experiences are the primary tools for the codification and reproduction of social relationships, and a difference in the showcase of space makes a difference to social relationships too. For this reason, nation-states used architecture as the most visible sign of their new social order. It is not coincidental that building activities were regulated at an early stage in many states during the modernisation process of the 19th century. In Britain, for example, the Public Health Act of 1848 regulated urban infrastructure and the Housing of Working Classes Act of 1890 required local authorities to provide public housing. Similar provisions were made too by Haussman during the rebuilding of Paris in 1853 and 1870 (Kenneth Frampton, 1992). In the Ottoman Empire, during the Tanzimat era, similar regulations were approved. The creation of the Ebniye-i Hassa in 1838 widened and introduced new forms of streets, and brought in new standards for the facades and heights of buildings, the parcelling of land, construction techniques and construction equipment. As Peter Gleichman puts it:

> [w]ith the rise of relatively stable territorial states, *spatial thought in terms of state finances* was also intensified (…) From the nineteenth century onward, theories of overcoming space are more closely coordinated with the development of *practical systems* to that end. These "theories" became indispensable aids to further domination of space (1992: 36).

Gleichman argues that this control over space creates a theoretical "spatial thought" of people. And for him, "buildings are means of domination" (1992: 35). They "all indicate the tendency towards expansion of *enclosed spaces* and with it the expansion of the actual scope of legitimate monopolies of violence, or 'states'" (1992: 36).

Architecture was then a good tool for the creation of a homogenised nation and its domination by a centralised state.

Accordingly, the ruling classes of nation-states have always tried to create "national architectural styles. O.K. Werckmeister speaks of "[t]he need for a state architecture with representative communal functions as a built environment that both expresses and promotes the political loyalty of the population" (1997: 282).

In Turkey, for example, the Republican architecture of the period 1923-1932 is dominated by the features of the First National Architectural Style, which had first come into fashion after the restoration of the Constitution in 1908. This style was influenced mostly by the nationalist ideas of Ziya Gökalp (Metin Sözen, 1984: 28). Buildings were symmetrical, their facades being decorated with architectural and decorative elements derived from the Seljukid and Ottoman periods. Some buildings had false domes added solely for the purpose of creating the old Ottoman-Turkish image (İnci Aslanoğlu, 2001: 8). Sözen recalls that Ziya Gökalp was a member of the jury in the architectural competition for the *Türkocağı* building, which was constructed in Ankara in 1927. While this shows a great awareness of the idea of creating a national architecture, technical inadequacies made this impossible to achieve in the conditions of the day.

The dominance of the First National Architecture Style was partly because the Turkish architects had been raised with this style and partly because foreign architects invited to the country followed the same course as their Turkish colleagues. The Ottoman-Turkish features were applied to all buildings, regardless of their function - a school with a dome, for example. This "history-based" style was "contrary in principle to the reforms made to modernise the socio-cultural institutions," writes Aslanoğlu (2001: 9). From the nationalist point of view, the employment of foreign architects was another contradiction. An opposition began to develop among Turkish architects and within the state both to the First National Architecture

Style and to the employment of foreign architects. The search began for an architecture that would be more specifically Turkish.

Between 1930 and 1933, Aslanoğlu argues, the world economic depression led Turkey to follow more étatist policies which helped to strengthen nationalist feelings. (2001: 52) This spirit was soon reflected in architecture, giving birth to the Second National Architecture Style. Buildings of this style made use of the architectural features of the Turkish house - that is, civil architecture. But there exist few examples, and as Turkey became more open to the outside world, the influence of western architecture became increasingly apparent.

As of the 1930s, foreign architects were bringing to Turkey the neo-classical, monumental buildings which were used by all the nationalist movements that were gaining strength throughout the world. Some of the Ministry buildings in Ankara, for example, are very similar to the buildings which were produced in Berlin as a result of Hitler's search for a national architecture - "the monumental architecture on the order of Greece and Rome that Hitler idealised in his *Mein Kampf* and designed in his drawings of 1925 for a National Socialist State of the future" (O.K.Werckmeister, 1997: 290). According to Mechtild Rossler (1994), Hitler viewed Berlin as the centre of Europe and the world, and wanted to create a city that would display the power of the Nazis. In March 1933 he employed the architect Julius Lippert to create a truly "German city" (1994: 94). The goal of creating a nationalist capital, common to Germany and Turkey, also shows the importance of architecture for exhibiting and strengthening the economic power of the state. Ironically, neo-classical architecture was also used in the USSR after the revolution with the same end in mind (Frampton, 1986). Features borrowed from history can be used anywhere under the "nationalist" label for this purpose.

The flat-roofed cubic homes of the same period are another example. In Turkey, the cubic house was definitely the symbol of the

Westernisation to which the nation was committed. Sibel Bozdoğan describes the Republican discourse on the modern house as, primarily, "an extension of the nationalist emphasis on the nuclear family, especially on motherhood as a national duty and on the family home as a sacred space or hearth of national regeneration, all of which were ideas introduced in Turkey back in the Young Turk era" (1996: 317). Ironically, the same house represented, for the ruling class of Germany, a symbol of nomadism. The famous architect of the Weimar Republic, Paul Schultze-Naumberg, "praised the pitched-roofed German house with its roots sunk deep into the soil, contrasting it to the flat-roofed architecture of an uprooted people" (Frampton, 1980: 217-218). As early as 1926, Schultze-Naumberg wrote that "the flat roof 'is immediately recognizable as the child of other skies and other blood'" (ibid, 218).

Ankara is like an open-air museum of national architectural styles, including not only successive Turkish styles but the national architectural styles of the embassies built during the early Republican period which reflect the desire of the states concerned to represent themselves not only through ambassadors but also by means of their embassy buildings.

The interest in vernacular building that begins with modernity cannot be explained simply by reference to the way in which rapid urbanisation and industrialisation created masses of homeless workers. It was also important to prevent social unrest by creating a national house style which would shape the consciousness of the masses. In the USSR, there was an alternative: the communal housing. In their 1928 manifesto, the constructivist group in the USSR described the goals of the social transformation behind this type of housing as follows:

> [w]e are opposed to such prerevolutionary building types as the speculative apartment house, the private residence, the 'noble man's

> club' etc., all products of prerevolutionary social, technical and economic circumstances, but still serving as a model for buildings now being erected in the USSR. [Instead we propose] new types of communal housing, new types of clubs, palaces of labour, new factories etc. which in fact should be the conductors and condensers of socialist culture (quoted in Jencks, 1985: 86).

Although this dream was not made into reality, save for a few examples, it shows, in the words of Marxist architect Hannes Mayer, that the Leninist architect is neither an "aesthetic lackey" nor, as in the West, a "lawyer and custodian of the interests of the capitalist ruling class". Rather, architecture is "a keen-edged weapon in the class struggle" (Jencks, 1985: 88).

According to Charles Jencks (ibid: 30), an architect invariably postulates a society for his buildings and hence necessarily comes up against political problems. This is why major architects have defined their ideal political positions and became involved in everyday political decisions - whether by compromising with existing society or by defying or deflecting it. Jencks links this idea to the nature of architecture. For him,

> [a]rchitecture is a political art because it crystallises the public realm, shared social values and long-term cultural goals. It is here very much more involved with explicit social content than the other arts (ibid: 30-31).

For this reason, the famous French architect Le Corbusier (1887-1965), one of the most important protagonists of modern architecture, stated in 1923 that:

> [t]he primordial instinct of every human being is to assure himself of a shelter. The various classes of workers in society today no longer have dwellings adapted to their needs; neither the artisan nor the intellectual. It is a question of building which is at the root of the social unrest

> of today: architecture or revolution (Le Corbusier, 1986: 269).

Neither the revolution nor the architectural transformation which Le Corbusier looked forward to ever occurred.

Zygmunt Bauman claims that people today are no longer coerced but they are seduced (1998). They are seduced by the images, products, and life-styles as if they were free to choose. However, within the conditions of mass culture of consumption culture people can only be free to be consumed like the images or products. It is a world of commodity fetishism which reduces everything, human beings included, into exchange-values. Human relations are then stripped of their moral values by a process of *adiaphorization*, in Bauman's coinage. People are no longer "pilgrims" who seek a future and a goal but "strangers, strollers or tourists" wandering around (ibid). The poor live in their strict neighbourhoods around the cities, the rich live in their condominiums or suburban villas. They hardly have contact with each other. Universities, big business centres even shopping malls are moved away from the city centres. They all create their own *heterotopias*, to use a term of Foucault's (1997).

Inner cities are left to criminals, mafia-like organisations and become uncanny for their floating inhabitants. Moreover, by the help of urban renewal projects all the history of cities is swept away and usually replaced by fakes with much the same appearance as the old (The 'Bulvar Palas' Hotel in Ankara is a good example). The results of this process can be explained under two headings. First, it creates a power with the help of the visual. Looking is not the same as seeing. By looking, one can perceive only the surface, and only those aspects which it is desired to be shown. Thus every visual image means the absence of reality. Furthermore, it derealises and aestheticises it.

Secondly, as Gaston Bachelard (1970) wrote, every space contained compressed time, in other words, memories. However, by

creating new city centres and new satellite settlements, the collective memory of the inhabitants is destroyed. This means that the power of imagination which stems from the power of daydreaming is stolen from the people. Because, for Bachelard, we learn to daydream in the houses in which we are born. People without imagination are powerless creatures open to manipulation. Moreover, as Michel de Certeau (1984) posits, people find their resistance against power in their daily lives on the streets, in squares, on pedestrian routes which are very much related with the collective memory. Nevertheless the absence of reality under visuality, the absence of collective memory and the seduction of "free choice" creates masses who are open to manipulation by capitalism.

People who do not use even their five senses apart from looking, divided cities - people who do not interact with people different from themselves, no trust in anybody, no loyalties and in the end no responsibilities are the signs of the death of social space. There are no longer public spaces where different ideas and different people are represented. Instead, there are many private spaces having a claim to be public. So, actually, it is difficult to mention the distinction of public or private spheres any more. People who live in their homes under the bombardment of images of public and public spaces are privatised by the different interest and power groups.

Meanwhile, the question of housing remains one of the world's most important problems. In developed countries, the numbers of homeless are on the increase, and in developing countries, the majority of the population are struggling to survive in unhealthy living conditions. The argument that housing is one of the most basic human rights has still not been established, and housing and the people who occupy that housing are viewed as separate entities. "The house in the modern world is a consumer's item, a neutral product, like a box, a car, a television set" (Doğan Kuban, 1996: 5). Houses are also used as

symbols of prestige, full of consumption items which help to accumulate a kind of symbolic capital. This is essentially nothing but commodity fetishism in Marx's terms. Yet, ironically, it is all the same for a worker or for an employer.

> In the end, there will be little else for us to do but shop. The world in which we are trapped is in fact a shopping mall; the windless closure is the underground network of tunnels hollowed out for the display of images. The virus ascribed to junkspace is in fact the virus of shopping itself; which, like Disneyification, gradually spreads like a toxic mass across the known universe (Frederick Jameson, 2003: 77).

In addition many advocate that we are living in a postmodern world. It is no coincidence that postmodernism first manifested itself in architecture. It is not the architectural transformation but the transformation of architectural rationalism that has been popular since the 1970s. Architecture is in the service of a new form of commodity fetishism. It is even more ideological than ever because it uses the discourse of plurality, difference, relativity and locality; it hides the "distinctive 'cultural logic' in late capitalism" (Harvey, 1990: 253). In so doing, it both produces symbolic capital and consumes it. This is more than an "escape into irrelevant symbolism". Today's architects earn their living by marketing this "irrelevant symbolism" to the masses. Postmodernist architecture, as the producer of symbolic capital, is the most powerful ideological weapon which a ruling class has ever used in history, because it is being used at the same time all around the world. The most successful ideological influences, claims Harvey (1999: 101), are those for which there are no words, and which ask for nothing more than acquiescence in a conspiracy of silence. This being the case, the production of symbolic capital serves ideological functions, since the mechanisms which ensure that it contributes to the reproduction and continuing domination of the status quo remain hidden.

Every dominant class lays claim to the universality of the ideology which legitimates its position of domination.

> The class which has the means of material production at its disposal has control at the same time over the means of mental production, so that thereby, generally speaking, the ideas of those who lack the means of intellectual production are subject to it

writes Marx in *German Ideology* (2005:21). Architecture, being also a form of mental production, is therefore under the control of "the class which has the means of material production at its disposal." Moreover, it is an ideological tool which legitimates the domination. In short, it can be said that architecture is always ideological. It is ideological when the architect is "a cog in a machine" and it is still ideological when the architect chooses to "escape into irrelevant symbolism".

Anthony Giddens (1999) emphasizes the importance of distinguishing between two related emphases in Marx's treatment of ideology. First, social circumstances condition individuals' perception of the world in which they live. In this sense, language forms people's "practical consciousness". Secondly, with respect to the creation and diffusion of ideas, Marx generalises that in class societies the dominant ideas of any period are the ideas of the ruling class. In this sense, it is clear that the dissemination of ideas depends closely on the distribution of economic power in society. In this second sense, ideology belongs to the social "superstructure". In other words, the prevalent ideology always serves to legitimise the interest of the dominant class (Giddens, 1999:42).

2.1. Space

From the point of view of the first approach to ideology as defined by Marx, space is part of the social circumstances in which the activity of individuals occurs and which consequently conditions perceptions.

Space defines the physical borders within which the reality of everyday life is organised. With the help of these borders, human beings know what is done in one space and what is not. Moreover, people frequently identify themselves according to space: a housewife, a factory worker, and so on. This identification determines their face-to-face relationships with others.

> The reality of everyday life is organised around the "here" of my body and the "now" of my present. This "here" and "now" is the focus of my attention to the reality of everyday life (…) The reality of everyday life is not, however, exhausted by these immediate presence, but embraces phenomena that are not present "here are now". This means I experience everyday life in terms of differing degrees of closeness and remoteness, both spatially and temporally. Closest to me is the zone of everyday life that is directly accessible to my bodily manipulation. This zone contains the world within my reach, the world in which I act so as to modify its reality or the world in which I work (Berger & Luckmann, 1996: 36).

The first "zone of everyday life" is, of course, the house. The house is not just a specific part of the physical environment but also a product of a certain society.

Writing about American migrants and migration, John Berger (1984) states that the house originally signified the centre of the earth - not in the geographical sense but in an existential one. The house was once a kernel around which to construct the world, and the place where a house was situated was the soul of reality. In traditional societies, Berger goes on, everything on the earth that has meaning is real. The opposite of reality is chaos, which is perceived as threatening and thus dangerous. If there is no house in the soul of reality, not only are people left without shelter but at the same time they are lost in nothingness, in unreality. Without a house, everything is scattered.

From historic times to the present, human beings have needed to protect themselves, their possessions and their supplies within certain "spaces". Moreover, these spaces identified them with the emotional ties of their past and their future. The links between home and the dead/the past indicate that the home is a sacred space. The special protection which contemporary legal systems grant to the inviolability of the domicile demonstrates the persistence of the same understanding.

All these meanings that have come to be associated with the concept of home shape the cultural and traditional dimensions of housing. Rapoport writes that “[i]f provision of shelter is the passive function of the house, then its positive purpose is the creation of the environment best suited to the way of life of a people - in other words, a social unit of space” (1969: 46). As a social unit, the house does not only reflect the cultural and ideological aspects of the society it belongs to but also reproduces the values and needs of that system - a process central to the continuation of the various forms of social domination and legitimate authority. Davidoff, L'ésperance and Newby (1976: 143) argue that "[t]he ideology of the home increased the traditional authority of the household, emphasizing a solidarity of place while identifying the husband's personal authority over wife, children and servants." They assert that traditional authority is most easily stabilised in relatively small face-to-face social structures within which the desired social system can be maintained.

In this sense, the home has an ideological function. In other words, in addition to being a product of the society of which it is a part, the home, to which such weighty meanings are attached, plays an important role in re-shaping that society.

The home, moreover, defines "which people act so as to modify its reality".

In his book *Cehenneme Övgü* (In Praise Of Hell), in which he recounts the totalitarianism of everyday life, Gündüz Vassaf (1993: 62-

67) explained how the apartment building, the most common type of housing in Turkish cities today, results in millions of people doing exactly the same things, how their lives will be subject to exactly the same environment, how any creative effort they may make to reorganise the use of space will be prevented and how the fact that everything has its right place creates a sense of order - a false reality - in the environment. To him, the apartment is to the citizen what the barracks is to a soldier. The barracks is an extension of the uniform, serving to instill an unconditional discipline, and human beings have become civilian soldiers, living in the barracks of the apartment building. The rooms do not only determine what activity may be carried out in them, but at the same time affect both our feelings and the form of our relations with one other. Linked to each room are certain feelings and types of social behaviour. Rooms separated by function make sure that people's thoughts, conversation, feelings and relationships are kept as closely in line as possible with the designated function.

Vassaf may appear to be exaggerating. However, one example is enough to support his views. Today's men's and women's magazines which promise their readers a better sexual life, constantly recommend making love outside of the bedroom. And making love in the kitchen is one of the wildest (!) fantasies frequently employed in movies.

Georg Simmel already observed that:

> [a] person's gestures depend upon the spaces in which he or she customarily moves (…) they are more closely linked with the constant sameness and the habitual character of this milieu (…) On the other hand, these qualities may develop as a result of continual movement within spaces in which there is nothing left to conquer, spaces which have become nothing more than a corporeal extension of the personality (1984: 84-5).

The second "zone of everyday life" is made up of public spaces, such as workplaces or schools. Even the most private zone, the house, has an ideological function which shapes behaviour, perception and thinking patterns. But public places are the real places where ideology is imposed with the help of authority.

The reality of everyday life, state Berger and Luckmann (1996), is an "intersubjective" world - a world shared with others, unlike the world of a person's dreams. This world is as real to others as it is to the self, and a person cannot exist in everyday life without continually interacting and communicating with others. Although people have different perceptions of the world, they understand the same "objectifications" about the way in which the world is ordered. Consequently, there is an "ongoing correspondence" between the meanings of different people - "we share a common sense about its reality" (Berger & Luckmann, 1996: 37).

Architectural features such as hierarchical spaces, corridors and halls all create this "common sense about the reality of everyday life". It is well known that the design of the workplace affects the workers' performance. However, as Richard Sennett (1992: 30) points out, it also affects the socialisation of the workers. He notes that open-plan offices are supposed to increase productivity, as people are less likely to chat and gossip when they are in full view of everybody else. Indeed, in a paradox of isolation and visibility, staff tend to become more silent as the physical obstacles between them decrease.

Another example of visibility being used for social control is the Foucauldian *panopticon*. The panopticon, designed by Jeremy Bentham in the late 18th century, was a tower located inside a prison from which the guards could observe all parts of the prison. Because of the way it was designed, the prisoners did not know whether or not they were being observed at any given time. They assumed that they were being watched and adjusted their behaviour accordingly. Foucault

extends the concept to the whole of society: "[a]ll that is needed, then, is to place a supervisor in a central tower and to shut up in each cell a madman, a patient, a condemned man, a worker or a schoolboy" (1991: 200). Thus a hospital, a factory or a school can easily be referred to as panopticon spaces. With the help of such spaces, social order can be preserved.

> The panopticon, on the other hand, has a role of amplifications; although it arranges power, although it is intended to make it more economic and more effective, it does so not for power itself, nor the immediate salvation of a threatened society,: its aim is to strengthen the social forces - to increase production, to develop the economy, spread education, raise the level of public morality; to increase and multiply (1991: 207-8).

How does space manage to achieve all this? In order to understand this better, it is necessary to look at space's sociological features. In his article "The Sociology of Space", Simmel explains "several fundamental qualities of the spatial form upon which the structuring of communal life relies" (1997: 138). The first of these qualities is the exclusivity of space. "Just as there is only a single general space of which all individual spaces are parts, so every portion of space possesses a kind of uniqueness for which there is almost no analogy" (ibid: 138). The second quality of space, with a fundamental effect on social interaction, is that it is divided for practical purposes into units with boundaries that are both cause and effect of the division. "We always conceive of the space which a social group fills up in some sense as a unit that expresses and supports the unity of that group, just as much as it is carried and supported by it" (ibid: 141). The frame around each space serves to declare that there is a world within the space which is subject to its own laws, and to strengthen the reality and impression of such a world.

The third socially significant feature of space described by Simmel is its capacity to fix the contents of social formations. This, he asserts, is not a schematic extension of the principle of fixed determinacy to the spatial realm. Rather, it would manifest itself in the objective elements of life as stabilisation and a firm order. He introduces the term "pivot-point" to designate a more special sociological significance of fixing in space – namely, that the spatial immovability of an object of interest creates certain forms of relationships that group around it (ibid: 146). Fourthly, Simmel speaks of the sensory proximity or distance between people who are in some way related to one another: Relations with persons close to oneself, with whom one is in contact in a wide variety of situations and moods, tend to be characterised by decisive emotions – effusive joy or unbearable constraint. “It is a very old observation that residents of the same building can only stand on a friendly or a hostile footing" (ibid: 154).

Simmel argues that speaking and hearing create more organic feelings of unity than seeing others constantly. He suggests, moreover, that the sense of smell, while remaining below the "threshold of consciousness", and inexplicable in words, creates sympathies and antipathies. This stimulus, he suggests, are important for different races living on the same territory or personal contact between workers and the educated (1997: 156-7).

These sociological features of space proposed by Simmel are directly related to the biological and psychological characteristics of human beings. Most human spatial behaviour reflects a pattern known as territoriality, which is also apparent in other species. According to Douglas Porteous, “[t]erritoriality, involving the exclusive control of space by an individual or group, is intra-specific, involves aggression and confers valuable privileges" (1977: 30). Along with leadership, parental care and mutual stimulation, and dominance relationships, territoriality is one of four major behaviour patterns defining the

organization of all animal societies including human society, and it is a matter of controversy as to whether human territoriality is genetically or culturally determined. However, Porteous says culture "must at least be recognised as a major behaviour modifier" (1977: 21).

Control of space provides the individual with security, stimulation and identity. Of these, security is the most obvious feature - the individual's right to territorial control is generally accepted by others, and "many societies are held together by a dominance structure in which every individual knows its place" (ibid). This "place", Porteous suggests, might even be a favourite chair, recognised and respected by others. While territorial control provides security at the territorial core, stimulation - an essential requirement for organic existence, the absence of which typically results in severe psychic and behavioural disorders - is provided at the territorial boundary (ibid: 23). The importance of identity in today's society is unquestionable. According to Porteous, territoriality confirms and supports the individual's self-identity.

> Coupled with security and stimulation, the identity function of territoriality provides the individual with a strong basis for self-identification, personal integrity and psychic survival. In short, territorial behaviour is a support for the self (ibid: 24-5).

Space takes its power from these characteristics of human beings and at the same time dialectically strengthens these characteristics. Thus space plays an important role in shaping the "practical consciousness" of human beings. However, as David Harvey points out:

> [s]patial practices derive their efficacy in social life only through the structure of social relations within which they come into play. Under the social relations of capitalism, social practices become imbued with class meanings. To put it this way is not, however, to argue that spatial practices are derivative of capitalism. These

> spatial practices take on specific meanings and these meanings are put into motion and spaces are used in a particular way through the agency of class, gender or other social practices (1990: 259).

Accordingly, while space shapes the "practical consciousness" of men and women, it does so only through class practices. In this manner, the worker's perception of the factory is always different from that of the employer or manager. This difference also reflects differing perceptions, attitudes and values regarding space. All three of these develop as a result of experience, and further complexity is introduced by the fact that attitudes affect perceptions, perceptions affect attitudes, values determine attitudes - and that all of them help to internalise the social structure. For this, Pierre Bourdieu uses the concept of *habitus*, which functions "below the level of consciousness and language, beyond the reach of introspective scrutiny and control by the will" (1989: 466).

For this reason, space is one of the most insidious ideological tools. It "fixes" everybody in their "own places" and this ensures the continuity of the social order. Anthony Vidler suggests that among the many characteristics specific to architectural form, “space” has proved to be the most elusive.” Style, structure, function and composition, he argues, are all more tangible or easier to represent through physical description, drawings or models. The "space" of a building or urban area, by contrast, is neither physically evident nor subject to easy depiction. Its qualities can only be characterised through a study of what is not normally represented - the white ground of a plan, the implied sense of visual and bodily projection in perspective views, a solid model of the voids in a building (1998: 105).

In other words, architecture makes spaces tangible. Theodor Adorno explains this by saying that architecture has a different sense of space:

> [b]ut this sense of space is not a pure, abstract essence, not a sense of spatiality itself, since space is only conceivable as concrete space, within specific dimensions. A sense of space is closely connected with purposes. Even when architecture attempts to elevate this sense beyond the realm of purposefulness, it is still simultaneously immanent in the purpose. The success of such a synthesis is the principal criterion for great architecture. Architecture inquires: how can a certain purpose become space; through which forms, which materials? All factors relate reciprocally to one another. Architectonic imagination is, according to this conception of it, the ability to articulate space purposefully. It permits purposes to become space. It constructs forms according to purposes (1997: 14).

However, according to Lefebvre (1998: 38), architect's space is different from the lived space. He classifies three types of spaces: spatial practice (perceived space), representations of space (conceived space), and representational space (lived space). Perceived space is the spatial practices in daily and mostly urban reality. Conceived spaces are the representations of space which the social engineers, city planners and architects create in their intellectual work and this is the dominant space in any society or mode of production. Within the spatial practice of modern society, the architect ensconces himself or herself in his or her own space. S/he has a representation of space which is bound to graphic elements such as plans, elevations, sections, perspective views and modules. And those who make use of this geometrical *conceived* space believe it to be true. It is “a medium for objects, an object itself, and a locus of the objectification of plans” (1998: 361).

This type of space also defines its ideological and aesthetic purposes. The third space, lived space or representational space, is the space of inhabitants and users, and for Lefebvre, this is the dominated space, the marginalised space. Lefebvre notes that even the terms

‘users’ and ‘inhabitants’ are ill-defined and pejorative, contributing to the marginalisation of those referred to by them. “But what is use value when set alongside exchange and its corollaries?” he asks. The word ‘inhabitants’, he suggests, designates “everyone - and no one”. Consequently, the more basic demands of users and inhabitants “find *expression* only with great difficulty, whereas the signs of their situation are constantly increasing and often stare us in the face” (ibid: 362).

Lefebvre's lived space has the purpose of use. But as we have seen it is dominated by the conceived space of experts. For this reason, the use values of space are often overlooked, making its ideological purpose even more powerful.

> As for the eye of the architect, it is no more innocent than the lot he is given to build or the blank sheet of paper on which he makes his first sketch. His 'subjective' space is freighted with all-too-objective meanings. it is a visual space, a space reduced to blueprints, to mere images- to that 'world' of the 'image' which is the enemy of the imagination (ibid:361).

However, as Lefebvre points out, the locus of resistance and alternative restructuring of institutionalised discourses of space lies in the lived space. When compared with the abstract space of the experts (architects, urbanists, planners), the space of the everyday activities of users is concrete and hence subjective. It is a space of 'subjects' rather than of calculations. Lived space has its origin in childhood and is marked by the conflict between “an inevitable, if long and difficult, maturation process and a failure to mature that leaves particular original resources and reserves untouched.” It is in this space that the 'private' realm asserts itself, to a greater or lesser extent, in conflict with the public one (ibid: 362).

2.2. The Art Component of Architecture

If we go back to Adorno's idea that architecture is a purpose-oriented art, the purpose of architects should be to create spaces which address the needs of people in the most efficient ways.

Are architects able to achieve this purpose in practice?

> The architecture profession has had a bad press since the debacle of modernist housing, high-rise offices and city redevelopment in the 1960s. Though styles have softened and contextualism is in fashion, architects are still perceived as rich and powerful people in weird collarless shirts who impose their designs on a hostile public. In fact, despite seven mandatory years of training they are among the lowest-paid professionals, because there are too many of them - 27,000 in Britain, 70,000 in America. They work unsocial hours, often at weekends. Few design even modest buildings, most are engaged in mundane tasks, have little autonomy and are bossed about by senior partners, clients, planners and building inspectors. When things go wrong, architects take the blame. To make matters worse, the architect's area of expertise is constantly under threat from developers, contractors, engineers, planners and interior decorators, who think they could do the job better. It is true - one does not in fact need a qualified architect to design buildings (Jules Lubbock, 2002. "No Place Like Home" in *Times Literary Supplement*, no. 5196; November 2002;8. A Review of the book of Kenneth Frampton).

This long quotation explains very well the universal condition of architects today. Moreover, "the architect today more than ever is dependent on collective patronage, whether this is by the state, local government or a committee of businessmen (Jencks, 1985: 30). Yet, even this is not a guarantee to have a job. According to the former president of the Union of International Architects (UIA), Vassilis Sqoudas, only 2% of buildings all around the world have been designed by architects (2005:21). The examples of architecture which

we see and read about in architectural journals, he points out, are even less representative: only about one thousandth of the building stock. However, as Lubbock puts it, "architects are still perceived as rich and powerful people in weird collarless shirts who impose their designs on a hostile public". How can we explain this paradox? Why are perceptions of architects and the reality of the profession so different from one another? The image of architects is actually related to certain myths about architecture as an art and as a work of creation.

All societies have creation myths. According to a dissident version of the Judeo-Christian creation myth, recounts David Harvey, God became so exhausted after six days of creation that he created architects to carry on the good work. But another variant on the myth is that after God created architects he was so tired that he went to sleep, and hasn't woken up yet. “If there is a faint air of angst hanging over us, it may well be because the architects are worried about what God will say when He does wake up and sees what they have done” (David Harvey, 1996: 217).

Architects as godly creatures are supposed to be capable of transforming the world either by a good work or by "an urbanizing mess of things" (Harvey, ibid). Harvey quotes Karl Marx's famous comment: "[w]hat distinguishes the worst architect from the best of bees is this, that the architect raises his structure in imagination before he erects it in reality." Harvey points out that this is a metaphor. However, architects often seem to take this metaphor literally (!), and to exaggerate the part of their work which requires imagination, regarding it as the main source of creation, in order to be able to assert themselves as artists.

For example, when asked whether he was an aestheticist as such, one of the most famous American architects, Philip Johnson, replied, "[o]f course. I always thought that was what architects were for." He added that an architect had to be an artist. (Cook & Klotz, 1973: 24)

Another architect, Louis Kahn, considered that "the only language of man is Art" (ibid: 183). He went on to opine that architects never built to meet needs but to express desires. Architects may, in Peter Gleichman's words, "take advantage of the accumulated designing scope of symbolic arbitrariness as much as possible for their own stylistic freedom" (1992: 41). However, whatever is said about architects, it is based on the assumption that architecture is an art.

Similarly, Kenneth Frampton argues that architecture has its limits as a *metier*; and that despite its use of advanced techno-scientific methods it remains “no more an applied science than it is a form of fine art.” He sees architecture as a craft dedicated to the significant formulation of the human environment. He accepts that as an embodiment of societal value in spatial terms, architecture cannot be regarded as symbolic or abstract, and cannot be treated as 'fine art writ large'.

> Unlike literature, music. painting and sculpture, or even theatre, photography and film, architecture cannot legitimately aspire to any kind of cultural autonomy since it is too intimately involved with the processes of everyday life and with that which Jürgen Habermas characterized as the unfinished modern project; in a word with that which Marshall Berman has identified as the *pastoral* or caring mode as opposed to the *counter-pastoral* of the negative avant-garde (2002 pp.8-9).

Moreover, architecture, unlike any of the other arts, needs a commissioner before it is performed. In other words, an architect cannot produce a building and then try to find a buyer. Philip Johnson says, "[w]hoever commissions buildings buys me. I'm for sale. I'm a whore. I'm an artist" (Cook & Klotz, 1973: 37). This may be a crude choice of expression, yet it explains clearly the position of architects which results from the dependent nature of architecture - what Adorno

has called the "immanent impotence of architecture" - and hence of architects.

Adorno goes on to attribute the fact that the great architects from Loos to Corbusier and Scharoun were able to realize only a small portion of their work in stone and concrete not only to the reactions of unreasonable contractors and administrators but also to “a social antagonism over which the greatest architecture has no power” – namely, the fact that the same society which developed human productive energies so remarkably has also chained them to certain conditions of production, with the result that the people who in reality constitute the productive energies become deformed, according to the measure of their working conditions. This fundamental contradiction is most clearly visible in architecture. Neither the architect nor the consumer can escape from the tensions which it generates (1997: 15).

Why, then, does the idea persist among most architects that they are artists? Charles Moore, another well-known American architect too, suggested that:

> [o]ne of the great paradoxes is that art appears to be, by its very nature, revolutionary, but architecture, at the same time, is also establishmentarian art. And I find that very puzzling. Those architects who are most affirmatively doing the affirming of the *status quo* are the ones who will most loudly tell you that they are dealing with an art. I don't see how that can be (Cook & Klotz, 1973: 246).

What sort of *status quo* can an architect affirm? The relationship between rulers and architecture as a tool of the social order has already been discussed. However, an artist may also be a defender of the *status quo* in another sense. - that is, the artist may have some personal interests such as holding onto a privileged position. In fact, architects as artists are mostly the product of modernity. As previously

mentioned, modernity took the privileged position of architects in the building process for the benefit of engineers.

Uğur Tanyeli (1997) argues that industrialisation as the starting point of modernism was also a turning point of the historical evolution of architecture. However, he also argues that this alone does not explain the internal problems of architecture. Changes in architecture have to be meaningful in their own epistemology and activities - that is, the transformation of a normative epistemology into a speculative one. In the pre-modern world, each field of knowledge had its own unquestioned, closed normative system, according to which the correct response to any situation could be given by invoking one of a limited number of patterns. Issues which could not be solved using the existing patterns could not also be raised. Such normative systems left very little room for individualism. Modernism destroyed these systems and opened the door to the "speculative" form of knowledge which is not unquestioned but which rests on reason and which is therefore only true until it is disproved (ibid. 65-66).

Tanyeli goes on to suggest that the modern epistemological system provides different ideological choices. The system, to put it as plainly as possible, envisages the formulation of an architectural approach based on concrete justifications and consequently defendable by reason. However, the questions of what kind of justifications will be invoked and what mechanisms will be used to defend them depends on the ideological preferences of the period (ibid. 69).

Magali Sarfatti-Larson, on the other hand, states that in capitalist societies, the respective levels of emphasis accorded to the artistic, technical and social dimensions of the architecture profession have varied with times and place, but that the existence of engineering as a separate profession has almost everywhere precluded a strictly technical concentration. Given the established position of engineering, architects found it easier to base their professional claims on the

aesthetic of construction rather than on technological mastery or scientific methods. Accordingly, the image and identity of modern architecture continues to revolve around the subordination of technology to design (1993:4).

Kenneth Frampton (2002) explains similar ideas in a different manner. Citing Hanna Arendt's *Human Condition,* he argues that the key change was a shift in the work process of *homo faber* from the "what" to the "how". The change in focus from the thing itself to the fabrication process deprived man as maker and builder of fixed and permanent standards and measurements which in the pre-modern age had served as guides to action and criteria for judgement. (2002: 32)

For Frampton, this shift from "what" to "how" found its reflection in the division of engineering from architecture during the Enlightenment (2002: 33). While architects "were to dedicate themselves solely to the 'what'", engineers "were to concern themselves largely with the 'how'": Engineering came to concern itself not just with fortifications but with the taming of landscapes through the production of a measured infrastructure of roads, canals, viaducts, bridges and dams – a universal system of distribution. And as traditional materials and methods were surpassed, a more explicit form of structural expression came into being which was transparently penetrated by process. “From now on architecture looked to such structure for most of its symbolic substance” (Frampton, 2002: 34).

Aesthetic ideology was an option in this situation. Moreover, the rise of the bourgeoisie with its emergent tastes as the new potential client of the architect affected this preference. For example, Carl Schorske describes the different approach of the Viennese bourgeoisie at the beginning of the 20th century as follows:

> [t]he presumed client, the new man of *Bildung*, in contrast to his predecessor, who enriched his life with the works of acquired historical culture, was expected to define himself from within, to refine his own psyche

> into art. The forms of living - the house, its furnishing, its art - were to be personal expressions of each man's soul and beauty (1998: 161).

Under these circumstances, Schorske continues, "[t]he architect became less the builder and more the artist. A new terminology reflected the change: the architect became a *Raumkunstler* (spatial artist); architecture was called *Raumpoesie*" (1998: 162).

Not all architects conceive of themselves as artists, of course. Their self-conceptions vary in parallel with their views on whether architecture is an art or a craft. According to Adolf Loos, the famous modern architect who saw ornament in architecture as a crime (He went so far as to manifest his ideas under the title 'Ornament as Crime'), "[o]nly a very small part of architecture belongs to art: the tomb and the monument. Everything else, everything which serves a purpose, should be excluded from the realms of art" (cited in Frampton, 2002: 27).

For Loos, "[t]he architect's task was of the same order as that of the saddler or the tailor: to fill a practical need as economically as possible. Fantasy, (...) properly belonged to the artist, but not to the architect" (Schorske, 1998: 166).

So what does Loos understand by architecture? "If we find a mound in the forest, six feet long and three feet wide, formed into a pyramid, shaped by a shovel, we become serious, and something within us says, someone lies buried here. This is architecture" (cited in Frampton, 2002: 27).

Loss removed "from architecture its representational function and its power of symbolic statement (…) it cannot be read, for it says nothing; rather, it *does* something" (Schorske,1998:169). Thus architecture is reduced to mere function.

On the other hand, as Gadamer points out, it can be argued that architecture must be both functional and artistic. A work of architecture

is determined by both the aim which it is to serve and the place it is to take in a total spatial context. The architect's plans are influenced both by the particular living purpose of the building and by particular architectural circumstances. A successful building is a 'happy solution' which perfectly fulfils its purpose and at the same time adds something new to the spatial dimension of a town or a landscape. :"[t]hrough this dual ordering the building presents a true increase of being: it is a work of art" (1997: 134).

This dilemma - style and form versus function - was fundamental to all architectural theories of the 20th century, from historicism to constructivism and from functionalism to postmodernism. According to Tanyeli, all distinctions between different architectural styles or schools shoud be taken as ideological preferences. Ironically, despite this rich tradition, the "contemporary tendency" is "to reduce architecture to scenographic effects" (Frampton 2002:23). Under these circumstances, architects can no longer conceive themselves as artists or as craftsmen. In the words of David Adjaye, a young British architect, "[y]ou've gotta be a *showman*. You can't just do your work. You've got to put it out there" (Interview in *The Guardian Weekend* , February 8, 2003, my emphasis).

2.3 The Sovereignty of Architecture

While the ideological preferences of architects may change over the years, one thing that has remained constant is the "sovereignty of architecture". For this reason, Frampton believes that the architect "transforms reality" (2002: 18). The same reason, Le Corbusier posits that the alternative to a revolution is architecture. Again, Turgut Cansever, a famous Turkish architect also known for his theological (Islamic) ideas, suggests that there can be no talk of the existence of a civilisation in a climate where no architecture was formed. This is because preferences and successes of all kinds are represented in

architecture, which is a complete reflection of life and the conception of life, of moralities and of beliefs, and of the circumstances in which these are formed. Once human beings take responsibility for the beautification of the world and for environmental awareness, then they rise to the level of the caliph of Allah (1998: 238).

The insistence on the sovereignty of architecture i.e. its capacity to do everything also explains why architectural historian Sibel Bozdoğan, discussing the ideological aspects of Turkish modernity in architecture, can assert that

> [a]s the country makes peace with its Ottoman and Islamic past, and as the ideological nature of modernism in the 1930s gets exposed, it may be possible to look at architecture *as architecture* rather than as the bearer of some larger message such as national identity. Only then can the architectural culture of the early republican period be restored to its place in history and early republican buildings, once liberated from exclusive identification with Kemalism, be physically preserved as part of the country's architectural heritage (2001: 301).

Such examples can be multiplied. However, the point is that despite the sharp differences among architectural theories and architects, all take the sovereignty of architecture as a prior assumption, and none call it into question. Howard Caygill (1991) explains this sovereignty in terms of the existence of an "other" of architecture namely, the public. From avant-garde to community architecture, he argues, there is always an "other" to manipulate, educate and enlighten; architects, as the masters of space, are superior to this "other". Bozdoğan's words cited above reflect the assumption that not only architects but also buildings themselves are superior to the rest of society, and should be valued for their existence, not for the social context in which they are placed. Yet what is often overlooked is that the "spatial images are the dreams of society. Whenever the hieroglyphics of any spatial image are deciphered, there

the basis of social reality presents itself" (Siegfried Kracauer 1997: 60). The housing blocks which became the graveyard of more than 17,000 people in the İzmit earthquake of August 17, 1999, and the flimsy Çeltiksuyu boarding school dormitory which collapsed in the Bingöl earthquake of May 1, 2003, killing 84 children, were the products of a specific economic and political system and collapsed for the same reason. Can we regard them as merely buildings? Does the fact that they were not designed by architects make us feel any better?

Lefebvre is thus right in distinguishing between spaces, and in describing the domination of architects' space (conceived space) over lived space. Lefebvre also asserts that conceived space defines its ideological and aesthetic purposes. The ideological aspects of architecture and the ideological preferences of architects who regard themselves as either aestheticist or functionalist have already been mentioned. However, the strong and yet unreflected belief in the sovereignty of architecture obstinately remains the main ideological drive for the architect independent of his or her world view.

2.4 The Professional Ideology

Discussing science and scientists, Louis Althusser speaks of a "spontaneous philosophy of scientists" (SPS), arguing that "[t]he SPS bears only on the ideas (conscious or unconscious) that scientists have of the scientific practice of the sciences and of 'science' "(1990: 132). According to Althusser, there are two contradictory elements in SPS. One is internal: "convictions or 'beliefs' stemming from the experience of scientific practice itself in its everyday immediacy" (ibid). He calls this the *materialist* element. The other element is external to the scientist's practice: "a reflection *on* scientific practice by means of philosophical theses elaborated *outside* this practice and (…) manufactured by philosophers or scientists" (ibid: 133). This element can take many forms, Althusser states, such as "an emphasis on the 'value of science',

'the scientific spirit', its exemplary 'critical virtue' etc."(ibid). Althusser calls this the *idealist* element. He goes on to emphasise that although these two elements of SPS are contradictory, the materialism is dominated by idealism in the vast majority of cases, just as it is in the world we live in. He further posits the following:

> [a]nd even if scientists are fairly knowledgeable about the nature of philosophy, about the internal conflicts played out within it, and the way in which they are related to the great political and ideological struggles of this world, were they to recognise that in social, political, ideological, moral etc. terms, materialism is in fact massively dominated by idealism (which reproduces, on the theoretical plane the domination of the exploited classes by the exploiting classes), they would be reluctant to admit that the same balance of power exists *within* their own SPS (1990: 134).

Magali Sarfatti-Larson also argues that

> [p]rofessional autonomy permits the experts to select almost at will the inputs which they will receive from the laity. Their autonomy thus tends to insulate them – they live, at least to some extent, within ideologies of their own creation which they present to outsiders as valid definitions of specific spheres of social reality (1997: xiii) .

In the case of architects, regardless of whether they work as 'practitioners', academics or historians, the belief in the sovereignty of architecture leads them to think that architecture is an autonomous discipline (or semi-autonomous at least) capable of changing the world. For this reason, despite the changes in their conditions of work, in their class position and in the division of labour within the building process, they expect to be the chief controller of this process from the stage of design through to the completion of the building. They are often upset when their projects are modified by contractors, investors or users, and they oppose the further division of their discipline in such new

disciplines as urban design, landscape architecture, interior architecture and the like.

In the light of the forgoing, it can be said that there is no such thing as the sovereignty of architecture, except in the minds of architects, and that architecture is not an autonomous discipline. All these beliefs are chief components of the *ethos* of architects, which helps them ideologically to define themselves in professional terms.

The intention here is not to deny the power and significance of the architectural profession in a variety of its practices, but rather to fix it in its true place in the overall building process, with both its strengths and its weaknesses, and without attributing to it any superiority either over space or over the public realm. In my opinion, it is only then that a "reflexive architectural theory" can be created "for which architecture and the categories through which it constitutes and understands itself is an object" (Howard Caygill, 1991: 279).

The preceding theoretical discussion can easily be adapted to Turkey too. However, there are aspects of modernity in Turkey which distinguish it from modernity in the West, and these seem to give rise to some problematic issues.

In Turkish architectural discourse, there is a tendency to see the history of Turkish architecture in two different periods, as if there was a rupture in the continuity of the development of architectural practice. Within this approach, the Republican period, the turning point of Turkish modernity, is seen as the period when architecture became subjected to modernization.

Describing the pre-Republican period, Uğur Tanyeli (1996) asserts that architects worked as officials up until the eighteenth century. This, he argues, was the main factor which distinguishes them from the Renaissance architects. The latter, even when in the service of the highest-ranking administrators, were autonomous professionals, whereas for the Ottoman architect architecture was a state office rather

than a career. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, the Turkish nation-building process started to have its effect on architects too, Tanyeli (ibid:112) continues, and the architect became the willing supporter of the ideology then promising salvation for the existing society. Accordingly, the true and valid path of action in architecture became merely a matter of supporting that ideology. From 1910 onwards, the architect is the collaborator of a modern bureaucracy. This situation, Tanyeli (ibid) claims, prevented the emergence of a concept of architecture in Turkey. It did not occur to architects that there might be an independent architectural ideology separate from political ideology. This claim is actually a criticism of the republican period disguised as a criticism of the architects of the republican era in particular. It aims at stressing the difference between architecture in Turkey and in the West. It also reflects the view that a professional ideology can be independent of political ideology, thereby confirming the existence of an assumption that professional ideology exists (at least among academic architects).

The purpose of this thesis, however, is not to explain the historical development of Turkish architecture. There are many good works in this area. Yet, two of them have special importance for the discussion of the *ethos* of architects in Turkey, not only on account of their concise and comprehensive expositions of the history of Turkish architecture and architects, but also because of the curious conclusions they reached. These are Gülsüm Baydar Nalbantoğlu's *The Professionalization of the Ottoman-Turkish Architect* (1988, unpublished PhD Thesis, UC Berkeley) and Sibel Bozdoğan's *Modernism and Nation-Building - Turkish Architectural Culture in the Early Republic* (2001, University of Washington Press). In fact, Bozdoğan's book extends the conclusion of Baydar-Nalbantoğlu's thesis with a cultural criticism of the period. Both authors agree that the Turkish architects of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century

defined architecture as the representation of a political ideology, i.e. nationalism. Architects were bureaucratic elites. They adopted also a Western aesthetic ideology in order to distinguish themselves from engineers. Because they were very closely tied to the state, it was impossible for an avant-garde architecture to develop in Turkey. Bozdoğan (2001: 299) adds that the basic problems of Turkish architectural culture are related to the role which it assumed in a changing society according to the official ideology of the regime. The heritage of this culture was for the most part an architecture of serious and official appearance, linked to the state and exhibiting a top-down 'civilising mission' which generally sought unsuccessfully to influence society strongly and bring about a substantial transformation in the lives and viewpoints of ordinary people.

All these ideas stem from the understanding that Turkish modernity was imposed from above. As Baydar-Nalbantoğlu puts it, "[t]he architectural profession was *only one of the social institutions to suffer* from the process of modernization from above, through organizations patronized by institutions of power" (1988: 249, my emphasis).

However, first of all, the concepts of modernity and modernism which are the social and cultural aspects of modernization are among the most controversial and vigorously debated in contemporary philosophy and cultural theory. Frederic Jameson, for example, argues that :

> (…) we must make a sharp distinction between the deceptive visions of genuine cultural differences (…) and that completely different concept that names the alternate historical paths to modernity (or capitalism) in all the countries of the world. The position here (and many of us believe that it was not that of Marx, and that "England" was itself only one of those paths and not the normative model) is that all paths to capitalism are unique and 'exceptional', contingent and determined by a unique national situation (2002: 118).

Yet, Bozdoğan states that "also nonexistent in early Republican Turkey were an effective civil society, a modernist mass culture, and an autonomous bourgeoisie that could nurture architecture outside the official domain of the stat." (2001:291). Concepts such as an 'effective' civil society and modernist mass culture constitute the mythical part of a eurocentric understanding of modernity. According to Enrique Dussel,

> [m]odernity appears when Europe affirms itself as the "center" of a *World* History that it inaugurates; the 'periphery' that surrounds this center is consequently part of its self-definition. The occlusion of this periphery (…) leads the major contemporary thinkers of the center into a *Eurocentric fallacy* in their understanding of modernity. (1993: 65, my emphasis)

For Dussel (ibid:76), there was another face of modernity, namely "the negated and victimized 'other face' of modernity - the colonial periphery, the Indian, the slave, the woman, the child, the subalternized popular cultures." In these conditions, how can one speak of an effective civil society or a modernist mass culture unless one has the intention of demonstrating that modernity is the result of a mass movement and not a process imposed from above?

In a very recent discussion of modernity, Ulrich Beck (2003: 9) asks how it is possible to "maintain that this historical break is still contained within the organising principles of modernity that were developed in the 17th and 18th centuries?" He goes on to propose an answer namely that the meta-change of modern could only take place on the basis of its own peculiar normative and cognitive infrastructure which includes the advent of the socio-historical; the idea that society can be moulded politically and the principle that all decisions can and must be justified.

According to Beck, the main apparatus of this infrastructure was obviously the nation-state.

> The political subject of 'modern history' became and still is the nation-state. Modern history is so closely

> identified with the history of nations and states that it is rarely made explicit any more. 'History' is simply assumed to be national history unless otherwise noted, and society is assumed to mean national society (…) suddenly the beginning and end of modern society was identified with the past and future of the nation-state, as if there was nothing modern before it and nothing modern that could come after (ibid:11).

Thus modernity, even in Europe, is still a process of change "from above". If we combine this idea with Jameson's approach, in which different paths to capitalism are taken into account, it is difficult to understand why Turkish modernity should be a process of absence and *suffering*. It is hard to see why the creation of infrastructure should be a good thing if prompted by demand from the bourgeoisie but a bad thing if called for by a modern bureaucratic elite. Moreover, if we think of the bourgeoisie as the economic elite of capitalism, then it remains unexplained why modernity should be a bottom-up process when driven by one elite and a top-down process when driven by another. In short, in architecture as in other fields, it would be more useful to evaluate Turkey's specific path to modernity also in terms of its own internal dynamics rather than to criticise it from a eurocentric position.

Ernst Gellner (1994a) describes Turkey as one of the three liberal democracies in Asia and Africa (along with Japan and India). Among the three, Turkey, he says, stands out for two reasons: because "paradoxically, constitutional elective government is both intermittent and deep-rooted", and because Turkey was never colonised or fully occupied. Constitutionalism in India can be attributed to institutions left over from British rule and in Japan to the American occupation as well as to its subsequent economic miracle. But in Turkey the commitment to modern political ideas was, arguably, not an alien imposition but an endogenous development. "Turkey chose its destiny. It achieved political modernity: it was not thrust upon it" (ibid: 81-82).

Although Bozdoğan accepts that there can be different modernities, and that modernity is not under the monopoly of Europe (2001:22), she applies this understanding only when she explains the *Milli Mimari Rönesansı* (in fact Ottoman Revivalism), which goes back to the late 19th century. This, according to Bozdoğan, was the "first self-consciously 'modern' discourse" and also "the first anti-orientalist one, claiming its historicity and refusing to be a 'nonhistorical style'" (ibid:23). When she analyses the architecture of the Republican period, Bozdoğan seems to adopt a different approach, however, arguing that

> [m]odern architecture was imported as both a visible symbol and an effective instrument of this radical programme to create a thoroughly Westernised, modern and secular new nation dissociated from the country's own Ottoman and Islamic past (ibid:6).

and that modernism was essentially adopted in an ideological manner.

Ernst Gellner further states that, "[n]ationalism is not the awakening of nations to self-consciousness; it invents nations where they do not exist" (1994b: 62). Similarly, according to Benedict Anderson, "[c]ommunities are to be distinguished (…) by the style in which they are imagined" (1991: 6). Both remarks imply the socially-constructed character of nations. This construction needs some basic tools for creating the cultural homogeneity which helps to turn masses into nations. Language, education, shared history, shared cultural practices and religion are the most common tools. Moreover, as Eric Hobsbawm points out (1990), many symbols such as flags and national anthems are also used in this process.

There is no need to repeat ourselves by adding that a national architecture is one of such symbols. The important point is that while Ottoman revivalism is uncritically seen as genuine, modern architecture is quickly labelled as "imported" and "ideological". However, as discussed above, historicism and anti-historicism are all ideological

preferences in the different epistemologies of modernity or as Beck puts it,

> [t]he concept of "modernity" thus combines an historical break with the creation of history. Conceived thus, break and continuity, stability and change are both inseparable sides of the same modern coin. Both have ineradicably modern meanings. The concept of 'discontinuity' makes this paradox clear by grasping the ontological change of social organization and cultural imagination as a change in the system of reference. In this manner it does not deny or ignore the observable continuity of various social features, like religion and pre-market class statutes, that endure into modern society. But it emphasizes that they are repositioned in a new ontology of time and space (2003: 10).

There is thus no essential difference between the Turkish nation-building process and its Western counterparts, except perhaps arguably, for a time delay. The choice of the word "imported", if it does not simply imply that the Turkish process was different – e.g. because it was implemented "from above" - may be a hidden criticism of the choice of the West as a model. However, the paradox of a national elite that chooses the West as its model at the same time as it is trying to define its own national culture is not unique to Turkey. Mary Motassian has discussed this issue in her article "Ideologies of Delayed Development" (1994), which looks at the intellectuals of industrially backward countries such as India, Egypt and Turkey. The position of these intellectuals, appalled by the discrepancies between the living standards and "culture" of the West and those of their own communities, is, Motassian says, frequently ambiguous. The intellectual may resent the West, but is already at least partly Westernised himself and so cannot reject the West completely. "The nationalist claims to seek a blend of the 'best' in East and West… Behind this there is perhaps the implicit wish to see the 'East' as a genuine partner, an equal, of the West" (1994: 218-9).

This is just as true for Mustafa Kemal and his colleagues as well as for Turkish architects in the Republican era. Baydar-Nalbantoğlu writes:

> The architects of the Republican period preserved their proximity to the western world not only through their self-description but also through the adaptation of the modernist aesthetics. They were then faced with the problem of reconciling their nationalism with an imported aesthetic ideology. Ironically, the solution, too, came from the west, i.e., to define architecture as the representation of a political ideology (1988: 249-250).

The real irony in these sentences is that just two sentences previously the author has asserted the following of Turkish architects:

> [t]o assert their identity, they had to define their profession in the artistic realm. The terms of that definition had already been provided for the professionals of the nineteenth century through education reforms and by the presence of foreign architects (ibid:249).

Suddenly this aesthetic ideology becomes an imported one because it defines architecture as the representation of a political ideology coming from the West. If educational reforms and the presence of foreign architects in Turkey as educators and practitioners were a reality of Turkish architecture from the nineteenth century on, why does the ideology associated with them merit the epithet "imported" when it comes to the Republican period? This factor was already present, and it did not emerge as a problem because, as Motassian (1994: 219) puts it, "the nationalist claims to seek a blend of the 'best' in East and West."

Another important argument of Baydar-Nalbantoğlu concerning Turkish architects is that their discourse always conformed to contemporary political ideologies. Even when criticising state policies, like the favouritism displayed towards foreigners, she argues, they took care to formulate their attacks within the established ideological

boundaries of nationalism. “The architectural community in Turkey did not witness the rise of an artistic avant-garde precisely because of this uncritical standpoint that they never managed to surpass” (ibid:251).

Such argumentation also takes place in Bozdoğan’s book. It is true that Turkey has never had an architect capable of bombing his building because his project was amended at the construction stage, as in the 1949 film The Fountainhead, based on the novel of Ayn Rand of the same name. Nor has Turkey been the scene for experiments with futuristic architecture. But what do we really mean by an artistic avant-garde?

According to Howard Caygill, the modern movement legitimated its architectural interventions on the basis of an avant-garde ideology opposed to public opinion and officially-sponsored academic taste. The key elements of this ideology were a very abstract understanding of space and a utopian approach to human needs. Modern interventions were justified on the grounds that it was possible to effect spatial solutions to political problems. (1991: 261) Caygill continues:

> [a]esthetic avant-gardists define themselves against a body of philistines; a political avant-garde legitimates its vanguard role by postulating the "passive" or "trade union consciousness" of its constituency. In both cases, the revolutionary hyper-activity of the avant-garde legitimates itself through the representation of its other as conservative and passive (ibid: 262).

In the light of this definition, even though Turkish architects did not create a new style of their own, their vernacular buildings in Cubic forms and their public buildings in Ankara which Bozdoğan describes as very good examples of international style, could be regarded as highly avant-garde in the impoverished conditions of war-weary Turkey - not to mention their utopian concept of creating a new life-style which Turkish people were expected to commit themselves to. Moreover, those Turkish architects who regarded themselves as "an explorer of

science and technique" (Bozdoğan, 2001:161), "agents of civilization" (ibid: 100) or an "intellectual leader to guide our social life " (ibid: 173) - and who declared that "[t]he architect is no longer just an artist or craftsman but an expert with an unprecedentedly broad range of involvement and responsibility in everything from sociological and economic matters to the design of domestic furniture" (ibid: 160) - were clearly avant-gardist in the sense that they regarded the public as passive, backward and conservative.

In addition, as Bozdoğan readily asserts in another article, "The basic principles of this *yeni mimari* (new architecture), as the modernist avant-garde was then called, were captured in three words: rationalism, functionalism and *simenarme* (reinforced concrete), uttered with all the quasi-religious zeal and optimism of Kemalist "nation building" in both the literal and the metaphorical senses of the term" (1997: 133).

All in all, the insistence that Turkey has not had an avant-garde appears to be unjustified.

Thus, if one really believes that the

> idea behind the study of architectural culture is not to explain the work through what was said and written about it but to see the ways in which what was said, written and built collectively confirm, interpret, contest or negotiate the political and ideological agendas of the period (Bozdoğan, 2001:12, my emphasis),

then, one should really analyse the period within its own historical conjuncture, and not judge it from the standpoint of his or her present time - unless, of course, one agrees with the following unreflective and highly dubitable statement of Cynthia Davidson:

> [i]f architecture, like the Ottoman Empire, open itself up to "reform" by modelling its future on the time of information, it can only expect the same fate: confusion, ordinariness, and utter collapse as a discipline (1999: 11).

This is not simply a metaphor. It reflects the orientalist view of westerners concerning the Ottoman Empire and the new Turkish Republic, characterised by a western nostalgia for a fictitiously erected past and the resting on the deprecation of the Republican period as ordinariness. It also reflects the sovereignty of architecture very arrogantly, suggesting that architecture could have been independent of its age.

However, the word “ordinariness” can also be taken as the admission that Turkish architecture is not different from that of the West. This is helpful for one of the conjectures of this thesis that Turkish architectural history is not very different from that of the West, and although certain styles may be absent, the Turkish architects are much the same as their western counterparts in their struggle for professionalisation and in their understanding of that practice of architecture, allowing for some country-specific cultural differences.

Ali Artun posits that the production of buildings has, in almost all capitalist countries, been a field in which monopolization has come about late and in a slow pace and in which the modernization of the production process has been delayed for reasons such as the nature of the product, the character of the market, the conditioning of production by relations of land ownership and the line. Due to its close ties with construction techniques, its deep historical roots, the special relation of the profession with building production and its consequent inclination to protect its own traditional character, architecture has been an area in which the relations in question have made themselves felt particularly strongly (Hypothesis IV, 1999:124). Consequently in Turkey, where late modernization has affected all aspects of society, it is obvious that architecture has been particularly affected. However, the idea that Turkish architecture is different stems mostly from the existing conditions of practical implementation in Turkey.

Moreover, it should be mentioned within this context that even within a single country, the region or city in which the architectural practice is located can have an important influence on architecture depending on the level of economic and social development. Thus the locus of practice is an important component of the architects' *habitus.*

All this is very important for understanding their *ethos*.

2.5. The Legitimacy of the Architectural Profession

In recent years, the architectural profession has undergone further transformations of various kinds in line with changes taking place on a global scale. Previous transformations concerned the conceptualisation of architecture as a discipline and profession in the modernisation process. However, today's architects also face issues concerning the legitimacy of their profession. It is widely held that there are too many architects in every country. Statistical data paints a very different picture however. According to a survey of UIA member countries conducted by the Catalonian Architects Organisation (COAC), the total number of architects in 76 countries in 2002 was 1,268,373 – or 0.266% of the world's population. In other words, there is one architect for every 3,757 people in the world. This is an indication that architecture is available only to a minority who can afford it. World architects are more aware of this situation than ever. UIA congresses focusing on substantial issues of architects and architecture have been held every three years since 1948. A glance at the themes chosen over the past decade suffices to indicate the importance attached to the relationship between architecture and the "new world order". In 1993, in Chicago, the theme was "Architecture at the Crossroads: Designing for a Sustainable Future". The themes of the congresses held in Barcelona in 1996, Beijing in 1999 and Berlin in 2002 were, respectively, "Architecture for Cities". "Architecture in the 21st Century" and "Resource Architecture". The 22nd congress was held in İstanbul in

2005 centred on the theme of “CITIES: Grand Bazaar of Architecture*S*. Within this context the relationship between cities and architecture was handled in its many aspects and the declaration at the end of the congress emphasised that “the congress underlines the very significance of the necessity to question the political, economic and technological reasons of the conceptual dissolution and separation between city and architecture”. Moreover the congress “believes that an architectural and urban field of action, which aims the peace and happiness of the society, is one of the key factors for global security” (İstanbul Declaration, which was distributed during the Congress).

The shared views of world architects’ about a globalisation “that is more cultural and humanitarian and more respectful towards civilisational values” were expressed in the Twenty-second Congress of World Architecture as follows:

> - New policies should be established to consider the settlement problems of immigrants to cities and poor people as a basic right, as much as their health and education; similarly, new policies should be developed to avoid the utilisation of urban land as a means of real estate profits.
> - Municipalities and governments should give priority to the creation of environments that will consider the life and happiness of the people rather than land profits.
> - The development of an urban and architectural policy that aims to unify the cultures based on historical accumulations with universal values and with this aim integration of the historical heritage, as a common value of humanity, with today’s world.
> - Development of contemporary architecture in such a direction that will avoid excluding historical architectural labour and creativity, and instead in such a way to make good use of this accumulation as a “richness” of memory that will produce a future with a specific identity.
>
> The Congress hopes that this declaration will be evaluated by governments, together with all relevant parties, in the development policies related with city

> planning, architecture, the environment and culture (ibid).

World architects are also participating in the debate over sustainable development and calling for a new "utopian ecological democracy" which can be described as the "essence of a new modernism".

> The vision that foresees global existence only under the common denominator of a responsible modernism will substantially affect the involvement of architecture. Against the background of ecological disasters, moral depression and aesthetic poverty generated by irresponsible building practices, this challenge of a new enlightenment will urge architects to take stronger positions concerning their discipline and profession (Call paper in http://www.uia2005İstanbul.org).

Why are words like "modernism". "enlightenment" and "utopia" returning to the architects' agenda after all these years of "the victory of postmodernism" which attacked the values of the enlightenment and advocated the end of utopias? The answer can be found in fact in the questions which architects ask themselves: "[i]n what direction is the will-power of architecture developing, against practices based on the consumption of nature, history and the society?" (Call paper UIA 2005). This "consumption of nature, history and the society" is described as "the product of world capitalism which seeks unlimited profit". One of the easiest ways to increase profit is, of course, using the cheapest technology and labour available. This strategy brings the exclusion of experts in any field if there are alternative ways. For example, in city planning, infrastructure, national and regional planning and landscape design projects, the control and the coordinating role of architects is only 30.73% in 76 countries according to the COAC survey. Architects work mostly in building design (97.45%), while in other areas of responsibility of the sector their responsibilities decreased substantially

(technical consulting: 48.02%). When we consider that only 2% of buildings are done by architects all around the world, then the current picture of the world's architects is not a happy one.

Thanks to globalisation, moreover, world architects are facing another challenge. Most countries permit foreign architects to practise under certain conditions. According to the COAC report, foreign architects are able to work independently in 38 countries on the basis of their professional proficiency. Only in India and Indonesia are foreign architects not allowed to work under any circumstances. Turkey and a group of 16 countries oblige the foreign architect to enter into cooperation with a native architect. For such cooperation, the academic records and portfolio of works of the foreign architect is considered sufficient. However, there are plans to change these rules and to allow foreign architects to work independently in Turkey as part of Turkey's integration with the European Union.

The narrowing field of architects' influence has already created fiercer competition among architects and the presence of foreign architects in the market will further limit job opportunities. In addition, in today's world, architectural offices are starting to form monopolies, and the multinational architectural office is not very far from becoming reality. This means that in a country like Turkey small architectural offices will eventually become unable to survive. And change of this kind will undoubtedly lead to major changes in the nature of professional practice as well.

For these reasons, on the one hand, architects feel sorry for the dramatic situation of the built environment in line with their *ethos*, which forces them to think of themselves as bearing chief responsibility for building activities. On the other hand, they have real concerns about the state of their profession due to their 'ideology of professionalisation'. According to Sarfatti-Larson, professionalisation is a process which producers of special services seek "to constitute and

control a market for their expertise. Because marketable expertise is a crucial element in the structure of modern inequality, professionalisation appears *also* as a collective assertion of special social status and as a collective process of upward social mobility" (1997: xvi).

It can be said, in short, that the architect's job today is harder than ever before. The natural and cultural heritages of countries are being destroyed, built environments are becoming monuments to ugliness, and professional privileges have been lost. Yet even so, the architects still want to be the environmental consciousness of buildings while also defending the rights of their clients. All of this adds to the reasons for exploring the *ethos* of architects.

Sarfatti-Larson argues that "[c]hanging working conditions in our century may be drawing increasingly large numbers of professionals closer to a proletarian condition" (ibid). However, their education, their knowledge, skills and life-styles might be expected to give professionals some superiority over the working class because "[b]oth objectively and subjectively professions are outside and above the working class, as occupations and as social strata" (ibid).

On the other hand, in Ali Artun's II. Hypothesis, it is suggested that the process of production in small architectural offices displays the characteristics in the majority of these offices, not so much of a capitalist process as of an artisan. Most of these offices do not employ architects in return for wages, and a significant number of them employ nobody on a wage basis. The labour of the owner of the office is the determining factor. As the owner of the means of production, the owner of the office is both a small capitalist and his/her own wage labourer. Working with his/her own means of production, he/she reproduces his/her own labour and at the same time claims a part of the surplus value which he/she creates. His/her capital is not so much capital in a fully modern sense but rather is of the nature of natural capital, made

up of the instruments, workplace etc. which an artisan requires for his/her craft. In most offices, there is no accumulation of capital, nor any trace of the capitalist division of labour. The existence of one or more employees earning wages does not, of itself, indicate a fundamental change in this situation (Hypothesis II, 1999:123).

This contradiction makes architects more anxious about their own futures. The “impotence” referred to by Adorno with respect to both the built environment and their own situation as professionals force architects to be more active today.

In 1995, the Architects’ Council of Europe published a “White Book” entitled “Europe, Architecture and Future”. The aim was to draw the attention of the political authorities of Europe who did not seem to care as much about social and cultural problems as about economic ones. According to the European architects, the architectural profession ought to guarantee that those people who engage in building design and in managing building projects have a humanist formation. The architects declared that architects, by virtue of their unique set of skills, were in the best position within the construction industry to be environmentally conscious of buildings, to encourage quality in the built environment, to make professional proposals untainted by commercial interests, to defend the rights of the employer to the full and to make possible a dialogue between employers, users and people (2002: 54). An appeal was issued to architects to act in accordance with this position, and this in turn led European architects to seek the adoption in each member country of the European Union, with the cooperation of the governments concerned, a national architectural policy involving a redefinition of the role of architects. In all of these programmes, core themes are the involvement of architects in decision-making processes in the building sector and the role of governments and local authorities in regulating the sector. Many suggestions are also made to raise the awareness of the public concerning their built environment. These

suggestions include the inclusion of educational programmes about architecture even in primary school curricula, and various modes of cooperation with other professions in building design etc…(All of the national programmes can be found on the website of the Turkish Chamber of Architects: http://www.mimarlarodasi.org.tr).

The interesting point about these policies is that they describe themselves as "national" – even within the EU. Despite the attacks on everything labelled "national" witnessed in the so-called post-modern era, why does architecture need to have "national" policies? The answer is given by the Scottish government in the document "The Development of a Policy on Architecture for Scotland":

> [w]hat we seek from buildings is not solely practical. Whilst we expect, as a matter of course, our buildings to be stable, durable and efficient, they must also respond to and sustain our social and cultural needs and aspirations. These needs and aspirations may be private and intimate such as our desire for a sense of security and well-being in our homes or they may be public and symbolic such as the need to express a sense of *cultural and national identity* in our civic buildings (my emphasis) (http://www.scotland.gov.uk).

It may be argued that Scotland achieved autonomy only very recently (in 1996), and it is therefore quite normal for the Scots to be more concerned than others about national identity. But even if this is the case, the example clearly shows the function of architecture in the nation-building process. This function remained the same more or less in the 1990s as in the 1920s. Moreover, it is still held to be the duty of the nation state to regulate the building market and define the clear role of the architect in it for the sake of a country in a global world. The nation-state is still seen the most important authority to give the privileges which architects lost.

One reason for the loss of privileges of the profession is the division of labour in the design processes of the built environment. As mentioned earlier, many other professions such as urban design, landscape design and interior architecture are active in the field of architecture. In the past, all fell under the same umbrella. However, economic and political concerns such as the need to create new educational and employment opportunities have caused the influence of architecture to shrink. This in turn creates a crisis of legitimacy. Ultimately, writes Aydan Balamir, legitimacy involves power relationships, a search for status and a power struggle. The weapon used in this struggle for power is the claim to possess superior knowledge and a superior moral code (Aydan Balamir, 1996: 25). Sarfatti-Larson posits a similar idea stating that "(...) although professionalisation may be seen as "power struggle on a societal level", it is a struggle waged within the same class rather than across class lines" (1997: 157). In these circumstances, architects need to draw the borders of their professional identities. Most architects want the new professions mentioned above to remain sub-divisions of architecture, and continue to deny their legitimacy, or at least would like the right to supervise them.

2.6. The Organisations of Architects

If legitimacy is a power struggle, then it needs to be a collective struggle. At this point, the organisation of architects takes on great importance. All around the world, architects have their own professional organisations. In Turkey, there are three organisations of architects: *Serbest Mimarlar Derneği* (Turkish Independent Architects Association*), Mimarlar Derneği 1927* (Architects Association 1927) and *Turkish Chamber of Architects*. The first two are small organisations with a limited number of members. The Chamber of Architects is, on the other hand, a mass organisation because of the reason that every

graduate from a faculty of architecture should be a member. It has gained an influential position in the implementation of the profession. In most cities where the Chamber is organised, protocols have been reached with the local authorities according to which projects must be inspected and approved professionally by the Chamber before they can be adopted by the Municipality. The professional supervision of the Chamber is also required for approval of projects by conservation boards (*Koruma Kurulları*). In other words, architects are obliged to be members of the Chamber.

The Turkish Chamber of Architects was established through Law No. 6235 of 1954 on the Turkish Union of Engineers and Architects (TMMOB). The law entrusts the Chamber of Architects with the following main duties:

--to meet the common needs of architects and facilitate their professional work;

--to ensure that the profession develops in accordance with the general interests of the profession;

--to preserve the discipline of the profession so as to ensure that honesty prevails in relations among architects and between architects and the public;

--to cooperate with the official authorities and to be of assistance and make proposals to them and on matters related to the profession and the interests of the profession, and

--to examine all legislation, norms and specifications related to the profession and provide opinions and views on these to the relevant parties.

These duties can not be carried out without a specific understanding of architecture and architects. In other words, professional ideology can not be separated from organisation. Thus the organisations of architects are instrumental for preserving, strengthening and spreading this ideology. Moreover, because of the

Chamber's membership of international organisations of world's architects, it is also instrumental for bringing international influence to Turkey.

Although the formal establishment of the Chamber of Architects is relatively recent, the history of its organisation further dates back. Until the 19th century, architects were included in the organisation of the court of the Ottoman Empire as palace architects producing public buildings under the direction of the chief architect. Rules for buildings were set out and building work was inspected by this body. The design and construction of buildings other than public buildings – such as housing – was carried out by "master builders" within the system of *lonca* or guilds. In the second half of the nineteenth century, as westernisation movements gathered pace, the way in which the profession was organised began to change, both within the palace and within the private sphere. Towards the end of the ninetieth century, architectural services came to be provided to a large extent by foreign architects and non-Muslim Ottoman citizens who had received their education in other countries. The School of Fine Arts (*Sanayi-i Nefise Mektebi Alisi*) established in İstanbul in 1882 was the first institution to provide architectural education in Turkey in the western sense as was current of the time. The process of organisation moved ahead with the declaration of constitutional government. In 1908, architects and engineers established the Ottoman Society of Engineers and Architects. In the Republican period, architects resumed their organisational efforts from 1928 onwards, continuing to organise professionally in the Architects' Asssociation (*Mimarlar Derneği*) and the "Union of Master Architects" (*Yüksek Mimarlar Birliği*). The Chamber of Architects established in 1954 was to build on the progress made by these bodies.

All these changes closely paralleled changes in society. Although today's architectural historians harshly criticise the process, it is difficult

to see how else architects could have acquired professional legitimacy in a barely emerging capitalist market without sharing the dominant ideology of the largest employer – that is, the state.

According to Uğur Tanyeli (1996: 112), the way in which the profession developed resulted in the absence in Turkey of an area of *specifically* architectural responsibility *contiguous with* the area of social responsibility. In effect, this tricky sentence proposes that architecture should be addressed entirely independently. In practice, Turkish architects have always taken an interest in politics. Even their struggle against foreign architects was a political struggle in essence. The "area of architectural responsibility" is not totally independent, as the functional relations of professions are related to central social needs and values. Even issues of urban transport, infrastructure renovation and building licences fall into the sphere of economic and political domination. Thus professionals cannot isolate themselves as if they were "free-floating intellectuals", to use an expression by Karl Mannheim (1936).

Moreover, as Ali Artun claims in his I. Hypothesis, architects do not possess distinct social characteristics common to only themselves which distinguish them as a social group from others in society. In economic relations, they occupy various positions, and may even be linked to different modes of production (Hypothesis I, 1999:121). For this reason, it is again their professional ideology (especially among the academic architects) which leads them to think of a different form of responsibility -i.e an architectural responsibility, other than social responsibility. Sarfatti-Larson points out too that "the appearance of detachment and 'pure" intellectual commitments is more marked in academic circles than in the consulting professions" (1977: xv).

As we have seen on a global scale, the themes of the UIA World Congress and the international organisation of architects are not completely divorced from public issues. The Turkish Chamber of

Architects is not immune from this phenomenon. In conjunction with the TMMOB, other professional associations and intellectual circles, the Chamber of Architects has exerted an influence on the political life of the country. It has expressed its views not only on professional matters but also on more general issues such as economic development, human rights and the struggle for democracy. For the most part it has taken on an oppositional role.

This engagement in politics presents new problems for architects. Their organisation becomes alienated from especially its practising members. Today, although all of Turkey's self-employed architects are obliged to be members of the Chamber, but most regard the organisation merely as an authority from which it is compulsory to obtain approval for their projects. One of the most important indicators of this is the low number of members who take part in the Chamber's general meetings and in elections for Chamber officials.

The distance which architects keep from their organisation cannot be explained merely in terms of the structure of the organisation. In 1991 the İzmir Chamber of Architects carried out a piece of research which showed that architects espoused liberal ideas and regarded themselves, in class terms, as members of "the new middle class" (1996:102). In this context, main expectations of the members from the organisation were improvement in their income levels and improvements in their working conditions (ibid: 106). Only in these relatively limited areas did the architects expect the Chamber to be of benefit to them. Yet according to another survey carried out by the İzmir Chamber of Architects in 1996 among architects working in the public sector, 52% of the architects regarded the government as taking the prime responsibility for current urban problems. The second most popular culprit was economic conditions, with 22%. The proportion of those surveyed who held themselves as architects or the Chamber of Architects and the urban planners responsible was only 19% (1996:

17). From this picture a contradiction emerges. In theory, architects regard themselves as responsible for the built environment and in this sense they complain about the narrowing sphere of influence of their profession – but on the other hand they do not confront this issue within the wider context of the politics and economic policies which are responsible for this situation.

2.7 The Ethics of Architects

This problem brings onto the agenda the important issue of professional *ethics.* There are architects who believe that the *ethics* of architecture is only for architecture in other words for its product (Pekin, 2004: 90) and those who explain the influence of *ethics* over design in terms of the stance which the architect has adopted towards society and history independently of the design process (Kuban, 2004:219). Aydan Balamir, on the other hand, makes a distinction between the *ethics* related to the producer and the *ethics* related to the product. The former include principles for the conduct of professional activities, the responsibilities of architects towards society and members of other professions, and questions of professional honour and conscience. Product-related *ethics,* on the other hand, encompass principles related to the theoretical basis of architecture, that is, design *ethics* (1996: 26). Both Kuban and Balamir assert that the responsibility of the architect towards society is no guarantee of good design, in other words there should be also some other qualities of architects. Here, in fact, the architect's identity as an artist is seen to come onto the agenda. Meanwhile, while Turkish architects discussing the theoretical approaches about the question of *ethics*, in Germany, for example, architects forming their national architectural policies for a better environment are able to propose that architects should take an oath upon entering the profession to abide by a certain code of conduct, similar to the Hippocratic oath taken by doctors. Thus, a fundamental

concept such as *ethics* or codes of conduct can be treated as the product of a professional ideology.

2.8. Gender Issues in Architecture

Karen Frank has added another dimension to the argument by arguing that women, unlike men, have an "*ethics* of care" requiring "that no-one be hurt and that one respond to the needs of others", whereas men have "*ethics* of justice" which imply that everyone should be treated fairly (2000: 296). Accordingly, woman architects have a greater concern about the needs of their clients and users. In this context, the question of *ethics* can be said to be largely a subjective matter depending directly on the *habitus* of the architect

If gender issues can be raised even during discussion of such a general concept as *ethics*, then it seems likely that gender will be an important variable in the formation of the *ethos* of architects. In fact, architecture has not remained untouched by the influence of the feminist movement, particularly over the past 20 years, and there has been much talk of the exclusion both of women involved in the production of architecture and of women as users of its products.

Architecture is still largely a male-dominated area of activity. In the introduction to their book, *The Sex of Architecture*, Diane Agrest, Patricia Conway and Leslie Kanes Weisman explain this situation as follows:

> [t]he inscription of the sexualised body is a central and recurrent theme in Western architecture, but that body is neither innocent nor androgynous. It is a reification of the male longing to appropriate an exclusively female privilege: maternity. Thus the insistence in ancient and temporary discourse that male architects give birth to their buildings. Implicated in man's inevitable state of childlessness, which gives rise to an obsession with "reproducing himself" is the systematic erasure of woman and her contributions (Agrest *et al*, 1996: 11).

Women were, in fact, the first builders – a consequence of their need for a more settled order dating back to the to the period when they were involved in gathering activities in the first social division of labour, Erhan Acar suggests that the home did not emerge from the physical differences between men and women but from the separation of the places of production, and that hunting and gathering are separate production processes each requiring expertise and each having their own natural environments (1983: 9). He also proposes that the homes were built by women for the storage of the surplus production created by the labour of women. Neslihan Türkün Dostoğlu says that although women were the first builders, they later took on a marginal role as architecture, being a function of culture, differentiated itself away from the construction of buildings intended to perform functions of providing shelter and sustaining life (2002: 9). This marginal role still goes on today.

The reason why women architects, too, are marginalised both in terms of numbers and in terms of the tasks they perform is undoubtedly related to the duties imposed on them by a patriarchal society. In the United Kingdom, the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) undertook research in 1993 to determine why women did not remain within the architectural profession. The dominant response was a perceived incompatibility between the inflexible working arrangements of the architect and the demands of raising a family: “The research concluded that women’s decisions to leave the profession were not linked to academic or practical ability or to poor career choice" (2003:1), but to the heavy work load of the architectural profession which is difficult to reconcile with the heavy work load of being mothers and wives.

Social values are also influential in determining whether or not women are able to fulfil the needs of the profession. It is widely held in Turkey, for instance, that it is more difficult for woman architects to

work on building sites than it is for male architects, and that men are preferred for this kind of work.

Feminist architects also argue that women carry out architecture in a distinct way, that they have a special approach to the design process and that they are particularly sensitive to the space and to the client. (Jane Rendell *et al*, 2000). Karen Franck, for example, describes seven different characteristics of women which make possible “the feminist way of knowing and analysing”:

> (…) (1) an underlying connectedness to others, to objects of knowledge, and to the world, and a sensitivity to the connectedness of categories; (2) a desire for inclusiveness, and a desire to overcome opposing dualities; (3) a responsibility to respond to the needs of others, represented by an 'ethic of care'; (4) an acknowledgement of the value of everyday life and experience; (5) an acceptance of subjectivity as a strategy for knowing, and of feelings as part of knowing; (6) an acceptance and desire for complexity, and (7) an acceptance of a change and a desire for flexibility (2000:297).

Franck proposes on the basis of these characteristics that woman architects can create a different architecture from that of men, and that such architecture is capable of solving the invisibility of women in cities as users. Even if this is not the case, the *habitus* of individuals varies in line with gender and it is possible that the collective *habitus* of woman architects has a considerable impact on the *ethos* of architects.

2.9. Architectural Education

Last but not least, the *ethos* of architects may be affected by the nature of their education.

According to Necdet Teymur, the "educational specificity of architecture"

> (…) has a lot to do with whether or not, or to what extent, architecture is a 'discipline' in the traditional sense of the word especially if its real objectives and

> its basic scope are so closely associated with the *vocational training* of professionals
> Those who see architecture as a *discipline* of design and building tend to emphasize the *study* of it, while those who see architecture primarily as a *professional practice* of designing and building emphasize the *doing* of it.
> These distinct sets of foci and objects (which are admittedly, not mutually exclusive) involve different bodies of knowledge, skills, cultures and divisions of labour as well as where in the academic structure architecture is placed (e.g. in Faculties of Arts, Social Studies, Environment Studies, Engineering or Design, or in Colleges of Art) (1992: 17).

Arif Şentek (2005:55) describes architectural education as an education "without any book" in the sense that the necessary preparation for the architectural profession – and "especially" the acquisition of the capacity to produce architectural designs – cannot be acquired through a formal education. In other words, Şentek asserts, there are in architecture, unlike in engineering or other branches of science, no ready formulae or stencils for the solving of problems. The ability to design is essential in order to be an architect, and an architectural education must necessarily provide training in this area. Everywhere in the world, a period of architectural education of between two and seven years is prescribed, varying from country to country. In most countries, the length of training is around five years, and five years is also the period envisaged by the UIA in the UIA-UNESCO Architectural Education Charter (2004: 29). In Turkey architectural education is of relatively short duration – just four years. The students are selected, moreover, not according to their abilities but on the basis of the "science exam scores" which they achieve in a general university entrance examination taken by all high school graduates. Many Turkish architects are already criticising this kind of student selection as one of the reasons which negatively affect the quality of profession.

Furthermore, debates continue on issues such as whether professional education should be provided at university or in architectural practices. At the most recent meeting of the European Association for Architectural Education (EAAE) in 2004, it was suggested that it would be impossible to present everything related to the practice of the profession at university, and also if education in schools was geared entirely towards practice it would not be possible to carry out research or to innovate (Ciravoğlu, 2005:13). In other words, there is a certain tension between the discipline and the profession. This situation also affects the extent to which students use the knowledge which they acquire during their education in the actual practice of the profession. For example, in the survey of 1991 by İzmir Chamber of Architects, the number of respondents who stated that they made extensive use of what they had learned during the education was only 23.2%. For those graduating after 1980, the proportion fell to as low as 19%, whereas for those graduating between 1960 and 1969 the figure was 35.3%. Against this, the use of knowledge acquired as a result of professional experience was 33.3% (1996: 107). The survey of architects working in the public sector again conducted by the İzmir Chamber of Architects in 1996 showed that of the 30% directly engaged in architectural work every one felt that they had inadequate professional knowledge. This situation seems to verify the X. Hypothesis of Ali Artun which claims that an important part of the knowledge acquired [by the architect] in the course of his/her professional education goes unused, and has no practical outcome. This is because the education given is not in harmony with the real state of those economic relations. Education has been based on an imported model, on a model of education which parallels a different manner of organization of the social and technical division of labour (Hypothesis X, 1999:127).

The tension between the discipline and the profession as well as the position occupied by the universities in this context has resulted, Teymur also points out, in the adoption of different approaches by different universities. While some universities concentrate on developing the technical and practical capabilities of their students, others aim at developing abstract, general design abilities. This leads to the exclusion of certain elements of the profession and the imprisonment of the student into a narrow area of specialisation – the "apprentice architect". "academic architect", "engineer architect", "planner architect" and so on (Balamir, 1996: 30). Academics in architecture today tend to complain about a type of architect referred to somewhat derogatorily as a "market architect". Another topic of discussion is architects' lack of a certain level of taste and the need to develop this through education.

Educational institutions also play a significant part in passing onto students their professional ideologies. Professionalisation implies the use of a certain knowledge in the market place (Larson, 1977). The preparation of students for their place in the market is also the first step towards their professionalisation. In this context, while being trained as professionals, students are also indirectly presented with certain assumptions, attitudes and expectations regarding their profession. Even if the knowledge which is passed onto students for use in professional practice may be inadequate, they are implicitly provided with ways of dealing with the problems which they will face as individual professionals. After graduation, even if the knowledge which they have acquired varies due to the different approaches of their schools, the students find themselves in the end equipped with a professional ideology. In other words, while it is thought that different schools provide their students with differential understanding of architecture, what they all provide in common is a certain ideology of professionalism.

In consequence, it appears necessary to assume that the institutions from which architects graduate have a profound impact on their *habitus*, and to try to determine how important this influence is in their *ethos*.

On the other hand, the 1991 Survey of İzmir Chamber of Architects also provides more valuable information which is directly related to one of the variables of this study. Professional experience provides 31.9% of the knowledge necessary for professional practice (1993:107). Although professional experience might include work capacity, it is also related with the age of the architect. Age is important on the *habitus* of architects because it increases the accumulation of "economic, cultural, and symbolic capitals" in Bourdieu's sense. Economic capital, of course, is material skills and wealth. Cultural capital involves legitimate knowledge and intellectual skills, and symbolic capital arises from a sense of honour and prestige (Swingewood, 2000:212). These kinds of capital might give an opportunity for using different criteria in relation with design, with clients and users. For this reason, a study about the *habitus* of architects can not be carried out without considering the participants' age.

2.10. Love of the Profession

Ali Artun states in his Hypothesis XVI that the architect preserves links with the profession in question and with his or her specific work. According to him, the architect is the present-day symbol of the artisan's devotion to his or her craft, and regards this as a form of "superiority" (1990:128). The famous Turkish architect Şevki Vanlı has formulated this attitude in the title of his book of memoirs: "Architecture, My Darling". When the Ankara branch of the Ankara Chamber of Architects carried out a survey under the same heading, many of the architects responding spoke of this relationship of love. Vanlı refers to "… My darling Architecture… an abstract act that cannot be abstracted

from life…" (2005: 23). For another well-known architect, Behruz Çinici, "[a]rchitecture is the most humane of loves; you cannot create without loving" (ibid:19). Architect Gürhan Tümer defines this love as follows:

> I discover, albeit belatedly, that architecture is not only a set of lines drawn on paper, that a wall is not only a wall, a column not only a column, but that architectural space is a poem which reflects a philosophy, and that perhaps not all, but at least some buildings - those that can be described as architectural works - can be read like a poem or a novel, and that consequently to be engaged in architecture is a way of being engaged in philosophy or literature… In these circumstances, things become different, and I start to talk of architecture as my darling (ibid: 26, translated from Turkish).

What is witnessed here is once again the artistic aspect of architecture. It is this artistic dimension which propels architects to seek protection for their works under the copyright laws from which artists benefit. At the same time, it poses certain difficulties in terms of professional practice. Even those architects who do not describe themselves as artists are upset when others interfere with their works. In their relations with clients, they are in a position to be the guiding force, and they regard meeting the demands of the client as a compromise. This alone is a signal of the sense of superiority mentioned by Artun. It is also an indication of the different perception of space referred to by Lefebvre, and while it has to be stated once again here that this is directly linked to the professional ideology and certainly an important factor in the *ethos* of architects.

In her PhD thesis on "Professional Value Systems of Turkish Architects with respect to Clients and Users in Contemporary Residential Design Practice", Burçak Serpil Altay concluded that

> [t]his study has shown that even in a group of architects who are rather homogeneous in terms of location, years of practice, education etc., there are important differentiations in terms of their values and

> the reflections of these values in their practices. Hence a variety of role definitions and professional positions exist including value judgements which are in contrast to one another, even in a subculture of architects (2000: 97).

The value system is only one part of the *habitus* of architects. If this part of the *habitus* varies considerably, it is reasonable to imagine that the *habitus* as a whole will also display important variations. In this review of the literature, I have tried to outline the factors which may lead to these variations. The specific characteristics of space and the specific characteristics of Architecture and the chief definer of space create a special kind of *habitus* for its practitioners – i.e., architects. International influences, their education, their gender, their locus of practice, their organisations and their age may also make important contributions. In addition, they have their own professional ideologies. It is this ideology that unites their *habitus* as a collective one thus provides us with an opportunity to understand their *ethos*. But the best way to understand is to ask the people themselves.

For this purpose an empirical study was planned and interviews were conducted with architects around the issues discussed in this chapter. The following chapter explains the study in detail.

CHAPTER 3

THE RESEARCH

> ...research without a theory is blind, and theory without research is empty.
> Bourdieu & Wacquant (1992:162)

Bourdieu's theory centres on the dialectical relationship between *habitus* and *field*. *Habitus* is whole of the mental schemes by which people perceive, understand and evaluate their social environments, in other words, internalise them. People's behaviour and opinions depend on their *habitus.* The *habitus* is formed over a long period of time. It depends partly on the person's position in the world and varies from person to person. However, factors such as age, gender and social class play an important part in the formation of the *habitus*, and by the existence of a common ideology (practical consciousness in Marx's term) it is therefore possible to speak of the collective *habitus* of a group of people of similar background.

The *habitus* is a *structuring* structure, which organises practices and the perception of practices. At the same time, it is a *structured* structure, since the principle of division into logical classes which organises the perception of the social world is itself the outcome of the internalisation of the division into social classes. Each class condition is defined both by its intrinsic properties and by relational properties deriving from its position in the system of class conditions, which is also a system of differences. In other words, the class condition is also defined by everything which distinguishes it from what it is not or from what it is opposed to. The dispositions of the *habitus* consequently include the whole structure of the system of conditions, as viewed from

a life-condition occupying a particular point within that structure (Bourdieu, 1989:170-172).

Bourdieu's *habitus* constrains but does not determine thought and action. People make their own choices, but these are in line with the principles suggested by their *habitus*.

> The habitus, an objective relationship between two objectivities, enables an intelligible and necessary relation to be established between practices and a situation, the meaning of which is produced by the habitus through categories of perception and appreciation that are themselves produced by an observable social condition (ibid: 101).

According to Bourdieu, the strategies of agents depend not only on the *habitus* but also on their *capitals* and their positions in the *field*. Bourdieu states this in the following formula:" [(habitus) (capital)] + field = practice "(1989: 101). By *field* is meant the network of objective relations which exist between people and institutions. There are a number of semi-autonomous *fields* (artistic, religious, economic etc.), but the *field* of power (or rather politics) - a hierarchy of power relationships - serves to structure all the other *fields*. The *field* is an arena of competition in which the agents seek to defend and improve their positions. In this process, the agents make use of three kinds of capital: economic, cultural, and symbolic. The meaning of economic capital is obvious. Cultural capital involves legitimate knowledge, and symbolic capital arises from one's honour and prestige.

Differences within a *field* are produced not by individuals but by the objective positions occupied by agents and institutions. In general, however, agents occupying dominant positions will adopt defensive and conservative strategies while newcomers will adopt subversive strategies. Even newcomers accept the legitimacy of the field, and so they may change the *field* by altering hierarchies but they never destroy it.

Bourdieu analyses *fields* in three stages. The *field* of power is of primary importance and so the first step is to specify the relationship of any specific *field* to the political *field*. The second step is to map out the objective structure of the relations among positions within the *field*. The third step is an exploration of the *habitus* of the agents who occupy the various types of positions within the *field* (George Ritzer, 1996: 406).

If architecture is a *field* in Bourdieu's term, then its relationship with politics and ideology can be considered to constitute the first of the above steps. Now, for the second step, we can map out different positions of the practice of architects in Turkey. They can be classified into self-employed architects, architects employed in the public and private sectors and architects employed in academic capacities. Among academic architects, too, a distinction might be made between those in the public sector and those in the private sector.

This piece of research certainly aims to determine the *ethos* of architects in professional practice, yet for all practical purposes the scope of the research has been limited to self-employed architects who are directly carrying out the profession so it concerns itself with one position only among others in the same *field*. Architects who are members of the Chamber of Architects and who are self-employed constitute the sampling frame of the research universe of this thesis. The Chamber of Architects is organised around 21 provinces some of which encompass more than two cities. In small cities there are representative offices linked to the main branches.

The three largest provinces, İstanbul, Ankara and İzmir, account for 82.75% of the total number of members of the Chamber, and therefore also for the overwhelming majority of registered architectural offices. The total number of registered offices in Turkey stood at 8,958 as of the end of 2004. However, officials of the Chamber suggested that this figure did not paint a true picture of the total number of active offices, and that they had no idea of the real number of unregistered practices.

As a result, the figure merely gives a rough idea of the size of the sampling frame. A survey carried out on behalf of the Chamber by the research company *Veri Araştırma* and published in March 2002 (*Çalışan Mimarların 2001 Yılında Yaşanan Ekonomik Krizden Etkilenme Düzey ve Biçimleri Üzerine Bir Araştırma* - A Survey of the Extent to which and Ways in which Working Architects were Affected by the Economic Crisis of 2001) showed that 98% of self-employed architects were members.

According to this survey, the overall socio-economic level of architects is well above the average for the country as a whole. According to the same survey, while only 1.6% of Turkey's urban population is included in the "highest" socio-economic category (category A), 53% of architects fall into this category. Another 38% of architects fall into the "high" socio-economic category (category B). Thus the great majority of architects - as many as 92% - are included in the two categories with high socio-economic levels. This compares to a ratio of 10% for the urban population as a whole. The remaining 8% of architects are in the "medium" category (category C). For the population as a whole, this percentage is 46%.

The survey also showed that among employed people with a higher education, 17% fall into socio-economic category (A), but among architects this ratio is 53%. Self-employed architects tend to have a higher socio-economic level. Thirty eight percent (38%) of architects who are self-employed own the businesses for which they work, 45% have partners and 58% employ paid staff, while 29% work alone..

All these figures help us to better determine the class status of architects. In spite of their high socio-economic levels, they are not unaffected by the processes of disappropriation, tendency to proletarianisation and social polarisation. For example, as the survey of the Chamber of Architects indicates, 88% of self-employed architects experienced declines in their turnovers and volumes of work. These

statistics tend to corroborate the hypothesis put forward by Ali Artun in his 1978 survey, according to which changing economic balances result in tougher economic conditions for the owners of architectural practices and cause paid employment to spread significantly (ibid:123, Hypothesis II). Artun also proposes (Hypothesis IX) that architects and engineers, despite the trend in favour of paid labour, which becomes the dominant form of social status among them, still enjoy quite broad social opportunities and social mobility in their social life (ibid:127). The situation today tends to lend support to this thesis as well, although social mobility is more obviously of a downward nature.

Having specified the position of architects within their *field*, we can go on to Bourdieu's third step: the *habitus*. This study is basically directed towards describing the *habitus* of architects only in their professional practice. It accepts a number of variables as important elements of practising architects' *habitus*.

The first important element of architects' *habitus* is the city in which they live and work. Different cities create different positions occupied by agents and institutions in the *field* of architecture and this can give many possibilities to the agents, enabling them to employ different strategies in maintaining and advancing their positions within the *field*.

Another important variable influencing the *habitus* of the architect is the issue of gender. Architecture is still largely a male-dominated practice. Of the 29,655 members of the Chamber of Architects (as of January, 2004), only 9,916 (33.44%) are women. For cultural reasons, the great majority of woman architects in Turkey are unable to work on building sites and thus barred from the most important part of the work of profession. The number of woman architects owning their own businesses is also quite limited. Yet feminist architects all around the world, have been debating the possibility that women have a different concept of design from men, and that this could help to end the domination of architecture over user and space. Woman architects

possessing different characteristics, it is asserted by those feminist architects, will eliminate the hierarchy of public spaces and private spaces, and hence do away with the dominance of the one over the other. Their designs will introduce complexity and flexibility and ensure user participation. If not any others but only for reasons such as these, gender plays an important role in the *habitus* of the architects, and this study seeks also to determine whether or not woman architects really perceive themselves as different, how they perceive architecture and how they try to carry out their profession in a male-dominated world.

Age is another variable in the *habitus* of the architect. As Bourdieu envisages, it has an effect on the formation of economic, cultural, social and symbolic capital. Moreover, by comparing those who have lived through different historical periods, especially in a country where everything changes as quickly as in Turkey, it may be possible to reveal the continuity or discontinuity of various traditions and their impact on the *habitus* under question.

Another reason why the schools and faculties at which architects have studied may have a significant effect on their *habitus* is that education is also cultural capital. It is a well-known fact that the various architecture schools and faculties in Turkey exhibit different approaches to their subject matter. The architectural influences of many institutions - from the legendary *Sanayi-i Nefise* to the Fine Arts Academy in the past, and on to the Middle East Technical University and the State Academies of Engineering and Architecture (DMMAs) that have been incorporated into various universities - are apparent even in the way the architects which they have trained refer to themselves. Whether or not the graduates of these schools and faculties display the differences of which Teymur writes might constitute the topic of a separate piece of research, but for the purposes of this research, it was important to reveal the impact of the

particular institution in which the architect was educated upon his or her *habitus*.

The existence of a professional ideology also strongly affects the *habitus* of architects. Architectural education and existent organisations play an important role in the formation of this professional ideology. It provides architects with a special way of thinking about space, the sovereignty of architecture, its art component, the architects' devotion to their profession, the superiority of architects over clients, etc. Even the *ethics* of architects fall under the influence of this ideology. It also makes the architects more possessive about their field of influence in the face of the changes in the building industry by increasing their symbolic capital.

Organisation is another important variable. It is instrumental in spreading the professional ideology. Although the degree of participation varies greatly from one architect to another, all architects, for example, receive the publications of their organisation free and are thus in some way aware of the current debates and events, competitions and new approaches in their country and the international arena. Organisation also contributes to the accumulation of symbolic capital.

The last variable in influencing the *habitus* is international influence. Turkish architects are generally aware of international developments. This was true even in the 1930's. Today it is easier to grasp new developments thanks to modern communications, publications and other means. Because of the long historical tradition, the West was and still is a measuring rod for Turkish people. Architects are not immune to this. This habit also feeds the idea that Turkish architecture is different from the West especially among the theoreticians of architecture. Moreover the existence of foreign architects was a problem for Turkish architects in the past and this still seems to be the case. Globalisation also seems to create some other

problems and for these reasons international influence has great effects on the architects *habitus.* International influence has an impact on the professional ideology of architects as well.

Together with the effects of these variables, this study attempts to describe *how* architects describe themselves (artist, worker, employer), *how* they regard architecture (an art, a discipline, a profession), *how* they interpret space, *how* far they are aware of the domination referred to by Lefebvre, *how* they legitimise this, what kind of responsibility and authority they attribute to themselves in this process, and *how* they form their professional ideologies – understood in the sense of what Althusser terms the 'spontaneous philosophy of scientists' (SPS).

The *habitus* by means of which this ideology is internalised is at the same time, of course, a collective phenomenon. Therefore examining the *habitus* of individual architects should make it possible to set out the "culture" and "codes of values" of Turkey's architectural community, in short, its *ethos*.

Naturally, the *habitus* also determines every aspect of individuals' daily lives. However, as the purpose of this study is to describe the *ethos* of architects' professional practice, it is limited to issues related to the professional aspects of the *habitus* of architects.

3.1. The Research

This is essentially an exploratory-descriptive study. Given that there are variations of *habitus* from one architect to another, it is considered that the self-narratives of architects, in which each architect is able to explain himself or herself, are of great importance. For this reason, the method followed took the form of structured in-depth interviews with architects in different cities according to gender, age-group and educational background randomly.

Research was carried out in six different cities/provinces – Ankara, Antalya, Bursa, İstanbul, Kastamonu and Konya. Ankara and İstanbul

are the cities where 64.52% of architects are to be found. Bursa, Antalya and Konya are provinces in different regions having different potentials for development between them they account for 8.67% of Turkey's architects. Kastamonu has been included because it is one of Turkey's smaller provinces – there are just 37 architects in the city.

Architecture is a profession which requires a certain level of urban development and capital accumulation. The level of education of the people whom the profession serves also affects the nature of the service provided. For this reason, it will be useful to summarise some of the characteristics of the chosen provinces. (The data is taken from the State Planning Organisation's socio-economic development statues (SES) of provinces for 2003 (http://www.dpt.gov.tr).

Ankara: Located in Central Anatolia, the capital Ankara today comes second after İstanbul among Turkey's 81 provinces in the socio-economic development status (SES). The urbanisation ratio for the province is 88.34% and the total urban population is 3,540,522. In 2000, the city accounted for 8.33% of Turkey's GNP. As of 2003, the number of registered architectural offices was 1,455.

Antalya: Turkey's most important tourism centre Antalya, located on the Mediterranean coast, occupies tenth place in the socio-economic development status. The urbanisation ratio is 54.45% and the total urban population is 936,320. Antalya accounts for 2.5% of the GNP. The number of architectural offices is above 100, but only 2-3 offices are capable of getting big jobs according to an architect who lives in Antalya.

Bursa: Bursa, in the southern part of the Marmara region, is one of Turkey's fastest-growing and most industrialised cities. The urbanisation ratio of the province is 76.75% with an urban population of 1,630.940. Bursa is the province with the fourth highest share in Turkey's GNP, at 3.52% It ranks fifth in socio-economic development status. The number of architectural offices is 250.

İstanbul: Istanbul is Turkey's largest province by population and most important centre of industry. It is located in the northern part of the Marmara region. The urbanisation ratio of this province has reached 90.69% and the urban population 9,085,599, making it one of the largest cities in the world. The province accounts for 22.11% of GNP. There are close to 4,000 architectural offices – about half of the total number for the entire country.

Kastamonu: Kastamonu, in the Black Sea region, has been included in the research as an example of a smaller province. In the socio-economic development status, Kastamonu takes 51st place. The province accounts for 0.46% of GNP. The urbanisation ratio is 46.35% and the urban population 174,020. There are 37 registered architects and 7 active architectural offices.

Konya: Konya is a large central Anatolian province with a historic city at its centre. The urbanisation ratio of the province is 59.07% and the population of urban areas totals 1,294,817, the fourth highest figure for any province in Turkey. The province comes in 26th place in the socio-economic development status. There are more than 200 architectural offices in Konya.

Between them, these six provinces account for about 15 million out of Turkey's total urban population of 44 million. Spread over different regions, they display various levels of urbanisation and are associated with different sections of industry. Their past histories are all quite different. The approaches to these cities vary considerably in terms of geography and climate. They are variously situated by the sea, amid mountains and on plains. The surrounding vegetation may consist of pine forests or orange groves. Ironically, however, the urban environment of all these cities is remarkably similar. As one enters each of these cities, one sees the same unplastered apartment buildings, shanty-town cottages, aluminium-domed mosques and

industrial buildings, together with odd out-of-place postmodern sky-scrapers or office blocks.

The distinct architectural features of each city are confined to a limited central zone. Elsewhere, nature and the historical fabric have been torn up and replaced by a common fabric. The apartment blocks which surround the city centres differ only due to climatic factors – in some cases the windows are fitted with shutters, and roofs equipped with solar panels for water heating. Even the out-of-town housing estates – the products of a recent trend in Turkey – are all uniform to one another. In this instance, the importance of judgements made by architects is apparent.

A total of 31 in-depth interviews were conducted with architects in these six provinces. The interviews took place during working hours in the architects' offices, and examples of their existing or ongoing projects were observed. The architects interviewed in Ankara were mostly graduates of the Middle East Technical University and those interviewed in İstanbul were for the most part graduates of İstanbul Technical University. The architects interviewed in Kastamonu were mostly engaged in restoration work while those in Ankara were working on housing and public buildings. The architects interviewed in İstanbul were working on all kinds of building projects. The largest offices were in Ankara and Bursa, employing 30 and 25 people respectively. These offices were not merely architectural practices; they were at the same time construction companies, manufacturers of timber structures and traders in materials. However, the architects interviewed preferred to describe them as architectural offices. The oldest architect interviewed, in Ankara, was 59 while the youngest, in Konya, was 28. Two of the offices visited – one in Kastamonu and one in Antalya – were newly established. The personal details of the architects interviewed are given below.

Table 3.1. Architects interviewed by province

Province/City	Women	Men
Ankara	4	8
Antalya	2	-
Bursa	-	3
İstanbul	4	5
Kastamonu	1	2
Konya	-	2
TOTAL	11	20

The largest number of architects were interviewed in Ankara, followed by İstanbul with nine. Three architects were interviewed in each of Bursa and Kastamonu and two in each of Antalya and Konya.

Table 3.2. Architects interviewed by ownership of office

Ownership Status	Women	Men
Owner	2	9
Partner	9	11
TOTAL	11	20

Most of the architects interviewed had one partner. In the case of women, this partner was generally their husband.

Table 3.3. Architects interviewed by age

Age Groups	Women	Men
(1945-49) 56-60	-	1
(1950-54) 51-55	-	2
(1955-59) 46-50	3	8
(1960-64) 41-45	4	2
(1965-69) 36-40	3	2
(1970-74) 31-35	1	4
(1975-79) 26-30	-	1
TOTAL	11	20

Classified by age, the largest group of the architects interviewed – eleven in all - were 46-50 years old. They were followed by six architects in the 41-45 age-group.

Table 3.4. Architects interviewed by university education

Faculty of Architecture Graduated	Women	Men
Middle East Technical University - METU (Ankara)	3	5
İstanbul Technical University – İTÜ (İstanbul)	4	7
Black Sea Technical University - KTU (Trabzon)	3	-
Gazi University – GU (Ankara) *	-	2
Academy of Fine Arts ** (İstanbul)	1	1
Selçuk University – SU (Konya) ***	-	2
Yıldız Teknik University - YTU (İstanbul)	-	3
TOTAL	11	20

* including one from the Ankara State Engineering and Architecture Academy, later part of Gazi University

** now part of the Mimar Sinan University

*** including one from the Konya State Engineering and Architecture Academy, later part of Selçuk University

Eleven of the architects interviewed were graduates of İstanbul Technical University. Architects educated at this university were encountered not only in İstanbul but also in Ankara, Bursa and Antalya. The second largest group of architects interviewed were graduates of the Middle East Technical University. Six of these eight architects were working in Ankara, where the university is located, but one was interviewed in Antalya and another in İstanbul. Two of the graduates of the Black Sea Technical University interviewed were working in Ankara, and one in Kastamonu. Both of the graduates of Mimar Sinan University interviewed actually graduated from the Academy of Fine Arts before it became part of the new Mimar Sinan University. Likewise, each of the graduates of the Gazi and Selçuk Universities interviewed

actually graduated from the engineering and architecture academies which later constituted founding elements of the said universities.

Table 3.5. Architects interviewed by experience (number of years working as a self-employed architect)

Number of years in Practice	Women	Men
1-5	4	3
6-10	-	3
11-15	2	2
16-20	3	7
21-25	2	2
26-30	-	2
31-35	-	1
TOTAL	11	20

The largest group of the architects interviewed had been working as self-employed architects for between 16 and 20 years. However the sample also included two architects who had been working independently for just one year and there was one architect whose office had a 34-year history.

Table 3.6. Architects interviewed by size of office (number of persons)

Number of persons in office	Women	Men
1	-	2
2	4	4
3	3	6
4	2	3
5	1	4
25-30	1	1
TOTAL	11	20

More than half of the self-employed architects interviewed were working in offices where 2-3 people were employed. There were two offices where only one person worked. There were only two offices with more than five workers. One was a workplace for 25 people which was

engaged in manufacturing wooden structures as well as architectural work. The other was a construction company of 30 people which also included mechanical engineers among its partners. In both cases, the architects interviewed said that they were the owners of the architectural side of the business. All architects add that the numbers can vary depends on the work load.

Table 3.7. Architects interviewed by functions undertaken in the building industry

Function in the Building Ind.	Women	Men
Design work only	1	4
Design and supervision	3	6
Design, supervision and	7	10
TOTAL	11	20

Most of the architects interviewed said that their offices were involved in project control (supervision) and contracting as well as in designing projects. There were even architects who described themselves as developers (yap-satçı - literally “builder-seller”). Only a few architects stated that their offices were involved in design work only.

Table 3.8. Architects interviewed by specialisation

Type of Building Activity	Women	Men
Housing	4	4
Hotels, holiday villages	1	-
Offices, industrial buildings	1	2
Hospitals	1	1
Restoration	3	4
Public buildings	-	1
Shopping centres	-	1
No specialisation	1	7
TOTAL	11	20

The most common specialisation of the architects interviewed was housing, followed by restoration work. However, architects who gave housing as their speciality said that they also worked on projects such as offices and holiday villages, Moreover, a number of architects said they did not have any particular specialisation. Other areas of activity included office buildings, military buildings, hotels, marinas and horse-breeding farms.

3.2. How the sample was chosen

As mentioned earlier this study is an exploratory-descriptive and predominantly qualitative piece of research. For this reason, in-depth interviews were preferred as the main technique of data collection. The main issue was the representativeness of the sample. It seems difficult to assert that 31 architects are sufficient to represent the thousands of architects in the universe. However, recent approaches in methodology in the social sciences offer solutions for studies of this kind.

One of the sampling strategies in non-probability sampling techniques is *judgement sampling.*

> Sometimes called *purposive sampling*, this sort of sampling requires the researcher to use his or her best judgement to select a sample. Judgement sampling makes sense when the researcher has a great deal of knowledge about the population of interest. It is also useful when the point of the research is to obtain information not about the 'average' member of a population but (for example) about the *atypical* member (McIntyre, L.J., 2005: 105).

Given that the researcher is an architect it may be supposed to have "a great deal of knowledge about the population of interest" and accordingly in a position to make judgements in selecting a sample. In practice, the responses of the architects interviewed became increasingly repetitive after the first 20 interviews conducted, giving a sufficiently clear indication of the significant information for adequately

describing their *ethos*. The ensuing eleven interviews were consciously conducted with a view to understanding the peculiarities of architects displaying different research variables. In particular, a conscious attempt was made to increase the number of woman architects interviewed. Eleven interviews with woman architects (making up nearly one third of the sample) was considered sufficient in this respect, in view of the fact that the percentage of women in the entire universe of practising architects is approximately 33%.

The research began with a draft questionnaire. The questions were put to a well-known architect, who answered them openly and at the end of the interview made a number of comments. The insights of this architect proved very useful in determining the course of the study. After a survey of literature, it was decided to interview only those architects who are actively practising the profession but not taking part in theoretical debates in architecture publications. This might make it possible to establish the unity or disparity of theory and practice. Before giving the questionnaire its final form, a pilot study was conducted with one male and one female architect.

The research proper began in Ankara among architects known closely by the researcher in 2004. The snowball method then came into play, as architects suggested colleagues of their own for interviewing, in some cases even making the appointments themselves for the researcher. The choice of city was linked to the availability of key informants instrumental in obtaining appointments. The key informants in İstanbul, Bursa, Konya and Kastamonu were not architects. All the appointments in İstanbul were arranged by an architect friend of the informant. The other informants made use of their personal contacts. Arranging interviews in these cities was therefore relatively easy. The architects were also extremely accommodating in making time for the interviews, which were largely conducted within 1-2 days in each city. Arranging interviews in Ankara was more difficult because since the

researcher lives in Ankara the architects were able to re-arrange the appointments in line with their changing workloads and other commitments.

Obtaining appointments was the difficult part of the research. This difficulty was closely related to the time-consuming nature of the interviews. The shortest lasted for nearly one hour, and the majority of architects talked for longer. Excluding questions about personal information, the architects answered 73 open-ended questions – the figure being 78 in the case of woman architects. All the interviews were conducted by the researcher and were tape-recorded with the permission of the respondents.

The questions were drawn up within the framework of the topics referred to in the survey of literature and in consideration of the debates taking place in the Chamber of Architects publication, *Mimarlık* (Architecture) and in *Bülten* (Bulletin) of the Chamber's Ankara branch. Some of the hypotheses in Ali Artun's 1978 research was also borrowed for providing continuity between the past and recent works. The questions and views expressed in the Second Turkish Architecture Symposium of 1993 on "Identity, Legitimacy and Ethics" and in the 1997 symposium on "Architecture, Meaning and Taste" organised by the Turkish Independent Architects Association were also formulated into questions in the questionnaire. These two symposia were important not just for the submissions made but also for their discussion sections in which a large number of architects expressed their views whereby the architectural community had the opportunity to set out its own problems for itself. It would be an important step towards understanding the *ethos* of Turkey's architects to determine how far the architects interviewed shared or did not share the perceptions of the architects who participated in those debates.

The questions asked were divided into five thematic sections under the headings of architectural education, architecture as a discipline,

space, architectural practice and architects' identity. This division made it possible to ask topically-related questions in conjunction with one another; each section of the interview contained questions related to each of the seven conjectures of the thesis. First, basic personal information was obtained, then twelve questions were asked about the architectural education each respondent received. These questions were intended to bring out the influence of the institutions at which the architects were moulded into their *ethos*. Thirdly, thirteen questions were posed concerning architecture as a discipline, having a view to determining whether the architects regarded architecture as an independent discipline or not and whether or not they have an architectural professional ideology. Fourthly, thirteen questions were posed about space, in a bid to draw out differences in the ways in which the architects perceived space. This was followed by twenty-one questions concerning professional practice. These questions were directed towards what type of problems the architects encounter and their means of solving them in practice. In this section five extra questions were posed to the woman architects to probe into the effects of gender on professional practice. Finally, fourteen questions were asked regarding professional identity, the aim being to determine how architects defined themselves and how they viewed the architects of the early Republican period (See Appendix I).

The problem of the study is, then, to determine to what extent the collective *habitus* of the architects is responsible in shaping their *ethos* in professional practice in Turkey. Considering that the *habitus* is a "condition of existence" and stems not only from conscious, deliberate and rational practice but also from a socially-constituted "feel for the game" (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 126), the factors that were assumed to influence the *habitus* of architects in Turkey were their gender, their age, the city where they live and work, the school they

graduated from, their organisations, their professional ideology and international influence.

The following seven thematic conjectures have from the outset informed both the formulation of these factors and the subsequent field research. They can be thought of as assumptions, but they do not constitute hypotheses since the study is intended to be essentially of an explorative-descriptive nature.

Conjecture 1: International influences shape architects' *habitus* through the implication that their practice and architecture in Turkey differ from that of the rest of the world. Apart from certain cultural and economic differences, the development and current state of the architectural profession in Turkey is not significantly different from the development of the architectural profession elsewhere in the world. It is on account of the existing conditions of practical implementation in Turkey that it is thought to be different.

Conjecture 2: If we may talk of a spontaneous professional ideology of architects, such ideology forces them to think in a specific way about space, the sovereignty of architecture, its art component, its legitimacy, the architects' devotion to their profession, the superiority of architects over clients and users as well as their codes of conduct i.e. *ethics*. This ideology is formed with the aid of education, existing organisations and current international influences and it increases the architects' 'symbolic capital' in the *field*.

Conjecture 3: Architectural education plays an important role in the formation of this professional ideology (*SPI*). Graduation from different educational institutions does not result in differences in professional ideology but in differences in the degrees and types of knowledge and know-how used in the implementation of professional practice. Education provides the 'cultural capital' of the architects in the *field*.

Conjecture 4: The organisations of architects play an important role in fortifying the professional ideology, operating both spontaneously and consciously, and spreading of international influences. Organisation also increases to the 'symbolic capital' of the architects.

Conjecture 5: Architects' social and economic relations are differentiated according to the region and city in which they carry out their professional practice.

Conjecture 6: The criteria which architects employ in their professional practice alter with age. This fact causes differentiation in the accumulation of 'economic', 'cultural' and 'symbolic' capitals in the *field*.

Conjecture 7: In the architectural profession gender leads to differences in design and practice when seen particularly from the point of view of woman architects.

The corroboration or non-corroboration of these conjectures will hopefully reveal the professional part of the *habitus* of the architects, and the common characteristics which emerge in the process will help to provide a panorama of the architectural *ethos* in professional practice in Turkey.

Accordingly, the replies given to each question by the architects interviewed need to be evaluated as a whole, and the comments hiding between the lines of what they have to say must also be assessed as a 'symptomatic reading', for the *habitus* also has its unconscious dimensions. To this end, the following chapter will set out in an extensive manner the answers given to all of the questions.

CHAPTER 4

THE VIEWS OF THE ARCHITECTS INTERVIEWED

> The artist is only a vehicle for what always has been. Nothing can really be given presence unless it already exists potentially.
> Louis Kahn - Architect (in Cook & Clotz, 1973:180)

The 31 architects who were interviewed for the present thesis answered 73 open-ended questions during the in-depth structured interviews. Among them 11 women architects replied to five more questions about the relationship between gender and their profession. Some of the architects thought a lot before providing their responses. Others complained about the difficulty of at least some of the questions. In some cases they did not want to reply to certain questions such as “what is architecture?” or “what kind of person is an architect?” Some even gave answers to several questions within a single answer, without those questions being asked. Some talked a lot about each question while others were satisfied with single-sentence answers. All were initially cautious and tense to begin with but became more relaxed and talkative as interviews proceeded. One (R30) even likened the interview to a kind of psychological therapy, since he was always questioning himself about the meaning of architecture and about the responsibility of architects. Actually this comment was true of most of the respondents. As one of the interviewee (R22W) put it, one lives in a certain condition, never stopping to think what one is doing or what the meaning of that condition was. Thus it can be said that while answering the questions posed they were thinking of their own situations. Some

architects asked to be given in written form the interviews, not in order to check them but for their own benefit.

All of the architects continued the discussion after the interview was finished. They made very valuable comments about the research. All said that the study was a hard task but very necessary for the profession. All were frank, sincere and helpful. Without them, this research could not have been done.

As mentioned earlier, the questionnaire was divided into five parts excluding personal information. The first was about architectural education, the second about architecture as a discipline, the third about space, the fourth about architectural practice and the last about the architect's identity. This chapter follows the same sequence, starting with architectural education.

4.1 Architectural Education

In this part of the interview, the architects answered 12 questions. Education is naturally the first essential step for any modern profession. The reasons for choosing an architectural education might depend on very personal factors ranging from the person's own free will to pure coincidence. In Turkey, university education is determined by the points which one scores in the university entrance examination in which a relatively high mathematics score is needed in order to take a course in architecture. But there must also be other reasons such as parents' profession, if any, which lead young people to choose this specific education. Questions about education were placed first in order to understand the factors which affected the choice not just of a certain education but rather of the very profession.

Two of the architects interviewed (R1, R21) were graduates of the *Sanat Enstitüsü,* an art vocational school which does not exist today. They wanted to be artists, and their higher education did not leave them with any options other than an artistic profession. According to

them, architecture was very close to meeting their wishes and needs. The relationship between art and architecture was mentioned by other architects as well. Their ability to draw or paint led them to choose architecture. The response of one architect (R27) was particularly striking. His great grandfather was an architect in Yugoslavia, and when he was a child his grandmother had always told him that his hands were the hands of an architect. This points to a common belief that artistic persons also have different physiological characteristics such as long thin fingers. At the same time, it again shows that the artistic element of architecture is an important factor determining its choice as a profession.

Moreover, this is not the only factor. For two architects (R19 and R26), it was the technical element of architecture which was important. They wanted to study social sciences, literature or politics but their parents wanted them to acquire a technical education. They regarded the study of architecture as a technical education which was at the same time very close to the social sciences, and this view affected their preferences.

Although the varied elements of architecture made it a good choice for the combination of different desires, this was still not the main reason for choosing an architectural education. The people around the architects when they were young also had an influence on their choices. The father of one architect (R30) was an architect himself, and the father of another (R26) was a civil engineer. These parents directed their children towards architecture. The presence of an architect in the family or among close relatives had an interesting effect on the architects' choice of this profession. Some other architects mentioned the influence of an architect - perhaps only a neighbour – but spoke in terms of a coincidence or an unconscious choice.

The fictional or virtual image of architects also affected the young candidates. Two architects (R13, R28W) referred to the influence of

television, and to the film *Fountainhead*, based on Ayn Rand's novel of the same name.

To sum up: 18 architects out of 31 stated that they wanted an architectural education themselves, meaning that their choice was a conscious one. Four of these took a special aptitude test (the entrance system used for higher education up until 1974 at which a single general examination was introduced for all disciplines). For some, family background or the existence of an architect in the close circle had a great impact on their choice. The remainder of the architects interviewed admitted that they found themselves studying architecture as a result of the university entrance system. The explanation given by one woman architect (R8W) is particularly revealing about the combination of will and coincidence: she chose architecture because "[i]t was the best choice for a woman who got high mathematics points in the university entrance exam".

Asked whether there was an architect whom they thought of as a role model, majority replied in the negative. Some mentioned Mimar Sinan, the greatest Turkish architect in history, others Vedat Dalokay, Ankara's architect-mayor of the 1970s. They also said that they came to be influenced by the architects in whose offices they worked while they were students during their practical education or after their graduation. Interestingly, none of them referred in this context to the architects who influenced their choice of education.

During the course of their education, most of the architects had begun to form an image of the architect. Even though most of them could not define this image in exact words, it was possible to understand what it consisted of by asking them if they thought that they had today become the architects which they had imagined at that time. For most of them, an architect was a person who designed and built a building and handed over the keys to the users. Such architect's main concerns were artistic and aesthetic. Few of the architects thought that

they had become the architect which they had initially imagined. Only one architect (R7) said that he was hundred percent that same person he initially envisaged for himself. Two (R13, R 19) said that they were happy with the position which they had reached given the conditions of the profession and the country. The majority voiced various complaints, particularly about working with contractors and for money. In other words, as one architect (R18W) put it, "[l]oss of idealism is the main problem for many architects".

According to some of the respondents, their teachers in architectural schools helped to create their images of the architect. By nature, architectural education requires a close relationship between students and teachers; so a question was asked about the influence of their teachers. Architects were asked to name the teachers who influenced them most. The most influential teachers were generally the first-year design studio teachers. There was general agreement that these teachers have the greatest influence, although some architects said they were influenced by their teachers of architectural history. However, when asked why they were particularly influenced by that certain teacher, the architects generally answered in terms of the personal qualities of the teachers concerned. These personal characteristics varied widely. Some teachers were commended for being authoritative; others for being humane or simply a good person. Other important personal qualities cited included being powerful, cultured, trustable, decisive, consistent, rational, knowledgeable, many-faceted and a good communicator. Two of the architects were impressed by the philosophical attitudes of their teachers. Only four of the architects mentioned their teachers' approaches to architecture. The explanation of one of the respondents (R15W) summarises well what the architects expect of a teacher: "…ability to give abstract information, attention to detail, providing information on everything from the use of drawing paper to presentation, treating the discipline of

architecture in all its aspects and opening up your horizons on a whole series of topics." It is interesting to note that in response to this question, two architects said that they had been influenced by civil engineering teachers. These answers showed that the teachers' pedagogical stances were more influential than their approaches to architecture.

All of the architects except for two found their education inadequate in practice. The two exceptions (R4 and R5) said although the knowledge they acquired was adequate, the duration of the education should have been five years instead of four. The same suggestion was made by many other architects as well. According to one architect (R19), "[t]here can be no question of an adequate education. After all, architecture is a profession in which knowledge is tested and develops as you create buildings and projects on top of your education; it is a process."

Asked what the most inadequate part of their education was, the architects referred mainly to the practical dimension of the education. They also complained that they were ignorant of the construction market as well as about planning legislation and regulations. These were common complaints. However, the responses also showed variations depending on the schools from which the architects graduated. METU graduates complained about an inadequate knowledge of details, while ITU graduates regretted the absence of an artistic dimension, SU graduates a lack of freedom in design, GSA graduates the inadequacy of technical dimensions and GU graduates about a dearth of theory. With respect to the strong points of the schools from which they graduated, ITU graduates spoke of the technical and engineering dimension, GSA graduates of the artistic aspect, METU graduates of the theoretical and abstract approaches and GU graduates of the knowledge of details. In fact, with the exception of METU graduates, graduates of all schools mentioned

knowledge of details as a benefit of their education and some stated that they continued to use this knowledge. ITU, YTU, GU and KTU graduates believed they had an advantage with respect to the implementation of school projects in actual sites. There was an obvious satisfaction with all schools except for SU, but METU and ITU graduates added that the reputations of their schools conferred extra benefits. According to one ITU graduate (R5), "ITU is an *école*. It trains people who are candidates for running the state."

The most important differences between the schools therefore lay in their approaches to architectural education. Many architects admitted that they did not know much about the other schools. But for several of them who were not graduates of METU, this school served as a point of comparison. One respondent (R13) recalled visiting METU in Ankara as a student and being amazed at the extent of discussion between students and teachers - something he had not witnessed in his own school. Another respondent (R21) said when he saw the buildings and facilities at METU, it occurred to him that those like himself would have done much better if they had had the same advantages. Graduates of METU also regarded METU's campus, its Faculty of Architecture building and its library as distinctive and providing important advantages of their education. Education in English was another important factor for METU graduates. However, one of them (R3) commented that "[w]hen you are at METU, you start to believe in a concept such as architectural theory. But in fact the less you believe in this theory the more successful you are in the marketplace." Another interesting point is that METU and ITU appear as rivals. Some ITU graduates mentioned METU and some METU graduates spoke of ITU in the sense that the two did not share the same concerns in practice.

Finally, for an alternative viewpoint, it is worth giving the views of an ADMMA (now GU) graduate (R31). During his time at the school, he

argued, it was a place where the children of low and middle-income groups studied: “[i]t was, in a way, a natural reflection of the country as a whole. It was this which made it different from schools providing education in a foreign language, It followed its own examples. Because it accepted the conditions of the country and made its assessments accordingly, it was successful in the marketplace.”

The architects were unable to agree on the question of whether architectural education regarded special talents. Twelve of them disagreed, believing that a special interest and hard work were sufficient to become an architect. “I believe that ninety percent what is called of talent is hard work,” said one respondent (R24W), “in the end it is about abstract design – about the production of an image, so you can get there by developing yourself.” Curiously, this speaker was herself selected for deserving an architectural education in a special aptitude test – a system which was later abandoned. Another architect (R20) argued that: “[i]f you put ‘architecture’ in inverted commas – that is, if you are aiming to come up with a product capable of competing at the world level – of your own making – then, yes, I think a special talent is required.” Among the nineteen architects who felt that architectural education called for a special talent, there varying views were on the nature of the talent in question. Only two (R17, R2) referred to a talent for art, freehand drawing or perspective drawing. For the others, the special abilities required for an architectural education were defined in terms of analytical thinking, psychological and sociological comprehension, space perceptions, creativity, possession of a point of view, and sensitivity to details. In short, what was needed to become an architect was not simply artistic talent but something which went further than that. Nevertheless, all the architects agreed that hard work was essential even for the most talented if one also wanted to be the best.

The architects strongly agreed that the increase in the number of architectural schools decreased the quality of the profession. However, most were not against the number of schools as such but against the increase in the number of schools lacking qualified educators and proper infrastructure. In schools of this kind, they reported, anybody could become a teacher, and this inevitably affected the quality of the graduates. These less qualified architects degraded the profession. For this reason, some architects suggested that not everybody should become a designer-architect, but that some could become technical staff (R13, R19, R31). Three architects took the view that architectural schools should be set up only in large metropolitan centres and not in small cities. One of these was even went further: “I think that there should be no architectural schools in Turkey outside İstanbul,” declared this graduate of an Ankara school (R31).

Questions posed concerning architectural education provided an opportunity to compare the ideas of architects graduating from different faculties of architecture about their schools and their early expectations as well as later assessments of architectural education in general. Here it became clear that education shapes the architects’ habitus from the very beginning by implying what an architect should be. Although for some the choice of the profession was based on mere coincidence, those who had made a conscious choice said that their choice was influenced by an architect either in their family or in their immediate circle of acquaintances. This suggests that the general image of architects in society can influence young people to choose the profession. The responses of the architects interviewed showed that different architectural schools have different approaches, which in turn create different types of knowledge and know-how used in the implementation phase of professional practice. On this basis, it can be said that different schools create different architectural traditions in

Turkey, as was seen in the case of the rivalry between Istanbul-based ITU and Ankara-based METU.

Although the architects interviewed explained very precisely the differences between the schools from which they graduated, they agreed on the point that architectural education in Turkey is inadequate, especially in its practical aspects. This did not prevent them from acquiring a professional ideology. The responses of the architects also showed that the aspect of their professional ideology which is related to the art component of architecture is shaped with the help of education. It is this professional ideology which convinces them whether an architect needs a special talent or not. It can be said that those who believe that architectural education requires a special talent are more ready than their colleagues to accept the domination of the art component of architecture – an ideological preference, as discussed in Chaper 2. Moreover, the majority of architects believe that the quality of the profession is negatively affected by the high numbers of faculties of architecture in the country. It can be understood that they are opposed to mass education in architecture, which would make the profession less privileged in society. This attitude may also be a result of their professional ideology. If education is cultural capital, then the number of people who accumulate it affects the positions of everybody within the field, and also affects the legitimacy of the profession, which is another aspect of professional ideology. For all these reasons, education is very influential on the habitus of the architects interviewed.

However, education does not only provide a basic training. It also shapes the general theoretical basis of the profession. It guides students in line with the basic assumptions of the discipline. For this reason, the next step was to determine what ideas the architects held about their discipline.

4.2 Architecture as a Discipline

In this part of the interview, the architects answered 13 questions. The first question inevitably was the definition of architecture. Curiously, the architects found this question a difficult one. Some of them didn't want to give a definition at all. And even more interestingly, every architect gave a different definition, meaning that all the 31 architects produced 31 different definitions. Of course, these definitions had common denominators such as space, life, necessities and creation, but the ways in which these key words were put together were strikingly different. For one architect (R10), architecture was fun, while another (R3) compared it to chocolate, eaten for pleasure but not as a basic food. An architect who was engaged in restoration work (R2) compared architecture to the medical profession. For some, architecture was the creation of the physical environment and for others the creation of appropriate living conditions. To one architect (R13), architecture was a necessity while for another (R23) it was the art of making the world and the environment beautiful for other people. While one respondent (R30) said architecture was about time, space and a way of living, another respondent (R31) spoke of generating projects and designs. Yet another architect (R14) defined architecture as an art of space for increasing the quality of life. Other definitions proposed included the following: a profession which creates the life choices for human beings (R19); the science which combines human necessities with the fine arts (R27), and one of the three most important professions for social life together with medicine and law (R1). In another architect's definition (R6W), architecture influences societies by altering the quality of spaces which in turn is essential to raise the consciousness of human beings.

In defining the product of architecture, the architects were more precise. For most of them, the product of architecture was either a building or the space constituted by a building. Only a minority felt the

need to expand this definition to the built environment and to such details as furniture, lighting etc... For three (R20, R21, R25), the product of architecture was the project. When asked about the meaning and value of a building, the architects were even clearer. This was definitely that life in the building should be healthy, happy and comfortable. In other words, the value of a building lay in its function. Many architects referred also to the technical and aesthetic quality of life in the building and to the harmony of the building with its environment. Feelings about the building were also an important feature. One respondent (R27) formulated this approach as “the happiness of the users inhabiting the building”.

If the definition of architecture varies so much from architect to architect, does this mean that architecture depends on the world view of the individual architect? Architects were divided over this point. Half of them (16 respondents) believed that there was no architectural approach which was independent of the world view of the architect concerned. The other half (15 architects) believed that an architectural approach independent of a world view was possible, pointing out that there were clients whose demands differed from the wishes of the architect, and that at that very point some compromises had to be made if the architect wanted to get the job. On the other hand, even those who rejected the idea of an independent architectural approach admitted that there were architects who made such compromises frequently, while supporters of the idea of an independent architectural approach also agreed that architects should try to convince clients to accept better and more satisfactory solutions. Only two architects (R3 and R8W) were very clearly opposed to the idea of an architectural approach dependent on the architect’s world view. For one of these architects, architectural approaches ought to be independent; otherwise it would be totalitarian.

At this point, an interesting consensus emerged. Except for the last two architects (R3, R8W) and three others (R14, R19, R20), all the architects denied that there was a professional ideology independent of political choices. Moreover, with the exception of three different architects (R6W, R26, R23), all the architects denied that they had a purely architectural responsibility as distinct from social responsibility. For the three architects mentioned, their designs and projects were personal and their practice was and had to be independent. For the rest, architecture was also a social phenomenon and should be responsible and accountable to the society. One architect (R28W) tried to find a middle way between these two poles. According to her, social responsibility depended on the type of project: a house was one thing, a hospital was another.

Social responsibility is directly related to codes of conduct – i.e., professional *ethics*. However, all architects without exception agreed that there were no overall architectural *ethics* in Turkey. In such situation, they related their own conduct of the profession to personal *ethics.*

Another issue on which the majority of architects agreed was that architecture as a discipline lacked autonomy. Although all said that architecture was not an autonomous discipline, some believed that it could be independent in other circumstances – for example, if the "conjuncture", "social order" or "economy" were different. Two architects (R5, R13) clearly stated that architecture at least enjoyed an autonomous field in its design process. One architect who was strongly opposed to the idea of the autonomy of architecture (R19) argued that architecture was the coordinator of many disciplines. An architect worked as a conductor, harmonising among many different professions in order to create a useful product. Another respondent (R20) pointed out that the product is different from the production of fine arts because it is not created according to individual preferences; instead, its

production depends on supply and demand. Without demand, argued another architect (R30), an architect could not produce and just had to wait for a buyer. Given these specific conditions, one respondent (R14) concluded, architecture always depends on something else – the state or an individual client.

All these comments refer to the current situation of architecture in Turkey. What kind of changes were taking place in Turkish architecture today? According to the architects, the most important factor was economic. They believed that the economy could affect architecture either in negative ways or in positive ways. In a negative sense, the economy was responsible for migration to the cities, the creation of a rent economy, squatter settlements and the destruction of the historical fabric of cities. But for architects who viewed the influence of the economy in a positive way, it created capital and the desire to spend it in a conspicuous way, architecture being a good way of doing so. Globalisation and increasing communications opened the eyes of architects and clients to the good examples in the world. According to one architect (R16W), money made it possible to use good building materials, changing architecture for the better.

For certain other respondents, the political instability of the country also had an important impact on architecture. Governments seeing squatters as a ready source of votes were responsible for the built environments in Turkish cities today. At this point, many architects gave a definite date as a turning point: 1980, the date of the military coup which changed Turkish society in many ways. One of these changes was the introduction of a full-scale liberal economy. Some architects saw this as positive and others as negative, but all agreed that it was the main influence on Turkey and Turkish architecture today.

One architect (R14) went further to divide Turkish architecture into three distinct periods: the Republican period, the period between 1960 and 1990 and the period since the 1990s. This architect regarded the

second period as an era of stagnation for Turkish architecture. According to him, the first and last periods were innovative. Yet, he regarded the innovative architecture of today to be different from the innovation of the Republican era. It was not as progressive as the earlier Republican architecture, but depended mostly for its innovative ideas on the new type of clientele. Another architect (R7) made a similar point when he remarked that "[a]rchitecture did not change because it added on a series of values; rather, it developed entirely as a vehicle for the self-aggrandisement of the groups of investors."

Country-specific conditions create a country-specific architecture. But does this mean that in general country-specific architecture does not have similarities with world architecture? In other words, how different is Turkish architecture from world architecture? This question made clear that the architects' knowledge of world architecture was quite limited. Some of them admitted this frankly. Others who saw world architecture as different from architecture in Turkey turned out to assume that problems of Turkish architecture such as lack of quality, low use of technology, failure to establish standards, failure to conform to rules, lack of inspection, interference of political authority in architecture, people's conservatism, indecisive trends, economic instability, the limited influence of the architect, imitation and lack of creativity which were not encountered elsewhere in the world. It is worth noting that like most people in Turkey, when the "world" was mentioned, architects understood only "the West". Only two architects (R11, R14) stated that world architecture too displays variations.

Aside from this point, some architects stated that Turkey's cultural distinctiveness made the creation of a distinct architecture inevitable. There were also those who argued that architects in Turkey were the same as elsewhere, and that it was the practice of carrying out architecture which was different, adding that there were architects in Turkey quite capable of competing with the West. This shows that while

architects in Turkey do not see themselves being different from other architects from the point of view of their profession, they accept that architecture is affected by the general state of the country.

In the words of one respondent (R14), “[t]here is no bad architecture in those countries of the world which are in the process of developing their own cultures. Turkey is a Third-world country. We are capable of some individual successes, but there is no building culture. The client, the architect and the user are all a long way from that point.”

If the situation of architecture depends so closely on the situation of the country, then it is obvious that positive changes in the state of the country can change architecture in a positive way. But is it possible to reverse the direction? In other words, can positive changes in architecture create positive changes in society as well? Nine architects were of the opinion that architecture could not change anything in society, while 15 architects believed that good architecture could make a difference. One architect (R31) even believed that architecture could prevent corruption in societies. For the remaining seven architects, the answer depended on certain conditions such as how well architects were organised, and the changes in the attitudes of clients or a radical architectural approach. Although good architecture could not change the whole system, it would have positive effects on society because, as one respondent (R20) explained, a good physical environment and appropriately created spaces affect the socialisation process, thinking of human beings in a positive manner.

In fact - far from the possibility of good architecture is power in changing society - there is widespread acceptance among theoreticians of architecture all around the world of the existence of a crisis in architecture. What do Turkish architects think about this? To begin with, the architects understood the word “crisis” mainly as an economic phenomenon. Interestingly, nine of them did not believe that there was a crisis, because – they said – their businesses were going

well. This was a clear indication that they interpreted the question of a crisis in economic terms. One respondent (R1), for example, said that this was the first time he had heard talk of a crisis in architecture; it was in fact the construction sector which faced crisis.

For other architects there were differences between the crises of architecture in Turkey and in other countries. In describing the crisis in Turkey, in addition to economic factors, they referred to cultural differences, the decay of architectural values, a lack of demand for architecture from society, the demotion of the architect to the level of a clerk routinely signing papers, the contraction of the field of influence of the architectural profession, a lack of organisation, the poor quality of education, the large number of architects, a crisis of identity, the deficiencies of design capacity and the problem of imitation. Among the reasons for the crisis in the wider world, by contrast, they named, the economy, the globalisation of relations of production and the consumer society. One architect (R8W) summed up the situation as follows: “[h]ere there is plenty of work but the quality is low; in the world there is a shortage of available architectural work.

There were also certain architects who asserted that architecture had reached its saturation point in the world, and that this had turned into a crisis of creativity. In speaking of world architecture, many architects once again referred essentially to Western architecture, and in some cases admitted to having relatively little knowledge in this area. The assumptions of these architects were perhaps best summed up by one of the respondents (R19) when he said that “[d]eveloped societies have done everything. There is nothing left for architects to do. The population is not increasing, and cities are not being allowed to expand any more. There is no need to create anything new. But undeveloped societies face a lack of resources. Needs are not transformed into demand. So there is a logjam. Turkey is at the border between these two extremes. We are on the verge of the places that will change if and

when the ongoing transformations of the world order emerge more clearly."

The responses given in this section of the interview showed that each architect had his or her own definition of architecture. However, this does not mean that they each had different ways of thinking as architects. In fact, they shared many ideas about the discipline of architecture. These ideas were shaped by their education. The architects interviewed did not believe in the autonomy of architecture. Moreover, they did not conceive of an architectural responsibility distinct from their social responsibility. Half of them nevertheless said that an approach to architecture separate from the worldview of the architect might be possible. This belief might be a product of their professional ideology, the existence of which all the architects denied when asked directly. As Conjecture 2 suggests, the sovereignty of architecture is one of the aspects of the professional ideology. The existence of a latent acceptance of the sovereignty of architecture was also revealed in the architects' belief that good architecture can change things in society.

The answers given in this section of the interview also showed that international influence affects the *habitus* of the architects, prompting them to think that architecture in Turkey and their own practice are different from the rest of the world. Most of the architects interviewed believed that the development of architecture and the reasons for the crises that architecture is said to be undergoing at present were mostly due to the fact that Turkey's economic situation is different from the West. They explained the differences between Turkey and the West mostly in terms of the lack of something which they supposed to exist in the West. For his reason it can be said that the *habitus* of the architects interviewed is strongly affected by Western influence.

The professional practice of architects is shaped by the discipline of architecture and the way in which they comprehend it. The product

of this professional practice is, as they themselves stated, space. If space is the product, and if most architects believe that architecture has the power to change society, then it becomes important to see how they understand space as 'builders' of space. For this reason, the third part of the interviews with the architects was made up of questions concerning space.

4.3 Space

"Space is the definition of the void." (R9W). "Dimensions, colours and time create indefinite space, and our spaces are only pieces which we steal from indefinite space." (R11). "Space is the pieces which an architect separates from the void for any purpose." (R14). "Space is a border." (R5). "Space is volume." (R10), "Space is the place where one lives and defines his or her necessities (R7). "It is the framework of life" (R28W), "a style" (R3) and "a living place" (R18W). "A place which provides for, directs and facilitates life" (R17).

Such are the definitions of space given by the architects interviewed in response to the first of the thirteen questions making up the third part of the interview. Life, necessities and humans formed one component of the definitions, while voids, volumes and borders formed the other. Although the architects' definitions varied considerably, all the respondents quite agreed on the real value of space: its feasibility, its comfortableness, its ability to meet necessities and its functions. "[i]t is the life in the space which gives it its value," commented one architect (R15W). The relationship of any space with its environment, its geometrical form, its light, its smell, its volume and the material used were also named by the architects as qualities which conferred value on space.

The third question asked about space concerned the architects' criteria for shaping a space. The answers were consistent with the statements already made about the value of spaces. However, the

human factor figured more strongly at this point. The main criteria for most of the architects were the users, their demands and their needs and the functions of the particular space to be created. Many architects also found it necessary to mention the aesthetic dimension of a space in addition to its function. For one architect (R13), “harmony and content” were important; for another (R14) “the microclimate in a space”. According to some, the physical environment and relationships with other buildings also had to be taken into consideration. It was interesting to note how many architects used the concepts of space and building interchangeably: in an automatic reflex, they mentally started the design process while giving their criteria.

The architects were then asked how they started to design. Did their first step consist, for instance, of conceiving an image of a building or of specifying its functions, or with a certain plan and volumes? Nine architects said that they started by solving the functions of the building in question and five with the demands of the users. The starting points of the others ranged from the image of the building to its physical environment, the characteristics of the site and climatic conditions. One architect (R4) started with the wet spaces and staircases, which are jointly known as the nucleus of a building in architectural terminology. But all of them mentioned choices concerning functions. One architect (R21) explained that “[i]f the functions of a building are well solved, then even when the building is redecorated in 20-30 years’ time, you have nothing to be ashamed of.” The functions of a building first and foremost means the purpose of the building – a house, a public building, a hospital etc... Secondly, it also means different usages in the same building. So when they start with the functions of a building, architects are actually planning the life in that building. For this reason, it can be said that mentally architects start to live in their designs.

Is this the case? Out of 31 architects, 28 confirmed this using the word “definitely”. The other three architects had some reservations.

One (R3) said that it should not be a design criterion but inevitably it was done in design process. The second (R14) argued that one could design buildings which one would most likely never live in, and the third (R29W) explained that if she knew the people who were going to live in the building she did not live there mentally at the design stage, but that if the users were unknown then she did.

The way they imagined life in the spaces of their creation was important for the architects. As experts in space, they naturally had the ability to detail a space, but as human beings what did they feel when they first entered a space which was already designed by others? Every architect was able to define his or her feelings about a space at first glance. The first impression of any space was affected by airiness, quiet, light, volumes, the life in the space, its use and the materials employed. Some architects frankly admitted that they looked in a critical manner and usually succeeded in finding something negative.

If architects could be critical while they were in a given space, was then the space which they imagined while designing a building exactly the same as the space which came into being when the building was completed? Moreover, if the users used that space in a different way from the way the architect had imagined, how did that affect the architects? These two questions were critical for understanding the architects' perceptions of space in relation to the building process and to users.

Only seven of the architects interviewed claimed that the space which they designed largely coincided with the space that was created. For the other 24, it was not always possible. The comment by one of them (R31) was particularly striking: "[t]his is the difference between people and God. It is very difficult for an architect to say of a space that '[i]t turned out exactly as I designed it'." While this state of affairs is a source of disappointment for the architect, it is worth noting that architects attributed little of the responsibility to external factors such as

the demands of clients, the choices of the users or economic factors. Instead they blamed themselves. They declared that they had not concentrated enough, or that should have thought harder, or thought more three-dimensionally, or met with the client more frequently and been more convincing. They also reported reactions such as “how could I make such a mistake?”, or “I didn’t concentrate on it enough”. Only one architect (R15W) thought that her design had been changed during the construction process. She hoped that one day she would have enough money to construct a building and complete it in the way she had designed it. At the same time there were architects who recalled having the pleasure of discovering the finished work to be better than they had designed it. One of the most interesting cases was the respondent R11. He started to think during the interview and concluded that so far all his work had turned out just as it was designed, but that this was a sign of a lack of risk-taking and exploration, and must be regarded as a bad thing from the point of view of the profession.

The architects had stronger feelings about cases where users made different uses of the spaces than the ones which they had designed them for. Typically, they expressed “sadness”, ”anger” or “discomfort”. Even after a long discussion and agreement, one architect (R1) said he had been unable to get accustomed to such a change. Another (R19) described such incidents as “one of the worst experiences in architecture”. He had decided not to design homes any more, he added, on account of the kind of woman who would come to him with home decoration magazines in her bag. One respondent (R6W) explained that she was upset even by a wrongly-hung picture; another spoke of taking legal action against (R20) and a third reported that she did not want to visit the space in question and even denied having designed it (R24W). The metaphor used by one of the architects (R23) explained the reactions of the architects in such cases for

architects very effectively: “[i]t is as if your child has developed new habits and is increasingly becoming a stranger to you.” Another architect (R12W) stated that what angered her was that it showed that the people didn’t even realise how much care and effort she had put in.

Nevertheless, not all architects carried such feelings. Six architects asserted that they were not affected by such cases, that the users had their own lives to live, and that they could do as they wished. There were architects who said that it was only natural for a building with no clear identity to be used in different ways (R10), and that even though the architect’s rights and wrongs have reasons while those of the clients do not, “the customer is always right.” (R28W). Significantly, another architect (R14) argued that such situations arose from the error of the architect. Three of the architects who reported that they were not affected when people made alternative uses of the spaces they designed also believed that if the user deformed spaces in this way, the architect should think about whether the responsibility might lie with him or her.

In general all the architects agreed in the end that they were upset in some way or another when users made changes of this kind after all the discussions and the final agreement. The least affected were those engaged in restoration work, those designing public buildings and more generally those in situations where they knew that they could not have much influence, or where the user was unknown or where the spaces were intended to be multi-purpose anyway. One respondent (R3) welcomed changes of this kind, regarding them as indications that the user had come to own the project, and suggesting that this was as it should be. Only one (R5) reported never having encountered such an issue.

The phrase ‘unknown user’ is used to specify instances where there can be no direct relationship between the architect and the user. Mass housing projects, public buildings, hotels, hospitals and offices

are typical examples. In such cases, the concept of the ‘average user‘ is often adopted. What do architects really do in these situations? Three of the architects surveyed firmly denied the existence of any such concept. According to one (R14), the concept was impossible, since all users recreate spaces for themselves. The remaining architects regarded some concept of the user as a necessity. Some took themselves as the basis for their imagined user. Some considered all the alternatives and came up with a cross-section, while others kept the worst possible alternative in mind, or felt (R26) that if they designed with the most problematic user in mind, the result would be satisfactory for everyone. Finally, there were architects whose approaches fell between these extremes.

The user is certainly an important design criterion. It is inevitable that the desires of the user should be reflected in the space created by the architect. The question remains: how much do architects know about the ways in which their spaces come across to the user. In other words, do architects also adopt as a design criterion the impacts which the spaces which they create have on the user? To ascertain this, the architects were asked whether they thought the spaces which they created shaped the relations between human beings? Only one of the architects (R16W) flatly denied this. Two considered that large-scale projects (urban designs) might have such an impact. All of the others agreed that spaces were a determinant of human relations. One (R19) recalled a teacher once telling him that Churchill had said that people make houses and houses make people.

If the role of architecture in shaping human relations is so important, what attention does architecture pay to daily living spaces where people are constantly together, such as homes, parks, common spaces and streets? According to architects, these are things which should be at the heart of architecture in theory. However, all the architects also agreed that this was not possible in practice. As reasons

for this situation, which they found regrettable, they cited different specialisation in the building industry (especially city planners), regulations and legal conditions. All wanted to have a say in this area again. Their views were perhaps best summed up in the comment "[t]he architect should really be able to police the entire physical environment" (R26).

Given these conditions, it was important to understand to whom or to what the architects felt they were responsible during the creation of spaces. Since they undoubtedly thought that they influenced human relationships and that they were responsible for the built environment, where did their prime responsibility lie? This question produced some interesting results. Nine of the architects surveyed felt that they were primarily responsible to themselves – that they should do the best they possibly could. Another fourteen considered themselves to be responsible to the client or user. Eight spoke of a responsibility to history or the environment. These figures are based simply on the initial responses of those interviewed. It has to be added that some of those who felt responsibility to themselves or to the users also spoke of a sense of responsibility to the environment, while some of those who believed that their prime responsibility was to the environment added that they also had a responsibility to the users and to themselves. This shows that some of the architects had experienced a series of contradictions due to these divided loyalties and were seeking to find a middle way. The problem was well expressed by one of the architects (R23), who said that "[m]y own aesthetic values conflict with the wishes of the owner of the building."

To conclude the section of the interviews on the topic of space, the architects were asked, in the light of all their answers, to explain which of their projects or buildings had satisfied them the most and the reason(s) why. Four of the architects gave unimplemented projects as their favourite works. One of these had come third in a competition,

another was a graduation project, the third was a home which the architect had designed for herself but had not yet built, and the fourth had not been implemented due to various disagreements. In the context of favourite projects, it was notable how frequently the work-child metaphor - which we have already heard from one of the architects – was used. Some architects commented that all of their works were their children and they could not separate them apart. Others said they liked their first implemented project best because it was their first child, or – quite the contrary –some of the architects said that the project on which they were currently working was their favourite as their "youngest child". Twelve architects made a clear choice in favour of a given building. The reasons they gave for their choice included the happiness of the users, the beauty of the *façade*, the fact that they had been able to do as they wished due to the flexibility of the client and the role of the building in question in attracting other clients and, consequently, generating income. The reason for liking a work which is probably most valid for all architects was summed up by one of them (R17) as follows: "[t]he building which is built in line with my project is the building I like best."

This section of the interviews proved to be very important, especially for understanding the different perceptions of space which the architects held as professional "space producers". It was also important for illuminating the impact of the architects' professional ideology on their perceptions. The answers revealed that the architects interviewed believed that the spaces which they created shaped the relations between human beings. This answer was consistent with the view expressed in the preceding section of the interview that good architecture could change something in society. The architects defined space in an aestheticised way and could not stop themselves using the ideas of a space and a building interchangeably when setting out their design criteria for a space. This was in line with Lefebvre's point that

architects regard spaces as bound up to graphic elements such as plans, elevations and sections, and that this type of space also defines its ideological and aesthetic purposes. The fact that the architects felt disappointment at the very least when users changed the way in which the spaces they had designed were utilised is proof of Lefebvre's ideas that architects' space dominates the users' space and marginalises it. This too implies acceptance of the superiority of architects over users which is an important aspect of their professional ideology.

These attitudes are also very much related with the art component of the architects' professional ideology: as artists, the architects did not like intervention in their products. This was consistent with the finding that architects mostly blamed themselves if their design and its outcome in the actual building did not overlap. Their devotion to their works and the difficulty which they had in naming a favourite building among the works they designed was also significant in this regard.

In short, by addressing issues related to space, this section contributed to an understanding of the effects of the professional ideology on the *habitus* of the architects interviewed.

4.4 Architectural practice

The section of the interview concerning architectural practice formed the longest part of the interviews, not only because there were as many as 21 questions (26 for women architects) but also because the architects had a lot to say about their practice.

The first question asked was why the architects had chosen to work on a self-employed basis. Fifteen of the architects had previously worked in the public sector or in other private architectural businesses for periods ranging from four months to ten years. The other sixteen architects had only worked in their own practices. All agreed that the main reason for choosing to be self-employed was a desire for freedom in their work. Most of the architects linked this desire to their own

personal characteristics and their dislike of authority. One even explained his preference by invoking the characteristics of his sign of the zodiac (R17). For some architects, ownership of their own business was a family tradition. Only one architect (R18W) admitted that while she was working in the private sector she had twice been made redundant due to the economic crisis at the time, and that she had then started her own business in order to avoid a third “thank-you” from another employer.

One architect (R1) related an anecdote which probably also helps to explain the attitudes of all the others. “While I was working as a site supervisor, the boss told me off because he had spotted one bag of cement which had split open. But once I started working for myself, some materials had been ordered, and they phoned me at three o’clock in the morning and said they had arrived. So I said, just unload them and go away. In the first case I had difficulty passing on the responsibility for one bag of cement. In the other, a whole lorry-load of stuff arrived and I just told them to dump it on the spot. If anybody had stolen it, well, it was my property. You have this freedom when you are working for yourself.”

The architects believed that the best way to work was to be their own boss, but when questioned on the disadvantages of self-employment, only four of them denied that there were any disadvantages. For the rest, the economic dimension was especially important. Some pointed out either working on one’s own account was more risky or complained that they were unable to produce a sustainable budget. Some argued that the disadvantages stemmed from being a commercial entity and that the risks were the same as those faced by any trader in Turkey. Some of the architects also stated that being self-employed affected their personal lives. Some also admitted that in order to make money they were obliged to sign projects that had been drawn up by contractors or other architects, and

that they felt bad about it. The main worry of the architects was whether they would be able to earn enough: “you have to make enough to meet the cost of opening the office door every day,” declared one (R20). This was a source of unhappiness for them since in their eyes it was somehow demeaning to be a “*tüccar*” (merchant). “If only there were no money aspect, if only people came to you and requested buildings and somebody fed you and looked after you in a nice place and sent you on holidays and you could live without having anything to do with money,” wished one architect (R10). In spite of this, most of the architects experienced a sense of satisfaction in signing their own projects.

In most cases, the architects had been helped to set up their own businesses by family or friends. Six architects asserted that they had not received any assistance from anyone. Two used the money which they had won in an architectural competition. Another two architects had made use of bank loans. One architect (R22W) had raised the capital for her business by selling her gold jewellery – a typical solution for many Turkish women with financial problems. Subsequently, relatives, neighbours and friends had provided the architects with some initial projects, and they were now surviving thanks to their own efforts, the reputations they had built up or, once again, the “circles” in which they moved.

The architects’ existing projects served as good references when finding more work. In other words, satisfied clients were important for the continuity of the business. The oldest three architects, in particular, insisted that they received more jobs because of the successful works which they had already carried out. “[o]n the day after the earthquake on August 17, 1999, somebody I had sold an apartment to rang me up early in the morning and thanked me because the building was sound,” one of the architects (R1) recalled “[i]f he speaks about this to other people, that makes for a very good reference.”

In addition, according to the architects, the most important factors in obtaining work were political or religious kinship and good relations with private business, state organisations or local governments. They added that membership of clubs such as the Rotary Club, Lion's Club or even a football club could be a good way of obtaining access to jobs. Interestingly, however, while the architects named all these channels for obtaining work, they pretended that they themselves never used them, and complained about how hard it was to get work without doing so. "[i]f you have a professional attitude devoid of principles and standards, then it's quite easy to get work. This is the quality of the market and the consumer. I have seen this from my own experience. The better an architect you are, the higher your quality, the less work you get, because nobody wants to take the architect as an authority," complained one of the respondents (R31)

At this point, it became important to learn the architects' principles or their own codes of conduct in architectural practice. All had their own rules for the game. Most affirmed that they had rules governing every field of their personal life as well, so this was not just a question of the profession. Only two architects said that they were less rule-bound in their personal lives compared to their professional lives. Some of the rules which the architects interviewed abided by in the professional context were as follows:

- "What has been talked about is very important for me; I never step outside that framework." (R1)
- "I don't work for "*yap-satçılar*" (small-scale speculative builders); I don't made large price reductions. I never sign a project that has been drawn up by somebody else." (R3)
- "I always abide by the planning regulations; I don't lower my price in order to grab work" (R4, R8W)

- “I never make any concessions when it comes to the soundness of the building.” (R5, R18W, R29W)
- “I don’t work with clients who haven’t established a good dialogue with me.” (R6W)
- “I don’t do anything which I consider wrong, even if the client wants it and it would bring me extra revenue.” (R7)
- “being serious and keeping your word and not betraying anyone.” (R10)
- “respect for my fellow architects” (R19, R11, R12W)
- “When taking over a job, I don’t go ahead without talking to the original architect of the project.” (R15W, R17, R20, R14)
- “I don’t abandon my values in order to earn money.” (R21)
- “Nobody can force me to do something which is out of harmony with the environment.” (R22W)
- “I make no concessions, not only on my project but also on the quality of the engineers I work with.” (R25)
- “In restoration work I insist that the former characteristics of the building be preserved exactly as they were.” (R2, R27)
- “I never do anything which I know to be wrong aesthetically or technically.” (R28W)
- “I never tell lies about my job” (R24W, R31, R12W)
- “I follow universal standards like service to people, improvement of the environment and respect for nature.” (R23)
- “Whatever I do in my private life I am the same in my business relations. To be myself.” (R9W)

Three architects did not specify any rules. Although they mentioned some rules, they stated that they could do any project. This might point

to a misunderstanding of the question. Probably they understood the question in terms of what types of project they would take on, because as one of them (R14) – who clearly had some rules – stated: "[i]f a project is going to be done in a water basin or with permission in a conservation area, then rather than not having anything to do with it I would try to do it in the best way possible."

Generally speaking, when answering this question the architects were not talking hypothetically but were really thinking about their own practices. This might be another explanation why only three architects did not state any particular rules.

Another factor which one might expect to limit the practice of architects is the architectural movements and styles which they regard as their reference points. As is well-known, there have been many movements in the history of architecture - for example, functionalism, cubism, deconstructivism, constructivism, symbolism or postmodernism. Each movement has a different approach to design, to facades, to the relationship of buildings with their physical environments. For this reason, the architects were asked about different approaches within the same practice. Twenty-one architects said that they were not committed to any specific architectural style. Instead, some of them offered approaches of their own such as in the following statements:

- "An architecture of character able to define this country" (R1)
- "I lean a bit towards the deconstructivist aspect (R5)
- "Every movement in architecture has both masterpieces and buildings which I don't like." (R6W)
- " I don't believe in conforming to anything," (R7)
- "simplicity" (R9W)
- "A new adventure every time" (R14)

- “Liveable, properly used, modest spaces respectful of their environments” (R15W)
- “There is one I don’t like: postmodernism.” (R16W)
- “A bit eclectic, a bit alla turca” (R17)
- “I follow no particular trend; I mix art with business.” (R22W)
- “What they call movements I find too rigid; a bit functionalist, a bit cubist.” (R28W)
- “After all, architectural movements aren’t very important any more.” (R31)

Two architects engaged in restoration work described their architectural style as “conservation”. Another six defined themselves as functionalist modernist architects. One (R3) said he was still modernist because he believed in utopias. Another (R20) said he was functionalist and brutalist (modernist) because this was the way he had been taught at university. Two architects (R19, R21) said they had started out as functionalists but had later come to favour postmodernism. One respondent (R10) summarised his approach using the famous words of Adolf Loos : “[o]rnament as a crime”. For him, “[u]nless we did everything in the name of architecture as a society, we should try ornament in our architecture”.

Then there should be some important expectations about architecture in the mind of architects. What are then the architects’ expectations from architecture? What are they aiming at in their practice? Most of them replied that they were seeking to practice an architecture which had more character, was more aesthetic and provided more comfort but which was also physically sound. However, the aims of the architects also included earning money, making a name for themselves, creating works which would be noticed and which might prove lasting, designing multi-purpose, convertible buildings, remaining

active as architects until the end of their lives and, in the case of conservationist architects, preserving the buildings of the past for future generations. One of the architects (R31) simply wanted “[a] decent client – just somebody who knows what he wants and who doesn’t take away my autonomy in my own field of expertise.”

The path towards fulfilment of these expectations is not a straight one. Compromises are inevitable. Indeed, the architects felt that they made various kinds of concessions. They reported having to compromise on their freedom to design at will and to do things that were out of the ordinary. Sometimes they had to do the unthinkable in order to fit in with planning regulations, or to make concessions in the aesthetic sense so that their buildings would be solid. Most of all, they felt that they had to make compromises in their private lives and their personalities. Yet concessions and compromises are made when one is obliged to make them due to force of necessity. In the context of the professional practice of architecture, these obligations cannot be treated separately from the problems of the profession, that is, by establishing the problems of the profession, it may become easier to understand the reasons for the concessions that are made.

What are the general problems of the profession of architecture today? The answers given to this question can be grouped under three headings. The replies in the first group highlight issues arising from the way in which the profession is perceived by society - or in other words, issues related to the level of social culture and needs. Such issues were expressed in phrases such as “lack of knowledge of what we do” (R3), “the cultural inability of society to comprehend the profession” (R1), “failure to prove that architects are essential” (R7), “the fact that the profession has not been defined” (R8W), “a sector which everybody thinks they can do easily” (R24W), “a labour-intensive profession the output of which cannot be proven”. One of the respondents (R18W) used the words: “[a]rchitecture cannot be independent of the

environment and society, and to try to do it as if it were independent – that is, to try to create something detached from society and from all sorts of things…"

A second group of replies focused on the problems which the architects experienced in the implementation of their work, among them "the lack of standards" (R11), "lack of planning" (R21), "the crisis in the construction sector" (R20), "the inability of architects to obtain a just reward for the work they do" (R4), "erroneous development plans and a lack of supervision of their implementation" (R17), and "bureaucracy" (R7). These are issues which stem from the economic and political structure of Turkey. As one of the respondents (R9W) put it, "[t]here is discontinuity at every stage of the implementation of the profession; architects have become strangers to one process another in building industry by doing only design part."

The third group of responses was made up of those which related the problems of architecture to the architects themselves. According to these responses, the chief problems of the profession of architecture in Turkey were "education and the failure to instill the basics" (R2), "the weakness of architects' finances and their consequent inability to be selective about the works they take on" (R4, R6), "a dearth of ethical values" (R23) or the "inadequate organisation" (R22W).

Two architects offered quite different explanations of the problems of the profession. For one (R13), "[t]he influence of postmodernism must be overcome. The most important problem is the way in which architecture has come to be seen as nothing more than a game, reduced to the status of an object of consumption." For the other (R10), the most important problem of architectural practice was "desperation". "When you live life like a battle, hope declines, because you don't devote your efforts to yourself, your dreams, your utopia or better things, but you fall into the effort not to die, merely to survive, and hope declines and everything changes and gets wilder." These two architects

held that world architecture suffered from the same problems, whereas the other architects believed that architectural practice in the world at large was in a better state than in Turkey because there the architect was respected and society possessed a building culture.

Strikingly, none of the architects referred in their answers to the narrowing of the architect's field of influence, an issue constantly underlined by both architectural theorists and architects' organisations. So what did architects really think about this issue?

Nine of them accepted that an architect had to be a part of a larger organisation, and saw nothing wrong with specialisation in the building industry. One architect (R7) stated that specialisation was a good thing if it was provided by the other specialists who had a general knowledge of the architectural profession. However, for the remainder of the respondents, this trend was not beneficial for the development of the profession. For these, specialisation was artificial and had been created as a result of political preferences, the wrong educational policies, the demands of the market place, the search of other disciplines for legitimacy and the desire for profits on the part of private universities.

The architects generally took the view that this kind of specialisation should fall under the umbrella of architecture and be taught at postgraduate level. One architect (R13) went so far as to assert that even engineers working on projects and buildings should undergo a process during which they acquired a general architectural education. The words which most clearly expressed the feelings of architects on this issue were the following (R31): "[t]hese are the support units of architecture. In that sense, the architect is the person who brings together all these tasks in his/her own field - the person who creates the balances. In Turkey, there is just an ignorant fragmentation." This remark also illustrates again the difference which

the architects perceived between architecture in Turkey and in the world in general.

The suggestion that such problems are the result of political preferences raises the question of how architects today perceive their relations with the political administration – that is, with the state. The responses of the architects to a question posed on this issue may at the same time help to shed light on how they regard the way the relationship between the profession and the state has developed from the past to the present. For one of the respondents (R14), "[a]rchitecture is dependent either on the state or on the private sector. You cannot actually say either the ideology of the state or the ideology of the private sector is good. The important thing is the employer's relations to culture and the way he or she looks on the profession." In this context, the architects were in full agreement that the state was still the largest employer in Turkey. They also concurred in that the relationship between the profession and the state was problematic. Among the problems, they pointed out that the housing amnesties issued by the state fuelled the "rent economy", legislative arrangements were inadequate, inspection was not carried out even according to the existing arrangements, the bureaucracy imposed additional burdens on architects, a proper set of standards had still not been established, and that the building inspection law issued in the context of the bid for EU membership completely tied up the development of the profession, and so on.

Most of the architects also asserted that the state had taken a positive view of architecture up until the 1960s, but thereafter the unplanned economy had had a negative impact on the profession. Today, architects, according to one of the respondents (R24W), are "in some sense the transition agents of the relationships which citizens are to form with state institutions. You are the crank of the bribery mechanism. It's easier to give through you." Another interviewee

(R15W) went even further: “[t]here is a conflict which arises from the fact that architecture is more of a social profession. The fact that you are responsible to society and to the environment leads to a serious clash in an area where so much money changes hands. For this reason, architecture is a profession which has come under considerable pressure. This affects the *ethics* of the sector and also limits the design options.”

Some architects voiced other dimensions of the same clash. One (R4) asserted that “[t]he state doesn’t like architects or their professional organisations at all, because architects have a different way of looking at the world. If they feel something isn’t right, then they oppose it. We are under pressure. These new building supervision companies will completely change the supervision mechanism in the profession and bind us hand and foot.” However, it cannot be said that all architects took a positive view of their oppositional role. For one respondent (R26), “[a]rchitects have always been against the state; now they are suffering the consequences.” That said, all architects also have expectations from the state. They would like legislation to be issued only after consultation with themselves, and its implementation to be supervised. The words of one architect (R10) sum up this situation: “[t]he squatter settlements are an issue for the state. The deterioration which has been seen there is not just something which affects only the architects; it is something which damages the whole country.”

With architect-state relations in this condition, the state is now preparing to introduce legislation to give foreign architects – who are currently obliged to work jointly with a Turkish architect – the right to operate entirely independently. From the early years of the Republic onwards, the history of architecture in Turkey shows that the struggle against foreign architects had an important place in the profession acquiring its legitimacy. So what do today’s architects think?

Ten of the architects interviewed took the view that allowing foreign architects to work in Turkey would have an extremely negative impact on the profession because, as one of them (R18W) put it, “[w]e are not in the same lane.” Another of these architects (R16W) argued that foreign architects would “not affect us finding work because an employer won’t pay us 100 but they will have them do the job and pay them 800. This is the kind of society we are.” Another interviewee (R3) described the same situation as follows: “[a]dulation of foreigners is a bad thing, it has a negative impact on the training of young architects and on the production of mature ones.”

Fourteen architects believed that the arrival of foreign architects would have either no effect on the profession or that it would have a positive one. These architects argued that the foreigners were already working in Turkey, that there were jobs which they could not do, that they would never cut their prices by 85% to win work, and that it would become possible to benefit from their knowledge and skills. Some of the architects were even quite derisory about the matter. “Let’s see what foreigners can do with what is available here,” said one (R17), “the technology they are accustomed to doesn’t exist; the workmanship they are used to doesn’t exist. Let them come and work here and let’s see what they can do and let them see for themselves.”

The remaining seven architects had some reservations about foreign architects. If good architects came to Turkey and there was fair competition, it would be a good thing. However, if bad architects came or if the foreign architects did not operate on an individual basis but as entire offices and sectors, then this would have a negative effect, because existing practices would be forced to work as subcontractors and they would cause small architectural offices to go out of business altogether.

Another important topic which the interviews sought to investigate was whether or not woman architects came up against additional

problems during the course of their professional practice on account of their gender. Both the men and the women interviewed were asked whether there were differences between man and woman architects in the practice of the profession. According to nine of the men and five of the women, there was no such distinction. Against this eleven of the men and six of the women took the view that there was a difference.

One of the women who said that there was no difference (R8W) it was a question of whether or not one possessed emotional intelligence, and you had to be able to sense things in order to be a good architect and acquiring this ability depended on the education you received. The other women who did not believe in the existence of any gender-related differences in professional practice (R9W, R16W, R24W, R29W) were of the opinion that design was a personal thing, and that different designs stemmed from different personalities. However they also stated that the disadvantageous situation in which women in society find themselves might also be reflected in their profession.

Those of the men interviewed who believed that women were different all agreed that the difference did not arise in the design of projects but at the stage of implementation. One of these men (R10), for example, affirmed that "[w]omen are more realistic. They are not so curious. It is more important for them to be shown appreciation. They are not big fighters; they keep away from endless struggles." Another man (R14) opined that "[t]here are very few who can cope with the implementation, who can take part in those relationships. Those who do so are quick to feel the wear and tear and to turn their backs. Women don't like taking risks; they prefer to work for salaries. If 90% of office owners are men, 90% of those employed by these offices are women". Other men architects (R17, R31) argued that "[o]n the building site it is an advantage to be a man, women are more efficient in the office. I employ women architects here." For another male respondent (R21), "[t]hey have problems when it comes to implementation. When

they have children they leave the job. Among those who go on working, they find they can't make a living just by drawing projects so they turn to interior decoration."

All of the eleven women interviewed stressed the difference between men and women when it comes to implementation, albeit not in these terms. It was interesting to hear one of the woman architects who stated that women were no different from men (R9W) explain the situation in very much the same words as her male colleagues: "[w]omen are whimsy. They don't want to be involved at the production stage, so they never learn the whole process but remain at the project stage."

It should be noted that the question as to whether women architects had a distinct approach to design was put only to the woman interviewees. All the women were aware of a social prejudice assuming that women pay more attention to aesthetic considerations while men are more concerned with functionality and physical soundness. However, they themselves disagreed with this assumption. They indicated that the only things which might influence their designs were their emotional capacities and their close relationship with the details of life. Only one (R22W) took up a clear position to the effect that "[t]he woman designs a kitchen from her own life; a man cannot do this."

Asked how they thought being a woman affected them in the practice of their profession, most of them responded about having to be careful in their dress, speech and behaviour – issues which, as one of the respondents (R28W) stated herself, "are problems that stem from being a working woman, not from being a woman architect." So did they face no special problems at all? When the question was put this way, eight of them agreed that workers on the construction site sought to test their knowledge. Some reported being given bodyguards (R8W), employing various means to see whether all the builders would work together or not (R9W), meeting condescending responses to what they

had to say (R12W) or being bored by the conversation at alcoholic meals with male clients (R18W). Probably the basic problem, expressed by one of the same women (R12W), was that “[t]hey don’t see you as a technical person but primarily as a woman and they find it difficult to take orders from a woman.”

The question of how, in such circumstances, the women succeeded in getting themselves accepted produced some interesting answers. Women who worked together with their husbands noted that when they were with their husbands nobody listened to them, but that when they went around alone they noticed that people got used to them after a while and they were able to get themselves accepted. One woman (R18W) said that she had become more and more like a man in the course of time, but another (R29W) did not see any problem; it was not a matter of gender, she argued, but of “hitting the same wave length as the person you are dealing with”. With only one exception, none of the woman architects referred to special female conditions such as pregnancy or breast-feeding. They appeared to have solved this in one way or another. Only one woman (R8W) recalled visiting the construction site when she was pregnant and breastfeeding and having problems with practical things like transport and toilets. Finally, the woman architects were asked whether they felt that they needed separate organisations and all of them briefly said ‘No’.

On the other hand, the problems of architects are influenced by the city in which the professional practice of architecture is also conducted. The responses which the architects gave to a question concerning the advantages and disadvantages of the places where they carried out their practice will be examined here on a city-by-city basis.

Ankara: Twelve of the architects interviewed were working in Ankara. According to the Ankara architects, the city had a number of advantages including the fact that it was a large city, the existence of many architectural offices, the large number of projects in the public

sector, the close proximity of the central bureaucracy and the ease of travel to and from İstanbul. One respondent (R11) pointed out that Ankara architects could take on projects anywhere except İstanbul: "[a]part from official dealings, the Ankara architect doesn't work for Ankara." This view was, in effect, supported by another architect (R16W) when she said that "[h]otels choose Ankara because you can only get a Tourism Allocation Certificate in Ankara. Even without a project you can easily get the certificate. But aside from hotels Ankara doesn't have much of an advantage." Ankara was thought of as a city which combines the advantages of being in a large city with being an easier place to live than İstanbul. One of the respondents (R28W) argued because Ankara was a smaller city everybody knew each other, and therefore the city had advantages when it came to making connections, passing on work, obtaining references and so on. The greatest perceived disadvantage of Ankara was the difficulty of obtaining work, which was linked to a relative lack of building culture of clients by comparison with İstanbul (R3), a shortage of large projects and the fact that there were only housing projects outside the public sector, and that saturation point had been reached in this field (R28W). In addition, there were problems such as slow payments in projects carried out for the public sector (R12W). With one exception, all the architects were content to be living and working in Ankara. The exception (R28W) found Ankara too modest and deplored its lack of variety. One architect who came from Kırıkkale (R29W) took a neutral stance: since she worked on small projects, she did not think it mattered much where she worked.

Antalya: Two Antalya architects were among the interviewed. By coincidence, one of these (R6W) had moved from Ankara after running an office in the capital for three years: "The reason why I chose Antalya," this architect explained, "was the disadvantages of Ankara. In Ankara, you can either get work from the state or the military or you

can work as a subcontractor. In any case you remain a white-collar person, tied to your desk. The Ankara economy is limited too. Antalya has developed economically and has a lot of potential. I came here to work as an architect." By contrast, the other Antalya architect (R8W) interviewed, who had been working as an architect in the city for 22 years, reported that "[t]he volume of work is rich; the city built up very quickly. Even so, the architectural practices are not at the same level as in Ankara or İstanbul. Investors prefer to have their projects done in Ankara or İstanbul because architects working on their own cannot develop ties with the Municipality or the Tourism Ministry." The architect added that with the concentration of Russian tourism on Antalya, there was a preference for partnerships with Russian architects. These last comments dovetailed with those of the Ankara architect quoted above (R16W).

Bursa: Three interviews were held with architects working in Bursa. All three were of the opinion that Bursa enjoyed numerous advantages: it was the largest city in Anatolia apart from İstanbul, Ankara and İzmir; it was economically developed (R1); it was a beautiful city with a favourable climate and topography and important historical and natural assets (R19), and every passing day foundations of a new factory were laid (R26). The architects also mentioned the proximity of Bursa to İstanbul and commented that the educational and cultural characteristics of its people were more developed than the Turkish average. Indeed, according to one of the three (R26), there was so much work in Bursa that there was actually a shortage of architects. All three architects stated that Bursa's main disadvantages were its very rapid expansion with its population growing by around 50,000 a year, leading to a distorted form of urban growth. "[i]n the easter part of the city, unlicensed buildings account for 80% of all buildings. What difference does it make if you put up a good building there or not?" complained one respondent (R19).

İstanbul: Nine İstanbul architects were interviewed. But as we have seen, these were not the only architects to comment on İstanbul. The city acted as a point of comparison for architects in other cities, and as in the cases of Ankara and Bursa, geographical proximity to İstanbul was itself seen as an advantage for the other cities as places to work. The İstanbul architects were naturally aware of the advantages of their city. According to them, İstanbul was the centre of architecture in Turkey: "[c]apital is here. There is more work here than anywhere else. The people who understand the architecture best are here." (R10) And, needless to add perhaps: "[t]he larger the cake, the larger the piece that you can hope to obtain." (R17). However, the problems appeared to be just as large as well. In fact, among all those interviewed, the İstanbul architects were those who spoke the most about the disadvantages of their city. Significantly, the problems which they referred to were not problems specifically related to architecture but problems of life in general.

According to one İstanbul architect (R9W), "[y]ou can't live a refined life; you can't help being affected by all the social pollution." A second (R10) put it like this: "[i]n Ankara, you don't have to gird your sword. Here you are always alone and always at war. It is a city which crushes and destroys people, it is a city of [numerous] crises. If you overcome the crisis, fine. If not, you don't emerge unscathed. That's why there are so many crazy people here." Other architects commented, for example, that: "İstanbul is a terrible city, deformed in every way. Human relations, business ethics, the building design process… all these are very difficult" (R15W); "In small places you do relatively little work but you gain a lot from them. Here you do a lot of work but you don't earn very much and what you do earn you spend straight away" (R20); "If you have business in various parts of the city, then getting around causes you to lose a great deal of time; it's difficult to supervise properly (R27), and, in similar vein, "[w]hat you can get

done in a small city in a day takes a month in İstanbul." In spite of all these problems, all but one (R15, who dreamed of working as an architect in a small town) were happy to be in İstanbul because, as one of them (R18W) put it, "İstanbul is a great city; there is nowhere like it in the whole world."

Kastamonu: Kastamonu is the smallest province covered by the sample. Interviews were carried out with three architects. None of them saw any disadvantage in being an architect in Kastamonu. According to two (R2, R22W), the biggest advantage was the historical fabric of the city. There are 534 listed historic buildings in Kastamonu which have been included by UNESCO in its world heritage list. It is a city where the need for everything to conform to its environment is particularly compulsory (R22W). Accordingly, it is a city with a great potential in the field of restoration work (R2). For the third Kastamonu architect interviewed (R4), if there is any disadvantage, it is that "all projects have to be of a certain type, a certain height, a certain number: Here, a 100 houses project is a very large job." However, the architect added immediately that this was not a major issue, and that architects enjoyed good living standards: "[y]ou won't find any hungry architects here; they all have their own homes and cars" (R4).

Konya: Two architects working in Konya, too, were among the interviewed. They were the least satisfied among all the six provinces. According to one (R21), there were many more architects than actually needed in Konya; it was a "static, stagnant city. People are conservative. They have a different view of architecture and they don't bring work." The other architect (R23) agreed that "Konya has a certain cultural make-up which negatively affects the architect and the practice of the profession." He explained that "Konya is closed to the outside world. People don't place the necessary value on ideas, service. This is the difference between the developed society and the undeveloped." He went on to interpret economic development as follows: "[t]he

industrialists, the leading employers haven't acquired enough cultural competence. The companies have developed very rapidly. They have no roots." Both of the architects said that they were not thinking of working anywhere else because their families were in Konya.

The last word to be said about architects and their cities is this: apart from three architects, who had moved from Kahramanmaraş to Kastamonu, Kırıkkale to Ankara and Ankara to Antalya respectively, all of the architects interviewed were practising the profession in the city where they had started to practise it, and none were thinking of moving to another city. With all their advantages and disadvantages, those cities were their habitats.

Earlier, some architects mentioned architectural competitions as a factor contributing to the establishment of architectural offices or affecting access to work. In Turkey as in the whole world, architectural competitions are an important part of architectural practice. Besides international competitions, competitions are held in Turkey, particularly for the large-scale projects of public institutions, such as state hospitals, municipal offices, cultural centres and other official buildings. However, there are not as many competitions as there were in the past. As the private sector becomes the most influential employer, competitions have started to lose their importance and their numbers have dwindled. Although taking part in competitions is expensive and imposes tough deadlines, it is generally regarded as an integral part of architects' professional practice. For this reason, the architects interviewed for this study were asked whether or not they took part in competitions. Ten had never taken part in a competition - although one of these had acted as a member of a jury for such a competition. Two architects reported that they had taken part in more than 30 competitions while the others had experience participating in between one and ten competitions. One of the architects who had taken part in the most competitions (R31), had won five first prizes. Two of the

projects in question had been fully implemented and one had been implemented in part. Among the other architects there were also some who had won prizes in competitions, but only one (R10) could point to a project which had actually been constructed as a result of a competition.

The architects were also asked how competitions affected the practice of the profession. The architects can be divided into two groups on the basis of their replies. For one group of 17 architects which included architects who had never taken part in a competition, the impact was positive. Competitions were seen as helping people to reach new heights, to improve themselves, to think freely and to bring their professional potential out into the open, while the projects generated by competitions were said to be better than those drawn up as a result of tender processes. Competitions were also viewed as providing an opportunity for new graduates, and as institution which enabled young architects to express themselves. “I owe my place in the architecture profession to competitions,” declared one architect (R31). Another (R10) said that he had started to find more work after winning a competition. But the second group of 14 architects which included architects who took part in competitions, believed that competitions made no significant contribution to the profession. These architects argued that competitions could not be won by original projects, they were always won by the same people, there were competition lobbies and there was such a thing as separate group of architects known to be “competition architects”. Some claimed, as in the words of one architect (R14), that competitions were tantamount to “distributing work to certain people”. Thus even if competitions were important in the professional sense, they were also criticised for the improper way in which they were conducted in Turkey.

It is perhaps only inevitable that discussion with architects of the professional practice of architecture was dominated by the problems

which they experienced in practice. The responses given by architects concentrated on problems not only when they were directly asked about the problems they encountered but also when they were questioned more generally about issues such as gender, the cities they work, competitions, relations with the state or the status of foreign architects. But what did architects think about organisation as a possible avenue for solving these problems? All of the architects were members of the "*Chamber of Architects*". Three were also members of the "*Independent Architects Association*" and one of the "*Architects Association 1927".* One of the two architects exclusively engaged in restoration work was the manager of the provincial "*Environment Protection Foundation"* and the other was a member of the "*Historical Environment and Conservationists Society*." One architect was a member of *ÇEKÜL* (another conservationist society). One of the architects questioned was the head of the provincial branch of the Chamber of Architects; another was a member of the board of directors of the provincial branch of the Chamber of Architects in another province. All three of the architects in Kastamonu had responsibilities at the local representative office of the Chamber of Architects. Six of the architects questioned had also at some time worked at the Chamber of Architects in capacities such as secretary or member responsible for publications of the board of directors.

While 28 of the architects believed that organisation could play a very important role in the solution of their problems, they were quite critical of the current organisation (by which it would be correct to understand the Chamber of Architects). Of the architects who did not believe in organisation, two (R28W, R29W) blamed the lack of awareness of the members for the failure of the organisation to achieve anything: "[i]f you don't do anything for yourself, the organisation can do nothing for you." A similar view was taken by the third disbeliever in organisation (R13) who opined that organisation was only feasible

among people who shared the same values and could not come about through legal pressures and obligations.

The architects' views of what might be achieved through organisation can be summed up as follows: increases in unit prices, the prevention of signature-trading, improvements in client relations, legislative changes, the adoption of professional ethics, the formation of a professional ideology, an increase in the respect accorded to the profession, the protection of the social rights of the members. As one architect (R1) reasoned, the Chamber of Architects is responsible first to society, secondly to architecture and thirdly to architects. However, the architects complained that the Chamber of Architects today was far from fulfilling these responsibilities. "I have lost my enthusiasm for the Chamber because of what it has achieved so far," stated one of the respondents (R3), while according to others: "[t]he Chamber of Architects nowadays works as if it were an organisation responsible for implementing the laws of the state" (R5); "[t]he Chamber of Architects does nothing about contractors who cut their prices by 70%; it just generates gossip and divisions between "us" and "them" (R6W); "[l]et's say, I like the 'cheerful' people at the Chamber of Architects" (R9W); "[t]he Chamber is like a place that belongs to those who work there, not to the architects themselves - even on a very straightforward matter I am unable to get information" (R12W); "[t]here are decadent relations at the Chamber" (R13); "[t]he political divisions at the Chamber its partisan atmosphere disturb me" (R17); "[t]he Chamber remains the monopoly of a small group" (R18W); "[t]o the same extent that the struggle for democracy affects our profession, so the Chamber should take a corresponding interest in it. It should start from there" (R21); "[y]ou will get nowhere with people who go to the Chamber to have a drink and organise dance classes" (R25).

All these were the genuine thoughts of the members about their organisation. In the light of these views, the architects were asked what

the main duty of the Chamber of Architects should be. Answers included: to organise the young people (R1, R26), to carry out inspections (R2), to ensure communication among its members (R4), to act as a democratic mass pressure group (R5), to provide legal consultancy (R7), to reflect professional ethics (R15W, R18W, R19), to make architecture more respectable (R9W), to embrace its members rather than acting like a public notary (R12W), to provide vocational education within the profession (R15W), to defend the rights of its members (R16W, R20, R27), to form a professional ideology (R17) and to create alternative projects in respect both of professional practice and of national policies (R22W, R24W, R28W). Although these proposed aims include some rather abstract ones like being a democratic mass pressure group, it is apparent that architects generally expect the Chamber of Architects to solve the problems which they encounter in their own professional lives.

Finally, the architects were asked to evaluate the future of their profession. Sixteen of the architects were optimistic. These architects felt that: "[a]rchitecture may change its form; it may move more in the direction of environmental arrangements" (R7) or that it would carry on as at present, with only minor changes "once a certain economic and cultural dimension is achieved" (R13) or "once the idea that every task should be carried out by its expert takes hold" (R12W). One architect (R14) asserted that architects would always continue to design, another (R19) that there was still much to be done in the world in architectural terms, a third (R20) that architecture, like art, cannot die and a fourth (R21) that as long as there were people there would be a need for spaces, and consequently need for architects. Another architect (R31) expressed his optimism in the words, "[a]rchitecture will change as life changes; it is a profession that will exist as long as there is life and consequently its future is bright". Still another view was that "[t]here might be great crises in the world and people might return to

living in caves. This is possible. But it stands to reason that after that there will definitely be houses again." (R10).

Two architects (R6W and R16W) said that they were concerned only with their own futures and had not thought about the future of the profession beyond that. The remaining 13 architects, however, were extremely unhopeful. According to one (R15W), the future of the profession would be no different from the future of Turkey unless the economy in general as revitalised and more active policies concerning the profession were adopted - or if architecture could not solve the problem of sheltering the poor (R5). Another architect (R9W) saw major difficulties looming as long as physical and social organisation remained disconnected from one another and architects viewed their work only as an element of the physical organisation. In consequence, architecture, in the words of another respondent (R3) was not among the professions that would be talked of in the 21st century. This architect thought that building technology would develop, and that architecture would become more and more specialised and end up as a hobby. Another respondent (R8W) approached the question rather differently, using the phrase, "[i]f the doctor's mistakes are under the ground, the architect's mistakes are above it." For her it was necessary to be aware of this. If those who worried only about their own futures are included, half of the architects were thus very pessimistic about the future of the profession, making it seem difficult not to agree with the architect (R10) who felt that the biggest problem of the profession was despair.

This section of the interviews indicated that the architects prefer to work on a self-employed basis because of their personal characteristics. According to them the worst part of the job is having to engage in the commercial part of their business. The self-employed architects cannot see themselves as employers even when they have employees. Mostly the offices are staffed by only one to two persons

and the architects attach importance to the manual part of their work, which requires that they too should be workers. They are proudly insistent on this. These findings – and the fact that the architects have their own architectural styles - are all closely linked to the art component of architecture and thus to the architects' spontaneous professional ideology. The responses which the architects gave to questions concerning their offices showed that family, relations and close friends are important support groups in Turkey. References made to factors such as religious or political affinity and the need for good relations with private business, state organisations or local governments in order to obtain work demonstrated that clientelism is very much at work in Turkish business life, while the state is still the architects' biggest employer. Self-employed architects in small cities enjoyed more privileges and were mostly satisfied because they had more modest expectations. This showed that the city where the architects lived and worked had an impact on their *habitus*. The interviews showed that the architects believe that there is a lack of knowledge and acceptance of the importance of the built environment among Turkish people, which can be seen in the ways in which the country differs from the West. According to the architects interviewed, this is the reason for the problem of the legitimacy of architects and architecture. On account of their professional ideology, the architects expressed concern about the legitimacy of their profession and wanted to be chiefly responsible for the built environment. The architects interviewed had their own ethical rules and complained of the lack of an ethics of architecture in Turkey. This ethical outlook springs from their professional ideology, which they have possessed since the beginning of their education.

On the other hand the architects interviewed believed in the importance of organisation in solving their problems. They were members of the Chamber of Architects but they were highly critical of

the current state of their organisations. This in itself is a proof of the impact of the organisations on their *habitus*.

Woman architects interviewed believed that the difficulties they experienced stemmed from being a woman in a male-dominated society, and not from being an architect. The difficulties they mentioned were limited to the implementation stage of the profession, and this was evidence of the effects of gender on their *habitus*.

Moreover the architects were relatively despairing about the future of their profession

To sum up, the answers to the questions in this section tended to corroborate the conjectures of the study. The next section of the interviews might indicate more clearly whether the architects were equally devoid of hope in defining their own identities.

4.5 Architect's Identity

The architects interviewed for this study were asked to define three things: architecture, space and finally architects. Most of the architects found it difficult to define these three concepts. If defining space was relatively easy, then the most difficult question was the definition of the architect. One respondent simply said, "[y]ou won't get an answer from me; it's a difficult question" (R20). Another architect (R29) preferred not to give a definition, since every person was unique. The definition offered by a third architect (R17) perhaps shed some light on the difficulty of the question: "[a]n architect is so many things that it is hard to define..." This architect went on to suggest that the architect was "a person who contributes to social peace, who is good at personal relations, who gives direction to human relations and social life, up to a point, and contributes to the development of the country."

Probably on account of the difficulty of the question of identity, three of the architects were content to answer that they were human beings. Two (R5, R30) added that the human being in question was

sensitive to his or her physical environment. According to another, such human being was a “firmly anchored professional”. In the words of another architect (R7): “I don’t think there is any difference. If I was a butcher I would carry the same responsibility. Every profession has an area of responsibility and an interest which is unknown to the others.”

Nevertheless, the remaining architects all attempted a definition of the architect which made reference to their responsibility and sensitivity to, and awareness of, the physical and social environment. Moreover, as one of them (R12W) put it, an architect is “a person of many sides, an intellectual, somebody who has to be very good at the relations between art and engineering.” This intellectual dimension of architects was also stressed in the definitions of another six architects (R1, R4, R6W, R13, R14, R28W). The artistic character of architects was referred to by four (R2, R8W, R10, R15W). All of this was summarised by a respondent (R27) who described the architect as “both an artist and an engineer, a person who solves problems, a mathematician, somebody who has to acquire a bit of science.” For another respondent (R19), personality traits were also relevant: “a confident, determined person. This is balanced with knowledge, experience, tolerance, modesty, which give us the cultural, artistic dimension of the architect.” However, such personal characteristics were not welcomed by all the architects. According to another respondent (R11), “[a]rchitects always see themselves as a privileged section of society, above or beyond day-to-day influences. Another respondent supported this view using a colourful Turkish idiom sarcastically: “[t]he architect is a person who goes around and boasting, ‘I created all the small mountains’… There is something strange about all of us. Perhaps it stems from our education, from being able to think about everything in three dimensions.”

Architects are expected to be role models (R2, R24W), leaders (R4) and – quite interestingly – physically good-looking. One

respondent (R26) described the architect as “a handsome, well-groomed person, His physical appearance has to be good in order to harmonise with what a person who designs the environment has to say.” All in all, as another architect (R9W) put it, “I am, as an architect, somebody who describes everything; I am a person who asks the question ‘Why?’ in both the social sense and the physical sense”. Or “I am a person who lives to the full and helps others to do so,” affirmed another architect (R22W).

Interestingly, as few as four architects defined the architect as a designer, creator, planner or maker of space. In most of the definitions, by contrast, the main denominators were the social elements and the role of architects for society. If the architects interviewed looked upon architects as people who service society, then how did they define their status in that society or, sociologically speaking, their class status? This was the second question asked in this part of the interview. All of the architects were somewhat confused in answering this question. They all started their answers by describing themselves as workers and very hard workers at that. But they also admitted that, as private business owners (Some of them had their own salaried personnel), they were also bosses. Having admitted this fact, they immediately added that their mentality was different from that of a conventional boss. They described themselves as brothers, sisters or friends for their workers. As one of them (R27) explained, “[t]he architect is not like other employers. Depending on the situation, we are on the same level as the workers. Sometimes we fall into worse conditions than them, you are obliged to meet their needs before you can meet your own.”

The architects also noted – in the words of two of them (R28, R30) – that they were the workers of their clients. The architects also specifically emphasised the manual element in the practice of their profession. Probably for this reason, they looked on themselves as

workers. One (R18), for example, explained that "[i]n terms of mentality, after all, there is no question of being a boss. We can't live like bosses. Even if we have done a lot of works, our cars are like construction site vehicles, with our picks and shovels in the back. There are times when we do everything ourselves." Another architect (R1) stated that "[w]hen I pick up the broom on site and sweep up, my son says, 'that kind of work isn't fit for you, Dad;' but it doesn't bother me because at the end of the day it is something I do for the sake of the quality of what I am going to produce. A similar point is made by another architect (R4): "[w]hen materials are delivered to the worksite I unload it; when it comes to getting work I can speak a different jargon." One response (R10) which perhaps summaries the feelings of many in response to this question ran as follows: "I see myself as an architect. It would be an insult to architecture to call me a worker or a boss. Architecture is architecture. I feel closest to doctors from in certain respects. Architecture is one of the most complex tasks in the service sector". It was noteworthy that the two youngest architects (aged 28 and 33) described this question as reminiscent of something political, and specifically stated that they were just architects. One of them (R26) added that "[s]ome people might choose to be political, but that's not the way I've chosen."

If architecture is architecture and "it is a nice feeling to be an architect" (R31), how important was the role of architect in their lives? For 21 architects, the role of architect was the most important role in their lives. Ten architects said that their family roles came first and the role of architect second. It is worth noting that there was no difference between genders in this respect. While the roles of mother and "head of family" came ahead of the role of architect for one woman architect (R16W) and one male architect (R25) respectively, another woman architect (R8W) for example, put the role of architect before motherhood. There were some architects (R5, R18W) for whom the

role of architect had been most important when they were younger, and others for whom it was becoming increasingly important (R10). Those architects who described the role of architect as their most important role added that they enjoyed and took pride in being described as architects.

This leads to the question of whether the fact that they were architects affected their personalities and attitudes to life in general. The two older architects said that their personality and profession overlapped with one another so well that it was difficult to say which of them influenced the other. However, the oldest (R7) was sure that his personality had influenced his profession. All of the other architects accepted that their professions influenced their personalities. Even when buying clothes, reported two women architects (R8W, R22W), they found themselves paying attention to harmony of colours, ratios and similar details. Other distinct characteristics which architects emphasised included sensitivity to the environment, an involuntary habit of looking at buildings, being distressed by the irresponsible behaviour of other city-dwellers, finding it easier to make syntheses, developing different sensitivities because of their artistic sides and taking a more aesthetic approach. One of the respondents (R3) summed up these elements as follows: “[t]o pay a bit more attention to detail; to seek happiness in the details of life… I am able to see beauty in things which other people take for granted, and I know how to be happy about it.”

The architects believed that they interpreted the environment in a different way from other people due to their characteristics as architects. Conversely, did the people around them think of them differently because they were architects? This was another question put to those interviewed. One of their commonest complaints was the tendency for people to ask them questions such as what paint they should choose when decorating their homes – rather as everybody

asks about their illnesses when they meet a doctor. One of the architects (R8W) deplored the fact that while architects were always consulted about matters which properly concerned the interior decorator, they were not consulted in their own true field of activity, the construction of buildings.

Particularly after the major earthquake in 1999, architects in İstanbul reported that they had frequently met with questions about the safety of buildings. One architect (R27) told of how his neighbours had not returned to the building in which they lived until they had seen him enter it at the night of earthquake. Another architect complained that people around them tended to ask for material support because they thought of architects like doctors and lawyers as belonging to well-paid professions. One respondent (R1), who was head of the provincial Chamber of Architects, revealed that he felt society expected something of him particularly in terms of influencing local government.

Several architects (R19, R22W, R24W, R26) believed that more attention was paid to what they said as architects. Some other architects, however, took the view that the architect's artistic side was misunderstood and they were expected to display the marginal characteristics that were widely attributed to artists in general, or that other characteristics of theirs which actually stemmed from their personalities were mistakenly attributed to the fact that they were architects. Significantly, two architects (R7, R17) recounted that because they were "ordinary-looking" – that is, they had no beards or ear-rings and generally wore suits and ties – "people are disappointed and tend to ask 'what kind of an architect are you?'"

While some of the architects themselves confessed that architects tended to be of marginal appearance, garrulous, conceited and self-important, other architects noted that they met with one of two different attitudes when they introduced themselves as architects. In the words of one architect (R6W) "[w]hen I say I am an architect, sometimes it

has a benign affect and sometimes a harsh one. Those who look on you harshly are the foreigners. Because they don't know the real situation, they ask you 'was it you who created this [unpleasant urban] environment?' But the Turks say, 'Oh is that what you do? What a great job you have!'" Another architect (R10) reported that he had often heard people say 'I wish I was an architect'. He surmises that the combination of creativity and social involvement makes the architect a figure that responds to many dreams.

This quality of architecture may assist the architect to command respect and put him or her at an advantage in terms of social status. In fact, only seven architects denied that their professions conferred social status. At the same time, of the 24 architects who believed they gained in status, six thought that this advantage was linked simply to the fact that they were university graduates or, in everyday language, "educated people" rather than to the profession of architecture specifically. A similar point had been made by two of the architects in response to earlier questions. These architects (R18W, R21) were the first people in their families to have been educated to reach this level. They took the view that it was not their status as architects but the fact that they had been educated which made them different in their personalities, in the way society perceived them and in their social status.

Factors such as these might influence the ability of architects to communicate with clients and users who are people of very different make-ups from themselves. For this reason, the architects were asked how they struck a common language with their clients and users. Four architects conceded that this was very difficult. One (R11) wondered if this could be the reason for his lack of success in finding work. He suspected that he put people off, possibly as a result of his personality or of the fact that his architect's identity was very prominent. Another architect (R27) described an interesting tactic he used: "I ask them to

find somebody they know in this line of business to act as a kind of control or advisor. I find it easier to relate to such a person. Because we come from the same profession and he's the client's man, they listen to him better."

Two other architects (R20, R21) said that they only explained very simple things and preferred to manipulate in other respects. Some of the other architects (R6W, R23) said they took a technical approach, making use of three-dimensional drawings, animations and models in their explanations, changing their language and not using the specific language of architecture. "I talk just like they do," one architect asserted (R22W), "[t]here is no other way. Then you can make it feel a bit lighter, by using various reference points, even if you don't talk like them completely, you manage not to talk down on them too much. You create a balance and you manage to persuade them." Some architects also said that they were people who naturally formed good relations with other people and used everyday language, and that consequently they experienced no difficulties in this area. "[i]f he is macho, then I am macho too," declared one (R4). For two of the architects working in Kastamonu (R2, R4), this was even easier because they were born and bred there and shared the characteristics of the people of the area.

Some architects spoke of *listening* to the clients first, of *analysing* them and of *permitting* them to include their lives in the project – even to "do a little architecture: themselves", in the words of one architect (R19): "[p]eople are curious about architecture. By making it possible for them to think, 'I thought of this wall' or 'I raised this level', you get them involved in the affair and then they are happier in that space." A very different approach was taken by two architects (R7, R9W), who believed that the client did not need to understand everything, and that the ideas which the client had formed needed to be erased. Both of these architects asserted that they formed good relations with other human beings and that they did not talk didactively. They explained

that “[m]y best jobs have been jobs which the clients didn’t understand. When they understand, they start to make comparisons with something else and then they use this something else to start dictating some things to you. This is very dangerous.” (R7), and “[w]hen they have a visual collage in their minds, it’s dangerous. It’s a bad thing. First you have to zero this. Then you can start putting other things into their heads. In this way, they start to think in the same concepts as you do.” (R9W) To this, another architect (R10) added, “[l]ike a doctor, you mustn’t let your expertise be questioned. I am the person who knows this job. Architecture is my job, not my client’s. I am the judge here, I am the emperor. After that it’s a mutual exchange. You try to learn the good things and get rid of the bad things.”

This architect was the only one who said that if he believed what he was doing was good, he would do it even without having persuaded the client. Other architects reported that if they failed to agree, either they or the client would decide not to go on with the job. But whatever form of dialogue the architects entered into with their clients, when discussing the issue, all of them spoke in condescending terms of “bringing the clients round”, “allowing them” to get involved, “imposing things”, “coming down to their level”. According to one (R14), education or its lack thereof was the biggest obstacle here. For another (R29W), this was the most difficult part of the job, but everybody eventually learned how to do it.

Time teaches everything. As time passes and architects grow older, what changes do they observe in themselves as architects? First of all they all thought that they were more mature. They disliked some of their previous projects and criticised them more easily. “[y]ou start to produce purer products; you develop a more consistent approach, your relations with people develop further,” added one respondent (R5). “[y]ou start to become known,” explained another (R12W). Two architects (R4, R16W) reported that they had become more difficult and

temperamental, and that they did not accept things easily any more. But, on the contrary, the oldest architect (R21) and others (R3, R7) declared that they had become more tolerant. Another architect said that “[i]n my early years as an architect I was very radical and never made compromises, but as time went by I started to make concessions. An increase in self-confidence and greater selectivity figures in the responses of two of the architects interviewed (R19, R20). One of these (R19) who is 54 years old explained: “I have increasingly become self-confident. I used to do jobs which were simple and useful. Now I am doing more fantastic things, with more aesthetic concerns and a higher image ratio. In buildings, it takes years before you can set out your own style and make a statement.” However, there was one architect (R6W) who took quite the opposite position: ”[p]reviously I thought of myself as an artist creating masterpieces but now I also think of myself more of a technical person.”

Similarly, one of the older architects (R1), aged 54, stated that he found it more appropriate to aim at things which were small but achievable rather than to chase after very large goals. The youngest architect interviewed (R23), aged 28, said that his architectural level had risen and his relations with people had started to develop. On the other hand, another architect (R31) took the view that what mattered was not age but how actively one worked. “[t]he more actively you work, the more experience you gain, and the more you knowledge and awareness increases, because you are in touch with more people,” this architect explained, “[a]s a result, you get to know yourself; you come to understand what your limits are.” The most unusual answer to this question came easily from the respondent (R11) who said, “[a]t first I thought it was really important to construct buildings, but now I have started to see the construction of buildings as an atrocity. Constructing buildings should be a last resort; the existing building stock should be

used." This architect added that in a country in which existing buildings were constantly being demolished and even historic buildings could be destroyed, it would be necessary to wait for a series of social changes to take place before his ideas could be put into practice.

In fact, architects in Turkey have been important actors in social transformations since the early years of the Republic, What did today's architects feel about this? Did these architects – who, when defining the architect, constantly emphasised their own relationship with society – think that they should play a part in changing society?

Seven architects felt that architects had no such duty to perform. Another six said that this was a responsibility not only of architects but of everybody who had a sense of responsibility or carried out a profession. They thus agreed that they had a role to perform in social transformation. Eighteen architects unequivocally said that architects should play a part. In all, then, 24 of the architects questioned agreed that they had a duty to influence change in society. In this way, they shared the common understanding of the architects of the Republican period. So what was the main difference between the architects of today and the architects of that period?

In response to this question, three architects said that the difference was the same as the difference between society in those days and society now. In the words of one of these architects (R28W), "[w]hatever the difference is between the teachers of those days and today's teachers, the same difference applies to us too." These architects did not, however, have negative opinions about the architects of the period in question, such as those entertained by two of the architects interviewed. Of these, one (R9W) spoke of the architects of the past as "dictatorship's architects", while the other (R24W) said she preferred the architects of the present day, since "I see a democratic structure today. In spite of all its mistakes and sins and errors, the present era is closer to democracy." Another two

respondents (R3, R25) said that while there might be differences in approach between the architects of the past and those of today, this was mostly a nostalgic approach. Two others (R12W, R22W) were of the opinion that people were more "cultured" today, they were more focused on their real needs, and the architects of today were therefore better than those of the earlier era.

With the exception of these last six, the architects interviewed referred to a series of characteristics of the architects of the Republican period which gave them advantages over their present-day counterparts. To begin with, there were only a few of them and they were given work. They were more knowledgeable and cultured, had very good teachers and were better educated. They had an ideology and a stronger voice in social affairs. Opportunities were opened up for them, they were excited and enthusiastic, and their social status was higher than that of architects today, The buildings of the period were really the work of architects. As representatives of a change of regime, they had a strong sense of duty and a passion for rebuilding and recreating something from nothing. In the words of one architect (R31), "[i]n that era, importance was given to design and very important buildings were constructed. These days, buildings are still seen as important, and ceremonies are held to mark their opening – but the quality of the building no longer matters. The important thing is to finish it quickly. While the schools built in that era all had an architectural value, the schools today are in a deplorable condition." Only one respondent (R10) did not, when comparing the two periods, regard them as completely separate: "[t]oday the concept of society has changed, building technology has changed and even the process of project production has been altered," said this architect, "but from a lot of points of view, you could say that things are not so far removed."

This answer brings us to the question of whether architects in Turkey have and carry a tradition. According to eleven architects, there

was such a tradition; according to 20, there was not. Of those who believed in the existence of a tradition, two (R3, R18W) suggested that tradition was something created by schools and by architectural education. The architects engaged in restoration work opined that there was a tradition but that it was not reflected in the projects that were produced. One respondent (R22W) believed that there were regional traditions, another (R5) that there had been a tradition up until the 1950s but this had been replaced by a *gecekondu (*squatter settlement) tradition from the 1960s onwards. These answers indicate that architects understood the term 'tradition' in a variety of ways. For example, the architect (R10) who denied that there was a major break between the architecture of the Republican period and that of today replied that he did not believe that there was such a thing as an architectural tradition anywhere in the world. Another architect (R7) took the view that every profession constituted a tradition, but saw nothing in Turkey that could be treated as exemplary. For one of the respondents (R28), a tradition existed because "everything is constantly being written on that basis". Yet for another (R30): "The architect cannot have a written tradition, but in Turkey everything has been written down."

Despite the conceptual difficulties, it is possible to extract from these answers the conclusion that the majority of architects did not think that there is an architectural tradition in Turkey. Asked whether architects constituted a homogeneous group, all but one (R5) of those interviewed expressed the view that architects in Turkey differed greatly from one another. Nevertheless, two of the architects (R17, R28W) thought that architects were slightly more homogeneous than members of other professions. As a follow-up, the architects were asked whether they thought architects had a common culture. Again the answers were mainly negative, with six exceptions. Among the architects who thought that a common architectural culture existed, two

(R14, R31) spoke of a certain professional approach, while two others interpreted architectural culture in a different way, reducing it to a matter of approaches to building and design. One of these respondents (R8W) took the view that "[i]n some building divisions, there is apartment culture, or villa culture" while the other (R27) believed that there were "a number of cultures like functionalist, elevationist and so on."

The fact that the great majority of architects questioned (25) felt architects had no common culture made their responses to the question of what constituted the greatest problem in relations among architects themselves all the more interesting. The interviewees produced three categories of reply. One group focused on unfair competition, the second on the lack of professional solidarity and the third on the lack of communication. With respect to professional solidarity, the architects highlighted ideological quarrels, the tendency to regard the professional organisation as an ideological entity, jealousy, lack of criticism, widespread professional selfishness and the unwillingness of anyone to listen to anyone else. Only one respondent (R19) believed that there was no major problem. According to him, "[a]rchitects are a group who have long achieved the tolerance and solidarity which generally originates from this profession."

These words also reflected the speaker's trust in and love of the profession. The final question which the architects were asked was directed towards this point, that is, were they happy or not happy for being an architect? In response, against two who said that they were definitely unhappy, the rest were all very happy. One of the unhappy ones (R25) explained his position as follows: "[p]eople are happy when they find solutions to contradictions. You understand everything; you understand people – but you can't solve their problems. This also means that you can't solve your own problems. For this reason, I am unhappy. I wish I had been a philosopher because, as an individual, I

might have found some solutions. The burden of society is too heavy." The other unhappy architect made the following comment: "I can't say I am very happy, because there are so many things which I haven't been able to intervene in, to take on, to struggle with. I am 46 and my hair is all white." Two other architects (R14, R24W) admitted to feeling unhappy from time to time – having their ups and downs – but stated that there was no other work in which they could do better. They were more happy than unhappy because "I do this job well because I have no professional deformation" (R14).

In summary, this section of the interviews demonstrated that the architects really love their profession, and that being an architect has a great importance for their *habitus*. It provides them with a sense of superiority and a privileged position in terms of social status independent of their economic conditions. These are important aspects of the professional ideology. With age, moreover, the architects said they became freer in their designs and practice. This conclusion is compatible with the other conjecture of the thesis. The architects interviewed were more at peace with the architects of the Republican period than with the theoreticians of architecture. They envied the former because they thought that they had had strong ideals and had been highly valued by the society in which they lived. Moreover, the architects believed that they themselves should be agents of social transformation just like the early Republican architects. The interviews also showed that the architects do not believe in the existence of an architectural tradition or common architectural culture in Turkey. For them, architects are not a homogeneous group. They named the most important problems of the architectural community as unfair competition, a lack of professional solidarity and a lack of communication.

The responses received in this section of the interviews are especially important for showing how, despite the differing answers

given to the questions posed in the preceding sections, the architects share a kind of satisfaction about being an architect. Their identity as architects is the most important part of their lives. This also points to the impact of professional ideology on their *habitus*.

The answers which the architects interviewed gave to all the questions constitute their "feel for the game" within the architectural "*field*" adopted for the purposes of this study in accordance with Bourdieu's definition. It should not be forgotten that most of the differences in their thinking stemmed from their relations, attitudes and positions within that *field*. In this way, these differences made up the *habitus* of the architects.

The purpose of this study is not to set out the different *habitus* but to locate a common *habitus* from among these *habitus* and determine how this determines the *ethos* of architects in Turkey. For this reason, it is important to find the common points. This does not mean that the differences are to be overlooked. The concept of *habitus* is, after all, personal. Differences are an indication that people have different experiences, and that differences in experience operate even at the unconscious level. In the following chapter, the common points will be explained using the seven conjectures of the study. It is hoped that this will serve to clarify the *ethos* of architecture in Turkey.

CHAPTER 5

THE *ETHOS* OF PRACTISING ARCHITECTS IN TURKEY

> What I did was actually nothing individualistically important. I only did what time and my presence has given me. And I just expressed what had to be expressed.
> Mies van der Rohe – Architect (in Cook & Clotz, 1973:181)

Architecture is one of the sciences which create spaces for human life according to their necessities in an aesthetic way. The architect is ideally taken to be an intellectual and an artist who is sensitive and responsible to the physical and social environment.

These are more or less the definitions of architecture and the architect which emerge from the combination of definitions given by the architects who were interviewed.

Again, for them, this is the umbrella under which the architects try to erect the buildings which cover and thus create a space as the product of architecture.

These definitions also denote a specific *field* and a practice which aims at producing something in it. Within this *field* people have a special *habitus* and "by way of aside *habitus* is one principle of production of practices among others and although it is undoubtedly more frequently in play than any other" (Bourdieu, 1990:108). *Habitus* is a set of dispositions and again in Bourdieu's words "[t]here is a strong correlation between social positions and dispositions of the agents who occupy them" (1984:110). It is out of this dialectical relationship between *habitus* and *field* that practices are established. For this reason this piece of research seeks to locate the *habitus* of

architects in order to understand their *ethos* within the *field* of architecture in Turkey.

In this chapter the conjectures given in Chapter 3 will be assessed in the light of the responses of architects interviewed. It is hoped that the corroboration of these conjectures will give us a general idea of what Turkish architects' collective *habitus* is. It has already been mentioned that the collective *habitus* is responsible for shaping the *ethos* of architects in Turkey. Thus with the help of the description of the *ethos* of architects, architectural practice can be understood more clearly in a sociological way.

It should be noted that the interviews consisted of five thematic parts and each part in turn, consisted of various questions on the basis of different conjectures. For this reason the present chapter will examine the conjectures one by one according to the answers given.

Conjecture 1: International influences shape architects' *habitus* through the implication that their practice and architecture in Turkey differ from that of the rest of the world. Apart from certain cultural and economic differences, the development and current state of the architectural profession in Turkey is not significantly different from the development of the architectural profession elsewhere in the world. It is on account of the existing conditions of practical implementation in Turkey that it is thought to be different.

To corroborate this conjuncture, the answers to the questions about the development of architecture in Turkey, the specific characteristics of Turkish architecture, and of the specific crisis which architecture is undergoing today, specific characteristics of the problems of architectural practice in Turkey, the main internal problems of the architectural community, the existence of tradition and a common

architectural culture and the problem of foreign architects are taken into account.

First of all, most of the architects interviewed did not have a good, let alone grasp knowledge of world architecture. This is quite natural if, when engaged in the practical part of the profession, one is not usually interested in the theory or the current affairs of one's *field*. However, all the architects interviewed had some general idea which stems from architectural magazines and the general situation of their country in the world. For this reason what is seen to be different in Turkey by the architects is a lack of the things which they thought exist in the rest of the world. According to the architects the lack of economic and political stability, the lack of a common architectural culture and tradition, the lack of codes of conduct, and lack of continuous responsibility and engagement in the building process are the main differences between Turkish architecture and the world's architecture.

However, as Conjecture 1 posits, there is no doubt that the existing differences are due to the economy and the culture of the country and moreover there is a difference in implementation of the practice.

In the light of these arguments, the architects interviewed actually corroborated the first conjecture of this piece of research.

First, for example, for most of the architects interviewed, the main driving force in architectural changes in the country and also the reason for today's architectural crisis is the country's economic situation. Interestingly enough, while comparing their country with the rest of the world, the architects usually mentioned things which are directly related to the economy such as the accumulation of capital, technology, stability, the financial power of architects, and so on. This means that they saw their differences on the basis of the economy, which is one of the arguments of the first assumption of the thesis.

Secondly, when the architects named the problems of the practice in Turkey, they spoke of the lack of awareness on the part of the

Turkish people about the built environment and the lack of knowledge about the importance of architects. Moreover the architects did not believe that there is as yet an architectural tradition and a shared architectural culture in Turkey. Clearly, they assumed that these tendencies are all present in architectural practice taking place in the rest of the world. In doing so they were already verifying another argument of the first conjecture of the thesis which accepts that there are cultural differences which depend on the specific character of the country.

Thirdly, there were some specific practical implementations in Turkey that were thought to be different. Political interventions in the cities, lack of general planning in the construction industry and the lack of standards were mentioned as factors in this context.

However, while the architects were answering questions about the possible effects of foreign architects on the profession they expected positive changes if good architects start to come on the scene. At this point it can be said that they also accepted that there were bad architects too in the rest of the world. For this reason they never mentioned the backwardness of Turkish architecture or that architecture in Turkey was totally different in style or in building technology, or that it was underdeveloped or incompetent. Their complaints mostly stemmed from the different economic situation of the country in which they continue their practice.

Moreover, according to the architects interviewed, the internal problems of the architectural community such as lack of solidarity, unfair competition and lack of communication, are also the main complaints raised by world architects as they were declared in the Twenty-second World Congress of Architecture. So it can be said that, in that sense, there is no difference between the Turkish architects and the world architects.

At the Twenty-second World Congress of Architecture it was also stressed that there was a gap in architectural practice between the countries of the “first world” and those of the “third world.” This means that there are many countries in the world sharing a similar economic situation and architectural practice with Turkey. Moreover architects from the “first world“ also mentioned the responsibility of architecture towards culture and the environment, which implies that the destruction of the environment and culture through implementations is a universal issue. If squatter settlements are an issue in the developing countries, homelessness is an issue in the developed countries. Even the star architects of the world themselves could not stop mentioning the social problems of the built environment.

Why is it, then, that in Turkey there is a widespread understanding that Turkish architecture is different from architecture in the rest of the world? The most important point here is that when the architects interviewed compare their country with the rest, the only measuring rod is the West. This shows the unconscious level of the architects’ *habitus* also shaped by being a citizen of a country which has committed itself to western values (however ambiguous they are) since the 19th century. On the other hand, especially in Turkey’s intellectual circles, after the military coup of 1980 –a date also mentioned by most of the architects- a turning point in discourse emerged which asserts briefly that modernisation in Turkey was carried out by the state in a top-down manner and all the problems encountered today are the outcome of this particular historical experience. Shortly known as the “second republic” school of thought, this approach was transposed on architecture particularly by architectural historians. As discussed in Chapter 2, it is asserted that architects in Turkey adopted the ideology of the nation-state during the process of constructing modernity and since they employed architecture towards the same end, they remained dependent on the state, resulting in failure to create an independent

architectural discipline in the absence of an architectural avant-garde in Turkey. Such ideas have usually led to the conclusion that, because of a rupture in all sections of society, there is a lack of continuous tradition alongside a discontinuity in the culture of the country. The application of this assumption to architecture might be one of the reasons why Turkish architects claim that there is no architectural tradition in Turkey. However, as some of the architects interviewed also mentioned, it was particularly the 1950s, with its rapid urbanisation and migration as a result of different economic policies which also sparked off the destruction of historical and environmental values. Interestingly, a detailed analysis of this period is still lacking in the case of architectural historians.

On the other hand, these approaches are “eurocentric” ones which evaluate issues solely or predominantly from the point of view of the West. Thus the conditions and development of the West is taken for granted and Turkish modernisation is seen formulaically as a top-down process, while differences between Turkey and Europe are regarded as negative. If the inevitable cultural superiority of the West is added on top of this, it can be seen that all developments in the West can in no time be imported into Turkey. Architecture too, is not immune to this cultural besiegement. All lectures at universities, and almost all publications are based on Western architectural styles and the developments in Western architecture. Although the situation has recently begun to change, especially as Japanese architecture and architects started to become more influential in the architectural circles of the world and of Turkey, students in Turkish universities are still taught the history of architecture from a predominantly western point of view.

The architects in Turkey are affected by this climate, and their *habitus* is shaped by international and, especially by Western influence.

This situation leads them to think that architecture in general and, in particular, the practice of architecture are different in Turkey.

However, the architects interviewed were not able to see that there is a "professional ideology" of architects more or less the same all around the world and that this spontaneous ideology strongly ties them to their colleagues who live and work in different countries. This concept of professional ideology leads us to the second conjecture of this thesis.

Conjecture 2: If we may talk of a spontaneous professional ideology of architects, such ideology forces them to think in a specific way about space, the sovereignty of architecture, its art component, its legitimacy, the architects' devotion to their profession, the superiority of architects over their clients and users as well as their codes of conduct i.e. their *ethics*. This ideology is formed with the aid of education, existing organisations and current international influences and it increases the architects' 'symbolic capital' in the *field*.

Discussing science and scientists, Louis Althusser writes of a "spontaneous philosophy of scientists" (*SPS*), arguing that "the SPS bears only on the ideas (conscious or unconscious) that scientists have of the scientific practice of the sciences and of 'Science'. (…) the content of the SPS is *contradictory*" (1990:132). For Althusser, the materialist tendency of this *SPS* is internal and it "represents 'convictions or beliefs' stemming from the experience of scientific practice itself in its everyday immediacy: it is 'spontaneous'" (ibid). Especially this part of the *SPS* is important when one is trying to understand a specific *habitus* in a certain *field*. The second part of the *SPS* is the idealist part which is "manufactured by philosophers or scientists". In architecture this part comes from the education process,

which will be discussed in the third assumption. In this assumption the "materialist" tendency of the *SPS* will be examined for architects under different subtitles. From now on, this thesis will use the term "spontaneous professional ideology" (SPI), synonymously with Althusser's *SPS*, in recognition of the difference between scientific practice and architectural practice.

However, before that it should be specifically noted that all the architects who were interviewed denied the existence of a professional ideology when they were directly asked about it. It might be interesting to consider this point as a sign that at an unconscious level of their *habitus*, ideology has negative connotations, as in the case for most Turkish people, and especially after 1980. However, this ideology or "'convictions or beliefs' stemming from the experience of practice itself in its everyday immediacy", as Althusser puts it, emerged in their answers to various other questions. For this reason it might have been interesting to find out why the architects did not accept their convictions and beliefs to be grouped under the epithet of 'ideology', and expressly denied the existence of a professional ideology when directly asked about it.

Moreover, the *SPI* of architects also serves the accumulation of what is known as 'symbolic capital' by the architects in the *field*. Bourdieu describes 'symbolic capital' as follows:

> [s]ymbolic capital is an ordinary property (...) which, perceived by social agents endowed with the categories of perception and appreciation permitting them to perceive, know and recognise it, becomes symbolically efficient, like a veritable magical power: a property which, because it responds to socially constitute 'collective expectations' and beliefs, exercises a sort of action from a distance, without physical contact (1998:102).

Moreover "the last important characteristic of is that symbolic capital is common to all members of a group" (ibid:103).

Perceiving the world differently with the eyes of an architect and being perceived by the same world distinctly as architect is confers superiority, prestige and honour on architects regardless of their consciousness whatever their economic and cultural differences may be.

Following these brief explanations, each aspect of the professional ideology can now be discussed individually.

The Specific Perception of Space: As discussed in Chapter 2, space is very important in human life. Not only its usage but also its symbolic and ideological meanings have great shaping impact on human relations. All of the architects interviewed, save one, agreed that spaces are a determinant of human relations and they all were aware of this fact when they were designing buildings. However, as Henri Lefebvre posits, the architects' space is different from the users' space (lived space) and usually dominant over it, marginalising it. Is this the case? When the architects were asked to define 'space', all of them used such technical terms as 'void', 'volume', 'border' or tried to define it in a somewhat romanticised way such as "it is a framework of life" or "the pieces which the architect steals from indefinite space". It is quite natural for a professional to define something related to his work in professional terms. However, if one provides an aesthetic or quasi-aesthetic definition it implies that one is also charging the term with different meanings. In other words, if an architect does not define space as merely "a living place" in the way ordinary people often do, it means that the architect possesses a different understanding with the term. This became evident through other questions. Although for all the architects interviewed the main criterion for shaping space were the users, with their demand, their needs and the functions of the space, many architects also found it necessary to mention the aesthetic dimensions of space. Moreover they used the concepts of space and

building interchangeably or, as Lefebvre (1998:361) suggests, “graphic tendencies such as plans, elevations, sections, perspective views and modules”. Of course this is understandable; however, when the time comes for users to use that space according to their own wishes, the architects were saddened, angered or at least felt discomfort.

If the user is unknown, most of architects used an average user which Lefebvre designates; “everyone - and no one” (ibid: 362). The majority of architects also explained that they use themselves some criteria and they always thought as if they would live in the space which they were designing. One reason for their disappointment might be that their design is also the product of their own desires. Moreover when they enter any space which has been created by others they are critical of, various aspects of that space distract them, and, as some admitted, they feel a “professional deformation”, an inclination to see something negative.

Thus, it can be said that Lefebvre was right when he said that the experts’ space is different from the lived (users’) space and it dominates the latter. These differences are mostly the product of the “consciously or unconsciously” held *SPI* of architects in “everyday immediacy”.

The Sovereignty of Architecture: In the theoretical discussion of this thesis in Chapter 2, the belief in the sovereignty of architecture among architectural theoreticians was highlighted several times. What it implies is that architecture could have been an autonomous enterprise or at least semi-autonomous one. It was also a main criticism directed against the ‘Republican Era’ architecture by architectural historians for its [supposed] docile acceptance of the ideology of the new State which was held to be the primary reason why the discipline of architecture in Turkey failed to become autonomous. Regarding this, the architects were asked three questions: “*Can architecture be an autonomous*

discipline?", "Can an understanding of architecture different from that of the architects' world view be formed?" and "*Is the field of responsibility of architecture separate from the social field of responsibility?".* Interestingly the architects questioned strongly opposed the idea that architecture could be autonomous. An architectural sensibility and responsibility distinct from social responsibility they considered impossible while agreeing that there cannot be an architectural approach independent from the worldview of architects. A strange conclusion was reached on this point regarding such disbelief shown by architects themselves towards the sovereignty of architecture. However this situation strongly confirms the ideas put forward by Magali Sarfatti-Larson, that "the appearance of detachment and 'pure' intellectual commitments is more marked in academic circles than in the consulting professions" (1977:XV). Nor this is all. The architects still see the state as the biggest employer and they also want the state to regulate the building market and define the clear role of the architect in it for the sake of the country in a largely volatile global environment. The nation-state is still seen as the foremost authority to give back to architects the erstwhile privileges which they now have lost. When asked to compare themselves with the 'Republican Era' architects they expressed belief that those architects were probably more respected in the society of their day due to the high esteem of their profession, and the vast majority also expressed positive feelings about them. Moreover, the architects still hold that the architect ought to be an actor of social transformation as early Republican architects once were. Again, here one detects a contradiction between the "academic circles" and "consulting professions".

On the other hand this does not mean that the "consulting profession" has no belief whatsoever in the sovereignty of architecture. Most of them answered affirmatively the question as to whether good architecture could change something in the social order. The reason for

this is because they hold that space has a power over human relationships. It can be said that their professional ideology leads them to 'convictions and beliefs' stemming from the materiality of their architectural practice.

The Art Component of Architecture: A separate question about the art component of architecture was not included in the interviews and this was a conscious preference. It was hoped that the unconscious level of the architects' *habitus* could be revealed by posing special questions about their professions' different components. Their preference to work as self-employed architects provides the first clues: they wanted to be independent, they dislike authority and they think that their personal characteristics are suitable for such independence. Moreover, they saw the most important disadvantage of being self-employed as necessarily engaging in the financial part of the business. These are the typical artistic approaches but on the other hand the architects could not situate their social position either as a worker, or as an employer.

As Ali Artun's second hypothesis suggests, they had their offices "not so much as the result of a capitalist process as of an artisan" and "the labour of the owner of the office is the determining factor" (1999:123). The architects interviewed too, insisted on their manual labour during the building process and this was not so much a complaint as the expression of what was seen as a necessary task.

If the actual building did not match the building they had imagined and designed, the architects mostly tend to blame themselves rather than any other actor involved in the building process. This shows that they view their building as an 'artistic product' which should wholly belong to its creator. This can be proved by their disappointment when the user alters the space the architect designed; some architects even mentioned that they sought legal sanctions against such cases.

Moreover, they could not easily name which of their buildings they liked best and used the word ‘children’ metaphorically to refer to them. If these are not enough for the architect to be counted as an artist, it should also be added that half of all the architects interviewed thought that architectural education requires special talent. They also mention different architectural styles which influence them. In their practice they are aiming at architecture which has more character, is more aesthetic, and at making a name for themselves by creating a work which will be noticed by others and which might prove lasting. These are not only the wishes of a ‘professional’ but also the wishes of an ‘artist’.

As already discussed in Chapter 2, the art component of architecture is an ideological preference, especially since architects lost their privileged place in society to engineers in the modern era. For this reason their *SPI* bears this preference, consciously or unconsciously, in every aspect of their practice.

The Architects’ Devotion to Architecture: The architects interviewed appear to love their profession. This is more than the love of duty. As Ali Artun posits in his fourteenth hypothesis, “the architect is the present-day symbol of the artisan’s devotion to his or her craft” (1990:128). As previously mentioned, architects speak of their work as if it is their children and for most of them the role of the architect, for better or worse, is the most important role in their lives. They frankly admit that their profession influences their personalities. Moreover, they are very well aware that the people around them take them special because of being an architect. This lends them an advantageous social status. All the architects except one felt very happy for being an architect, and those who were optimistic about the future of their profession expressed their feelings with sentences such as “art never dies”.

All this is closely related to the supposed component of art in architecture. The architects overall saw themselves as artists and as discussed above under the art component of architecture as also a part of their *SPI*. On the other hand, as Ali Artun suggests, “the architects regard this devotion as a form of superiority” (1990:128) which finds its reflection in the relationship with clients and users.

Superiority of Architects Over Clients and Users: This concept of superiority relates to the understanding of space, the sovereignty of architecture and the claim to art component of architecture. Therefore, while it will be discussed under a different subtitle, the comments made under other subtitles should also be borne in mind. The architects normally resent interference in their work. As one architect puts it, “it shows that people did not even realise how much care and effort the architect had put in”. Extremely put in the words of another architect, the architect “is the judge there, he is the emperor on that subject”. For this reason, when discussing the issue all of the architects spoke in condescending terms about “bringing the customers round”, “allowing them” to get involved, “imposing things”, “coming down to the clients’ or users’ level” and therefore unconsciously expressed their feelings of superiority over clients and users. Nevertheless, as it was seen in Kastamonu’s architects, living in a small city and being one of “them”, a native of that city, gives the architect some advantages. Some architects from other cities could not help mentioning how having a modest personality makes it unnecessary for them to try to find different means of communication. This shows that architects are actually quite aware of their sense of superiority over their clients. This feeling of superiority expresses itself on another issue of the architect’s *SPI*: the legitimacy of their profession in the building industry.

The Legitimacy of the Architectural Profession: In Chapter 2, it was explained how the emergence of different fields of specialisation in the construction sector have affected the area of activity of architecture and limited the scope of architecture to building design. Architects, however, have a claim to city planning, urban design, landscape design and interior design. While this thesis was being written, a big struggle had started between the Chamber of Architects and the board of directors of TMMOB (Turkish Union of Engineers' and Architects' Chambers), which had decided to take the responsibility for these services away from the Chamber of Architects. The Chamber of Architects Central Executive Board accused the TMMOB Central Executive Board for "hurting the culture of democracy, awareness of civilisation, the guidance of science, the rights of the artist and the benefit of society by 'erasing' some fundamental aspects of 'architecture' from the article regarding the 'definition of architectural services' in the guideline which regulates the architectural services offered by the Chamber of Architects" (*MimarlıkHaberler* [Architecture Bulletin], 2005: 2-3). As seen in Chapter 2, legitimacy is a struggle for power. Aydan Balamir claims that the weapons used in this struggle for power are claims to have in possession superior knowledge and a superior moral code (1996:25). In their collective struggle the Chamber of Architects carries out its task as it has always seen it. What the individual architects think about this matter is important however. Amongst the thirty one architects interviewed, only nine of them thought that specialisation was necessary and something positive. When asked directly, the majority of architects share the viewpoint of their Chamber. For the majority of the architects, a general architectural education should be given first, and different kind of specialisation areas should be chosen for postgraduate education. Moreover, in the answers they gave to another question about spaces of everyday life, they all claimed that all public spaces including streets, parks and

houses should be at the heart of architecture. Different specialisations in these areas were considered artificial. It can therefore be said that the *SPI* of architects does not let them accept the reality of the world today because of their claim to have “superior knowledge and superior moral code“ with respect to the built environment.

The Codes of Conduct. i.e. the *ethics* of Architects: What does the “superior moral code” of architects consist of? Interestingly enough, none of the architects interviewed expressed any belief in the existence of an *ethics* of architects in Turkey. However, as again discussed in Chapter 2, theoreticians too do not agree about what kind of *ethics* the architects have. For some it involves history and society and for others only the design process. *Ethics* related to the producer and *ethics* related to the product are also discussed. The former include the principles for the conduct of professional activities, the responsibilities of architects towards society and the members of other professions, and questions of professional honour and conscience, as Aydan Balamir puts it. The latter is design *ethics*, related to the theoretical base of architecture (Balamir, 1996:26). Yet, all theoreticians agree that an *ethics* a concerning social responsibility is not the sure guarantee of good design.

As the replies of the architects have revealed, however, the question of *ethics* is largely seen as a subjective matter, depending directly on the *habitus* of architects; therefore it cannot be separated from the worldview of the architects. There was no evidence of a concept of architectural responsibility independent of social responsibility. All of the architects interviewed said that they had their own rules and similar rules also applied to different aspects of their lives. Moreover, they felt to be accountable neither to their design process, nor to history, nor to environment, taken separately. They felt that all these responsibilities were inseparable. On the other hand, out

of the thirty one interviewees fourteen said they felt responsible towards their clients. From this answer it can be deduced that they can be flexible with some of their rules depending on the wishes of their clients. This was revealed when they explained the compromises they made; sometimes with aesthetic and design freedoms and occasionally doing the unthinkable in order to comply with the planning regulations, etc. Here again there is a contradiction between the "academic circles" and the "consulting profession" in Magali Sarfatti-Larson's words. Actually, according to Althusser, the contradiction is between the materialist and idealist tendencies of the *SPS* (in our case, *SPI*). The idealist component is external to the scientist's practice, "a reflection on scientific practice by means of philosophical theses elaborated outside this practice and (...) manufactured by philosophers and scientists" (1990:133). In the case of architects this idealist tendency is the product of academic circles and educational institutions as well as their social and cultural background. This brings us to the question of the effects of architectural education on the *habitus* of architects thus the third conjecture of this thesis.

Conjecture 3: Architectural education plays an important role in the formation of this professional ideology (*SPI*). Graduation from different educational institutions does not result in differences in professional ideology but in differences in the degrees and types of knowledge and know-how used in the implementation phase of professional practice. Education provides the 'cultural capital' of the architects in the *field.*

Necdet Teymur writes that "those who see architecture as a discipline of design and building tend to emphasise the study of it, while those who see architecture primarily as professional practice of designing and building emphasise the doing of it" (1992:17). The

tension between the discipline and the profession as well as the position occupied by the universities in this context has resulted, as Teymur also points out, in the adaptation of different approaches by different universities. Moreover Ali Artun posits in his tenth hypothesis that architectural education in Turkey is "based on an imported model, on a model of education which parallels a different manner of organisation of the social and technical division of labour" (1999:127). This also increases the effects of international influences on the *habitus* of architects. The preparation of students for their place in the market is the first step towards their professionalisation. In this context, while being trained as professionals, students are also indirectly equipped with certain assumptions, attitudes and expectations regarding their profession. The architects who were interviewed gave evidence of this when explaining the image of the architect that they had had in their minds when they were students. For most of them an architect was a person who designed and built a structure and then handed over the keys to the users. This architect's main concerns were artistic and aesthetic. As professionals however, while most of the architects still carry this ambition, they have complaints about working with contractors and having to work for money. This is one of the signs that they have internalised the basic assumptions and perceptions of the education they received.

Most architects chose architectural education consciously. However, they were constrained in their choice of school by their level of achievement in the university entrance exam. Most of them believed that they had the artistic ability and talent which they considered useful for architectural education. But talent was not enough. They also had to work hard in accordance with the different approaches their schools adopted with the help of the teacher who influenced them most; usually a first-year teacher. This proves that architectural education, being an "education without any book" in Arif Şentek's words (2005:54), needs a

greater pedagogical approach, especially in the early years. The architects tended to define the teachers who influenced them most mainly through their personal characteristics. This kind of approach helped them to overcome the difficulties of an unconventional education although they were in different architectural schools.

The architects were very well aware of the particular characteristics of their schools. For example ITU graduates emphasised the technical and engineering dimensions, GSA (now MSÜ) graduates of the artistic aspects, METU graduates the theoretical and abstract approaches and GÜ graduates the attention given to detail in their respective education systems. Interestingly, the disadvantages of all the schools seem to be the lack of knowledge of other dimensions, such as the ITU graduates' lack of artistic dimensions and the MSÜ graduates' lack of technical dimensions etc. There was an obvious satisfaction with all schools except SÜ. This is a sign that schools have an impact on architects' attitudes towards the profession by providing them with different approaches to architecture. For this reason, although the architects denied the existence of an architectural tradition in Turkey, it can be said that different architectural schools follow different traditions in raising their students, and this creates a school based tradition in that it is quite possible to speak of a METU or an ITU tradition.

On the other hand, all of the architects agreed that the part of their education which they felt to be most inadequate was the practical dimension, ignorance of the structure of the construction market and of planning legislation. This is in parallel with Ali Artun's words in his tenth hypothesis that an important part of knowledge acquired by architects in the course of their professional education goes unused and has no practical outcome. This is because the education given is not in harmony with the real state of economic relations (1999:127).

The architects interviewed strongly agreed that the increase in the number of architectural schools led to a decrease in the quality of the

practised profession. Schools lacking in good academic staff and infrastructure produce poorly qualified graduates and these less qualified architects cheapen the profession. Here, professional ideology, spontaneous or not, is again at work. Regardless of the school they had graduated from, all architects thought that architecture should be a distinctive, high-quality profession. Combining this thought with other aspects of the spontaneous professional ideology, that is the specific way of thinking about space, the concept of sovereignty of architecture, its art component, its legitimacy, the architects' devotion to their profession, the superiority of architects over clients and their code of conduct; it can be said that the concept of a distinctive, high-quality profession is provided by schools of architecture, regardless of the different ways in which they use knowledge and know-how in the implementation of professional practice.

Schools are also important for the production of architectural theory. Academic members of each school make a contribution to the discipline according to their own ideological approaches and their teaching parallels their ideas. If we again think of what Althusser wrote regarding *SPS*, this is the idealist tendency of the architects' *SPI* and it dominates the spontaneous materialist tendency in this particular *SPI* in every sense. For this reason it has a great impact on the *habitus* of architects.

Education is also the architect's 'cultural capital', although an increase in the accumulation of this capital can be provided by their material practice too because of the very nature of the profession.

Conjecture 4: The organisation of architects plays an important role in fortifying the professional ideology, operating both spontaneously and consciously, and spreading international influences. Organisation also increases to the 'symbolic capital' of the architects.

Despite some reservations and critiques, all the architects who were interviewed expressed belief in the importance of organisations for solving the practical and internal problems of the architectural community and gaining legitimacy for the profession in the eyes of the public, the state as well as members of other professions.

As mentioned in Chapter 2, the Turkish Chamber of Architects is the heir to a long tradition of professionalisation of architecture in Turkey which dates back to the Ottoman period. However this process was not limited to the bare interests of the profession.

According to architectural historian Sibel Bozdoğan, the first Ottoman Association of Engineers and Architects (1909 – 1922), unlike its Western counterparts, was not concerned about determining professional standards. Nor was it interested in achieving a monopoly in the construction market (2001:32). According to another architectural historian, Gülsüm Baydar-Nalbantoğlu, this was because Ottoman engineers and architects at the turn of the century viewed their alliance in predominantly idealistic terms – a "technologism" consistent with the politics of the modernist constitutional government - and therefore owed more to political consciousness than professional consciousness (1998:117). This "idealism" continued in the nation-building process of the young Republic in which the architects of the period saw themselves as to be the "agents of civilisation" (Bozdoğan, 2001:100) or an "intellectual leader to guide our social life" (ibid:173). Bozdoğan notes that the Chamber of Architects became a voice of opposition in the political arena after the 1960s and she approves it, regarding it as a part of the reaction to the official cultural norms of the early Republic (ibid:301).

However, it appears more plausible to treat the interest of architects' organisations in politics of Turkey as a continuous professional tradition. It is probably for this reason that the practising architects who were interviewed did not share the notion of a "pure"

architectural responsibility independent of the field of social responsibility and an understanding of architecture independent of the worldview of the architect, held by theoreticians. Organisational influence is an important factor in this issue as part of the professional ideology consciously held or not. However, it cannot be denied that the architects want their current organisations to dwell more on their professional issues as well.

Organisation affects the professional ideology of the architects not only through its tradition of engagement in politics but also as an institutional member of international organisations (Union of International Architects: UIA), it brings the international debate within the profession to Turkey. The Turkish Chamber of Architects has free monthly publications for its members. These bulletins report the current debates and events, competitions and new approaches both in Turkey and in the international arena and thereby in some way or another affect the *habitus* of architects. As one of the main sources of professional ideology, it helps to increase the accumulation of 'symbolic capital' of the professionals in one way or another. For this reason, the architects in Turkey expect their Chamber to take a close interest in their problems.

Conjecture 5: Architects' social and economic relations are differentiated according to the region and the city in which they carry out their professional practice.

This piece of research was carried out in six different provinces located in different regions of the country. The city in which architects live and work is an important tendency of their *habitus*. Different cities create different positions to be occupied by agents and institutions in the *field* of architecture, and this gives the agents the possibility of employing many strategies through which they can maintain and

advance their positions in the same *field*. As explained in Chapter 4, the architects are very well aware of the advantages and disadvantages their city provides and imposes on them. According to these architects, the most important factors in obtaining work are political and religious kinship and good relations with private businesses, state organisations and local governments. In other words, clientelism is very much at work in business in Turkey. Different cities supply some or all of these factors to varying degrees. The most satisfied architects in this respect lived in the smallest city covered by this study, Kastamonu. The architects in Bursa and İstanbul were next two, although they had complaints. This shows that in the case of Kastamonu, if the city does not receive migration, if it has noticeable cultural and tourism characteristics, if the number of professionals is limited and if the architects enjoy good relations with the inhabitants and the authorities which is so essential, their businesses can run well. For example, all the architects interviewed in Kastamonu appreciated the work of the former governor of the city and the way in which his works affected their work too.

For the architects interviewed, the second most important factor in obtaining work is references made to their existing projects. It is easier to attain a good reputation in a small circle than in a big one. This might be another reason for the current satisfaction of architects with Kastamonu. Moreover, in small cities people might be more satisfied with small gains. For example a criterion used by Kastamonu architects to describe their satisfaction is owning a house and a car. However, as the architects in İstanbul explained, if the pie is as big as it is in İstanbul, people expect to get a bigger share of it. For this reason "owning a house and a car" does not satisfy the architects in the big cities although they possess these things. This essentially means that big city architects' *habitus* differs somewhat from that of architects living and working in other cities. This is also a proof of the fact that

architects do not form a homogeneous group in economic and cultural spheres of life.

On the other hand, most unsatisfied architects were from Konya and Ankara. The foremost complaints of architects in Konya were people's ignorance of architecture and having to live in a closed society. This is understandable from the point of view of architecture but the complaints about Ankara were quite different from these. Architects living and working in Ankara mentioned the diversity of the city –not on the same scale as İstanbul, of course - and the opportunities in the public sector. For most of them Ankara was a "smaller city" in comparison with İstanbul and this was seen as a major disadvantage. The truth is Ankara is the second largest city and the capital of Turkey. This attitude brings to mind the so called somewhat futile Ankara – İstanbul rivalry which has its place in the collective memory of the Turkish people; Ankara is often viewed as the official, "boring" city of the Republic. As citizens of Turkey and as intellectuals, it was impossible for the architects interviewed to be unaware of this definition of Ankara, and their *habitus* probably bore unconscious marks of this. It is for this reason that the architects in Ankara who actually live in a big city - as Ankara certainly is - but have a conception of it as a small city appear to be unsatisfied, although architects who actually do live in small cities are more satisfied.

It may also be argued that the satisfaction of architects simply depends on their work portfolio. If they have work enough to allow them to lead their lives according to their wishes, they are usually satisfied with the city in which they live and work. However, as getting work depends on the opportunities offered by the city, it would not be wrong to suggest that the "city" is an important factor in differentiating the architects' social and economic relations. Moreover, as seen in the case of İstanbul architects, the city's different physical and social conditions affect the product. Among all architects it was those who live

and work in İstanbul who talked most about the solidity of buildings against earthquakes as a standard of design, due to the experience of the earthquake catastrophe of 1999. In İstanbul and Bursa, which receive intense internal migration, one of the most important complaints concerned the irregular urbanisation process, negatively affecting architectural practice.

In short, it can be said that different cities have differential impacts on the *habitus* of the architects.

Conjecture 6: The criteria which architects employ in their professional practice alter with age. This fact causes differentiation in the accumulation of 'economic', 'cultural' and 'symbolic' capitals in the *field.*

This assumption is also very instrumental for understanding another variable in Bourdieu's formulation of practice: (*habitus*) (capital) + *field* = practice (1989:101). It was assumed that the accumulation of the three types of capital identified by Bourdieu (namely economic, cultural and symbolic) would increase with age. Moreover the position of the agents in the *field* might become firmer. Only one question was asked the architects regarding this; that as time passed and they grew older, what changes did they observe in themselves as architects? At first sight the answers seemed only to suggest that they became more mature. However, as they continued to talk, they began to give clues regarding the accumulation of such capitals. They frequently used sentences in the form "I can (or cannot) do (...) at my age" while giving answers to other questions. In other words, depending on their age, there are things or compromises they cannot accept or they can make, and so on. It can be said that in this manner age gave them more freedom in design and choice of works. Yet the most striking differences between the older and younger architects was that the

older were more satisfied with their lives and the younger had more ambition with which to work toward their goals. The youngest architect interviewed, aged twenty-eight, wanted to gain recognition throughout Turkey, while the oldest said he was now more tolerant in the face of everything.

However, it must be admitted that there should have been more questions in the interviews to get a clearer outcome. The only outcome of this question was the generation gap, which is quite natural for every segment of society.

On the other hand, although it cannot be generalised, it was observed that the youngest woman architect (aged thirty-four) had less complaints about the implementation of the practice. This might be explained by the increasing acceptance of working women in society with the increase in the number of women in every *field* with the passage of time.

Nevertheless, the most important conclusion which could be drawn from this assumption is that all architects, despite their differences in age, carry their professional identity in the same way. All their answers pointed to this. This is the power of the education they received over their *habitus*.

Conjecture 7: In the architectural profession gender leads to differences in design and practice when seen particularly from the point of view of women architects.

> In my experience, the main difficulty for a woman practising architecture is perhaps more from within than external forces. The difficulties arise from public perceptions of what an architect is, what an architect (male or female) is like, how he or she should behave and what a Chinese woman is supposed to do (Ho, Denise, 2005:585).

These are the words of a Chinese woman architect who practices in Hong Kong. However, similar words could have come from any of the Turkish woman architects who were interviewed. Because they all agreed that the differences between male and female architects are in the implementation stage of the building process, and problems often arise from being a working woman, rather than an architect.

The woman architects were also very well aware of feminist theories regarding gender differences in architectural practice. However, they did not agree with the assumption that women and men had different design approaches. According to them, these differences come from different life experiences, and, after all, design is a personal matter.

Although they agreed that they experience some difficulties, especially when dealing with workers on the construction site, they again stress that this is due to being seen as a woman rather than an architect in the eyes of male workers, and that the problems disappear once they have proved their proficiency after a short “examination” period. None of them complained about the difficulty of finding work due to gender discrimination. One of them even said that clients were more content to work with a woman architect. Eleven woman architects were interviewed and it was observed that they did not solely engage in small-scale projects like housing but some of them were also experts on large-scale projects such as office buildings, hotels and ports.

On the other hand, although it was observed that woman architects are more likely to mention the concepts of light and airiness as defining the quality of space and seemed more likely to favour specialisation in the construction in the building industry, this cannot necessarily be said to be a result of their gender. There were men who fit into this category and women who did not. Also there were no significant differences between men and women architects in the replies given to any of the other questions included in the interviews.

The acceptance of the idea of the sensitivity of women in architecture may stem from the fact that there are fewer woman architects working on large-scale projects. Semra Teber who does engage in large-scale projects as a woman, admits that “in architectural design, it is easier to refer to ‘feminine sensitivity’ because of the smaller scale. Still the sex of a project remains to be questioned and investigated” (2005:587). Small scale projects like housing easily fit in with the assumption that the house belongs to the woman and this might constitute a perception in the eyes of the public and of woman architects themselves that woman architects design better houses because of their sensitivity to needs which they know better.

Here again, it is seen that there is a contradiction between the theory and the practice of architecture. Practising women architects were aware of the difficulties of being a working woman in a male-dominated society but like their Chinese counterpart they saw this as one of the difficulties of architectural practice related to “external forces”. Moreover most of the woman architects even reacted against being called a “woman architect”. For them an architect is an architect, and the problems they experience are a part of architectural practice as a whole. This outlook of the woman architects who were interviewed and the contradiction it poses to the feminist theories of architecture can also be explained in another way. The professional ideology, that is *SPI* of architects, may be so strong that it prevails above the gender aspects of woman architects. In other words, the problems that a woman architect faces are the problems of being female in society but not of being a woman architect. Quite interestingly, many male architects also share this idea.

With the seventh conjecture, the corroboration of the conjectures of this thesis is complete. As has been outlined, the *habitus* of architects in the field of architectural practice is shaped with the help of their

gender, their age, their locus of practice – i.e. the city where they work, the schools from which they graduated, the influence of their organisations, and international influences and their spontaneous professional ideology (*SPI*).

The formulation of these factors in the seven conjectures of the thesis and their corroboration through the interviews provide the opportunity to understand the collective *habitus* of the practising architects and hence their *ethos*. However, as has already been seen, within the same *field* of architecture it is possible to speak of the different dispositions of academicians or theoreticians and practitioners. Moreover, as Chapter 4 reveals, every architect has his or her own peculiarities. The question remains: how can it be possible to generalise the output of these seven conjectures as a collective *habitus* of architects in Turkey? Bourdieu explains this situation as follows:

> Though it is impossible for all members of the same class (or even two of them) to have had the same experiences, in the same order, it is certain that each member of the same class is more likely than any member of another class to have been confronted with the situation most frequent for the members of that class (1977:85).

For this reason it is possible to identify the collective *habitus* of the individuals within the same *field*. Moreover, again, in Bourdieu's words: "In fact the singular *habitus* of members of the same class are united in a relationship of homology, that is, of diversity within homogeneity characteristics of their social conditions of production" (1990:60).

What is then this homogeneity of *habitus*?

> The homogeneity of *habitus* is what within the limits of the group of agents possessing the schemes (of production and interpretation) implied in their production – causes practices and works to be immediately intelligible and foreseeable, and hence taken for granted (Bourdieu, ibid:80).

The homogeneity of architects' *habitus* is mostly provided by their *SPI*. According to Althusser,

> [w]e understand this term (SPS) in a very strict and limited sense. By SPS we understand not the ideas that the scientists have about the world (i.e., their 'world-view') but only the ideas they have (consciously or unconsciously) concerning their scientific practice and science (1990:132).

On the other hand, Althusser says the *SPS* and worldviews are "united by profound ties". The responses of the architects then showed that there was no architectural understanding independent of their worldview. But Althusser also insisted that "they can and must be distinguished. The SPS bears only on the ideas (conscious or unconscious) that scientists have of the scientific practice of the sciences and of 'Science'" (ibid). Thus in the *SPI* of architects is similarly about their practice and of "architecture". For this reason it is possible to ignore the differences among the personal *habitus* of architects and speak of a collective *habitus* although the social world, and its structures do not impose themselves uniformly on all actors.

By accepting the *SPI* as the homogeneity of the *habitus* of the architects, it is possible to understand the contradiction between the theoreticians and practitioners of architecture. In particular, the idealist tendency of the *SPI* in Althusserian terms, "should subordinate the experience of scientific practice to theses and therefore to 'values' or 'instances' that are external to it" (ibid:133). Moreover, this idealist tendency contradicts with the first set, i.e. the materialist tendency, and in the vast majority of cases dominates it. For Althusser, "in appearance, they are as 'spontaneous' as the first set: in fact they are highly elaborated and can be considered 'spontaneous' only because their dominance makes them immediately 'obvious'" (ibid). In the case of architects we can see the domination of the "highly elaborated" part

of their *SPI* stemming from their education and architectural theories. For this reason, while "architecture" as a discipline and theory, is more important for academics and theoreticians, for whom the emphasis is on the idealist tendency of the *SPI*, practice is of greater importance for practitioners, for whom the materialist tendency carries more weight. This causes contradictions between the two groups as it is the inevitable result of the contradictory nature of the Althusserian *SPS*. Nevertheless, both possess the *SPI* and occupy similar *habitus.*

In a nutshell, it can be said that the *habitus* of architects, homogenising through their *SPI* can create their *ethos* "at a deeper level, the unconscious principles of the *ethos* which, being the product of a learning process dominated by a determinate type of objective regularities, determines 'reasonable' and 'unreasonable' conduct for every agent subjected to those regularities" (Bourdieu, 1977:77). For this reason, it is possible to speak of the *ethos* of practising architects in Turkey by generalising the outputs of the seven conjectures of this thesis. Accordingly, the *ethos* of practising architects in Turkey can be described as follows:

From the first conjecture it was clear that, especially under the influence of the West, practising architects in Turkey believe that the lack of economic and political stability, the lack of common architectural culture and tradition, the lack of codes of conduct and the lack of continuous responsibility and engagement in the building process in Turkey (all supposed these things to exist in the West) created differences between Turkish architecture and World architecture.

The second conjecture showed that, stemming from their specialisation, the architects have an understanding of space which dominates and marginalises the users' space, and that they feel disappointed at the very least when users change the way in which the space is utilised. The practising architects do not believe in the idea that architecture can be autonomous. However, there is a latent

acceptance of the sovereignty of architecture in their belief that they should be important agents of social change because they believe that good architecture can change things in society. The corroboration of the second conjecture also showed that the architects love their profession: being an architect is the most important thing in their personal lives, the art component of architecture is very important for them (it gives them a superiority over clients and users) and they have a privileged position in terms of social status independent of their economic circumstances.

At the same time, the practising architects are anxious about the legitimacy of their profession and they want to be chiefly responsible for the built environment. In their practice, they have their own ethical rules –mostly putting their responsibilities to their clients first – and they complain about the lack of an *ethics* of architecture in Turkey.

Overall, the corroboration of the second conjecture indicated that, although they do not accept its existence when asked directly, there is a spontaneous professional ideology (SPI) among the practising architects in Turkey, and that this ideology unites them spontaneously against clients, users and other professionals.

The corroboration of the third conjecture, concerning architectural education, revealed that most architects had consciously chosen an architectural education. They were very well aware of the particular characteristics and different approaches of their schools. In this respect three different architectural traditions may be identified, depending on the different approaches to architecture of the different schools. First, there is the tradition based on the technical and engineering dimensions of architecture, as best exemplified in the case of ITU. Second, there is a tradition based on theoretical and abstract approaches, as in the example of METU. The third tradition is centred on the artistic aspects of architecture and exemplified by the GSA (now MSU). All the other architectural schools can be classified with

reference to these three traditions. Architectural education provides the cultural capital of architects. However, most of the practising architects believe that architectural education is inadequate especially in its practical aspects. Moreover, they feel that the quality of the profession is negatively affected by the high numbers of faculties of architecture in the country.

From the corroboration of the fourth conjecture, it became apparent that the practising architects believe in the importance of organisation in solving their problems but are strongly critical of the current state of their organisations. They also believe that organisation is important for gaining legitimacy for the profession in the eyes of the public, the state and members of other professions. The interests of architects' organisations in politics in Turkey is a continuous professional tradition. Probably influenced by this tradition, the practising architects do not believe in an architectural responsibility distinct from social responsibility, and they agree that there cannot be an architectural approach independent from the worldview of architects. Within this context, they also believe they can be important agents of social transformation. In this manner they are more at peace with the early Republican architects than with the theoreticians of architecture. They envy the former because they think that the architects of the Republican period had great ideals and were more highly valued as architects in society.

According to the architects interviewed, architects in Turkey do not form a homogenous group. The last three conjectures of the thesis were concerned with differences. From the fifth conjecture, it was revealed that self-employed architects in small cities enjoyed more privileges and were mostly satisfied because of their more modest expectations. The practising architects see the state as still the biggest employer and believe that political and religious affinities and good relations with state organisations and local governments affect their

chances of obtaining work (some or all of these elements are available to varying degrees in different cities). The sixth conjecture of this thesis showed that architects' positions in the *field* can vary according to their age. The older architects believe that they have more freedom in design and in choosing work.

The corroboration of the seventh conjecture of the thesis revealed that practising woman architects in Turkey believe that the difficulties that they experience stem from being a woman in a male-dominated society and not from being an architect. The difficulties they mention are limited to the implementation stage of the profession. The male architects shared the views of the women in this respect.

These are the main characteristics of the collective *habitus* and thus the *ethos* of the practising architects in Turkey in the first decade of the 21st century.

As in the case of the architects interviewed, every architect has principles which determine what is 'reasonable' or 'unreasonable' conduct with the help of their professional ideology, of architectural traditions dependent on different architectural schools and of the specific common characteristics which stem from being architects. For this reason it can be said that, contrary to the belief of the architects interviewed, there is a common architectural culture in Turkey, which is created by schools of architecture, related organisations and Western influences. "The objective regularities" which determine their *ethos* may or may not be much different from the objective regularities, i.e. the *habitus*, of world architects but one thing is certain. In Bourdieu's words: "[i]n short, the *habitus*, the product of history, produces individual and collective practices, and hence history, in accordance with the schemes engendered by history" (1977:82).

Architecture and its history are not exempt from this.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

> To go after [architecture]: not in order to attack, destroy or deroute it, to criticise or disqualify it. Rather, in order to think it in fact, to detach itself sufficiently to apprehend it in a thought which goes beyond the theorem – and becomes a work in its turn.
> Jacques Derrida (in Leach, 1997:326)

The Twenty-second World Congress of Architecture convened in İstanbul between the 3rd and the 7th of July, 2005. The importance of the Congress for this thesis is that the responsibility of architects towards society, culture, history and the environment was emphasised in very strong terms even by the "star architects" of the world, who otherwise, just like any other star, were having their photos taken and signing books for their fans.

One topical meeting was strikingly relevant to this study. It was the conclusion panel to prepare a manifesto for the two-day long chat room talks. The name of the panel was "Globalisation and Architecture: The Architectural Services that Trans-National Capital Stipulates". The meeting lasted for three sessions. In the first session the profession of architecture was discussed by the representatives of different disciplines, such as philosophy, sociology, economics and urban planning. This gave a multi-disciplinary understanding of architectural practice. In the second session the professional practice of architecture was discussed by practising architects from Asia, Europe and America. It showed how the problems of architectural practice are commonly shared around the world. The third and the last session consisted of evaluation for the preparation of the manifesto and was open to all

participants. In this session, many architects found an opportunity to share their opinions with their colleagues from around the world.

These meetings provided valuable insight for this piece of research in the sense that they showed that the problems of architecture are basically the same around the world. The architects from the “third world” had lived through the same experiences as their Turkish counterparts. Even in Japan, which is one of the foremost economies of the world and a relatively monistic culture, a third of all investment in the building industry came from foreign investors, which affected architecture in the country. A decline in the need for architects in the built environment is very common. Foreign architects are a problem in every country. There is a need for an international standardisation of architectural services. The intervention of other disciplines in architecture is reducing its legitimacy. The accountability of architects to society is a serious issue and harsh competition and the lack of solidarity among architects affects all of them negatively. Amongst all this, architects were “searching Architect, Architecture and Architectures, as a profession, as a cultural occupation, as a scientific discipline, as an artistic discipline” (Chat Rooms for Manifestos Summary Report, distributed during the Congress).

In one these sessions, Ergin Yıldızoğlu, an economist and a journalist, defined the architect as the most tragic personality among all other artists. For him an architect, as an artist desires to be unique and free but at the same time s/he wants to be able to sell her/his work. Other artists can set their works in society once they are complete but the architect has to find a client, bargain from the start and this is why architecture is gradually becoming impossible. Yıldızoğlu continued that in a world becoming more global the architect has four tasks: First; s/he has to manage capital, second; s/he has to be symbolic, third; s/he has to keep her/his special identity and the last; s/he has to form a

relationship between the rulers and the ruled. As these all contradict each other, the architect is a tragic character.

This was an outsider's view on the architect and architecture while the present study aimed at an insider's point of view. The main question was how architects see themselves and their professional practice. For this reason an empirical study was designed and thirty-one architects interviewed. It was thought that if the *ethos* of practising architects in Turkey were revealed, it would be possible to give an answer to the question.

The main path to reveal the *ethos* of architects was to uncover their *habitus* in the architectural *field*. Because, in Bourdieu's words:

> [t]he habitus fulfils a function which another philosophy consigns to a transcendental conscience: it is a socialised body, a structured body, a body which has incorporated the immanent structures of a world or of a particular sector of that world – a field – and which structures the perceptions of that world as well as action in that world (1998:81).

Habitus is a set of dispositions in a *field*. If architecture is a *field*, "the perceptions of that world as well as action in that world " or the dispositions of architects can be analysed by "the immanent structures of that world". It was for this reason that in this study, first a particular position – self-employed architects – in that *field* was chosen. A conscious choice was made to deal with the average and not the most prominent architects. The ideas and approaches of famous architects can be found in books, architectural magazines and interviews and can therefore be taken as part of architectural theory and discourse. However, there are practising architects whose experiences might be different, and revealing these experiences might make an important contribution to the existing literature.

The second step was to find the "immanent structure of that world". It was assumed that international influence, the "spontaneous

professional ideology" (*SPI*), the schools architects graduated from, the current architectural organisations, the city where architects live and work in, their age and their gender would affect the *habitus* of the architects. After in-depth interviews were carried out with twenty male and eleven female architects from seven different schools and seven different age categories in six different cities, it was found that these variables do have an impact on the *habitus* of architects. In other words, it was possible to corroborate the seven thematic conjectures of this thesis, which from the outset informed both the formulation of the variables mentioned and the subsequent field research. The common characteristics of the *habitus* of the architects interviewed describe the collective *habitus* of architects, and thus their *ethos* in their professional practice.

The interviews revealed that the Western influence which is carried by architectural education, existing architectural discourse and the links of Turkey's architectural organisations to international organisations have a great impact on the *ethos* of architects in Turkey. Because of this influence, the architects interviewed believe that architecture and the development of architecture in Turkey are different from architecture and the development of architecture in the West. They believe that architectural practice is implemented in a different way in Turkey, mainly due to economic and cultural factors,

Although they denied its existence when questioned directly, practising architects in Turkey are seen to possess a "spontaneous professional ideology". This ideology unites them *vis-à-vis* clients, users and other professionals. The most important part of their symbolic capital, this ideology affects the practising architects in many ways. Likewise, although the architects did not openly admit it, the art component of architecture is very important to them: they dislike interventions in their products, they blame themselves when their design and the actual building don't overlap, their understanding of

space is different from that of the users and they are devoted to their products. The architects interviewed did not believe in the autonomy of architecture, an architectural approach different from the worldview of architects or an architectural responsibility independent of the social responsibility. They have their own professional *ethics* in their practice. For the most part, they put their responsibility to their clients first. The architects interviewed love their profession and this gives them a superiority over clients and users, which confers on them a higher status in society. Self-employed architects in small cities enjoyed the most privileges and were generally satisfied with their life and work, because of their more modest expectations.

The interviews also showed that the woman architects interviewed believed that the difficulties which they experience stem from being a woman in a male-dominated society and not from being an architect. The difficulties which they mentioned were limited to the implementation stage of the profession. Age gave the architects interviewed more freedom in design and choice of work. The majority of architects interviewed believed in the importance of organisation in solving their problems, but were strongly critical of the current conditions of their organisations.

A fascinating part of an exploratory-descriptive study such as this is that it can reveal something that had not been initially assumed. It emerges that the specialisation of architects in the building industry - in other words the type of building they are most likely to design (housing, offices, industrial buildings, etc.) - and the functions they undertake in the building industry - in other words whether they only undertake design work or whether they undertake design, supervision and contracting together - also have effects on their *habitus* by producing, in both economic and psychological terms, a difference in the level of job satisfaction.

These are the main characteristics of the *ethos* of practising architects in Turkey in the first decade of the twenty-first century. By revealing the *ethos*, this study hopes to provide a deeper understanding of architectural practice in Turkey in a sociological way. From the point of view of sociology, it is also hoped that this study will provide an opportunity to understand the characteristics of a specific profession shaped by social structures.

On the other hand this piece of research also demonstrated that there is a gap between the theory and the practice of architecture in Turkey. Architectural theoreticians and historians believe more strongly than the practitioners of the profession in the sovereignty of architecture, in an architectural responsibility detached from the field of social responsibility and in architectural *ethics* for architecture only. Practising architects are more at peace with the architects of the Republican period than the theoreticians of architecture. And according to them, the state was, and still is, the biggest employer and the only place where regulations about their profession should be made.

In this study, the 'spontaneous professional ideology' (*SPI*) of the architect, the product of their education, international influence and organisation proved to be the main adhesive of their *ethos*. Due to this ideology, architects are able to overcome some differences amongst themselves and unite on the issues of sovereignty of architecture, different perceptions of space, the legitimacy of the profession, the art component of architecture, the architects' devotion to their profession, codes of conduct and superiority of architects over clients and users.

Having a professional ideology is not wrong and, as professionalisation requires special knowledge, it is also inevitable. However, to reduce everything to the narrow point of view of the profession or rather the discipline is dangerous. And especially in the case of architectural theoreticians it might result in contradictions of theory and practice. This is mostly because the 'spontaneous

professional ideology' has two contradictory components, although they have a dialectical relationship with each other.

The 'idealist tendency, which dominates the 'materialist tendency' in the *SPI* in most cases, has illusions such as the "value of science" and the "scientific spirit", of "its exemplary critical value" etc. In architecture it can be said that "the autonomy of architectural discipline", an "architectural approach independent from the worldview of architects", "*ethics* for architecture only", "an architectural responsibility separate from the social field of responsibility" and "the capability of architecture to change the world" are the main illusions held. This is especially valid for academic circles where *SPI* may partly turn into *SPS* (that is 'spontaneous philosophy of scientist' in Althusser's parlance). These illusions create an architectural discourse which is far removed from the reality of the social world and despite some criticism which they voiced, the architects are all to some extent affected by this discourse.

The primary reason for the different dispositions of the academics stems from their different positions in the *field* of architecture. This position gives them also a place in what Bourdieu calls the "general intellectual market or *field*" and for this reason their *habitus* is also shaped by the general intellectual *field* as well as the architectural. The *habitus* is transposable to other *fields* and, as Bourdieu states, "some practices may receive opposite meanings and values in different *field*s, in different configurations, or in opposing sectors of the same *field*" (1984:94). This is not the product of conscious choice on the part of the academics but rather it results from the dynamics of the interaction of positions in the academic or intellectual *field* for maintaining power. Thus the mainstream ideas of the "intellectual market" can be adapted easily to every *field* as the *habitus* is a transposable and generative phenomenon. It is capable of generating a multiplicity of practices and perceptions in the *fields* other than those in which they were originally

acquired. The adaptation of ‘second republic thought’ to architecture is a good example of this phenomenon in our case.

Secondly, despite their regret at the importance of the worldview of the architect, the academics’ understanding of architecture is also mostly dependent on their worldview. That the *SPS* (or *SPI*) and worldviews have profound ties is manifested in Turkey where architectural historians are never comfortable with the history of their country. Their evaluation of the Republican era as a process of from top-down modernisation leads them to accept a rupture in the architectural profession, a view which also affects architects who believe that there is no such thing as architectural tradition in Turkey. The acceptance by academics of the proposition that architecture is not an autonomous discipline in Turkey because of to its relationship with the ideology of the state is, in similar vein, a product of their worldviews. Because of the influence of Western thought in their education and career paths, they tend to see everything through the glasses of a Westerner and their judgements about their country become inevitably eurocentric, overlooking the idea that every country can have its own modernisation process. Interestingly, while the practising architects carry some of these notions, they do not share all of them. This creates a gap between the theory and practice or a rupture between the discipline and the profession. It can be said that the people who occupy different positions in a specific *field* have a different “feel for the game”.

For this reason a comparative study of the *habitus* of the architects working in the public and the private sectors as well as in academia –in other words, different positions in the architectural *field* - might be beneficial for a deeper understanding of the *ethos* of architects in Turkey, a point which guided this piece of research from the beginning. Such a study might in the future be combined with another study on the views held by other architects regarding self-employed architects and,

in colloquial terms, how the architects are perceived by “man on the street”. This might provide rich insights for understanding architects and architecture in general. These suggestions actually come from the architects who were interviewed for this study. They enjoyed participating in the study and, for the benefit of their profession, they offered important suggestions for further study.

On the other hand, it must be admitted that this is a qualitative study carried out with a limited number of participant architects. A survey of questions paralleling the questions in the interviews already carried out, which will be sent to every architect who is a member of the Chamber of Architects, will not only give a wider sociological perspective of architectural practice but can also provide a huge contribution to the policy making and organisational efforts of the profession in the era of globalisation, which reduces everything to naked profit and in which architecture is also treated as a commodity.

According to world architects,

> Global policies which take cities far away from the architectural content and creativity and consider them as mechanical production and consumption centres, even using them with an aim to making profits, are threatening the organic integrity of city and architecture (İstanbul Declaration, distributed during the Congress).

The world architects, then, no longer want to be the passive spectators of these developments but they want to become active participants of social transformation. Moreover the world architects have determined the prior conditions of the re-unification of architecture with the city as follows:

- Rather than the consumption economy that damages the life and the environment, a production economy that will prevent poverty;
- Absolute existence of peace that comes before other policies;
- Rather than an international dominance mechanism that imposes slavery to the nations;

- an international collaboration that will avoid the pillage of their main resources;
- The universalisation of the knowledge (ibid).

These cannot be demands of architects who feel responsible towards solely architecture. These are also demands for a "new architecture" responsible to humanity and the world. Moreover, these are very political and ideological demands envisaging a new world in which architecture, again as an ideological weapon, serves a different type of "benefactor". Probably for the first time since Le Courbusier made his famous statement "architecture or revolution" world architects have declared so strongly and commonly that they want to be at the service of the silent majority and not the privileged 2%. They have started to understand that they can only regain their privileged position by participating in large-scale projects for the masses rather than high level prestige buildings for the few.

Bourdieu envisages that a difference in the showcase of space makes a difference to social relationships as well (1977). Thus by a dialectical relationship a change in architectural policies can be reflected in different social relations and different social and economic relations can be reflected in different architectural practices which create a built environment which is more humanitarian.

Many architects are desperate about the future of their profession. The Twenty-second World Congress of Architecture gives hope and offers a new route for architecture. However, for this new endeavour to be possible, a new conceptualisation and restructuring of architecture from the beginning, i.e. from the education process, is necessary. The dualism between the discipline and the profession, with its impact on education, must be eliminated. Young candidates of the profession should be educated according to the needs of a responsible architecture in the service of the underprivileged masses. It should be accepted that – as the architects very much like to compare

themselves – architecture is a technical service like medicine or law. Of course, unlike other professional groups, architects also have a claim to "contributing to the artistic culture of their country". However, this can not be the priority. The artistic element is immanent in architecture and an artistic contribution will eventually be made if architects do their job properly according to a new "architectural and environmental discourse". Despite possible objections from theoreticians, this is the guarantee of good design.

Bourdieu suggests that the nature of the *habitus* changes with altered historical circumstances: "*[h]abitus* (...) is a transcendental, but a historical transcendental bound up with the structure and history of a *field*" (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:189). For this reason the *habitus* of architects can change and, as this study shows, the practising architects in Turkey already have a different disposition from that of the architectural theoreticians. "What is the architects' new role?" This was a question asked by a participant at the World Congress of Architecture. Perhaps this is a question that all architects should ask themselves. Perhaps the answer is simply to accept the role of a technical service staff worker in the building industry. Acceptance of this view is important, if change is desired in architecture. This will only be possible by adopting a political architectural approach which aims at rebuilding humanitarian architecture from its grassroots instead of the architectural discourse and practice which serves as a vehicle for the dominant ideology and reproduces the same kind of architecture and architects. In Frederic Jameson's words: "[o]ntologies of the present demand archaeologies of the future, not forecasts of the past" (2002:215).

REFERENCES

Acar; E., 1983."Kadın, Konut, Kent: Kadın Açısından Konut Sorunu" in Mimarlık Chamber of Architects Pub. No:83/1, pp.8-11

Adorno, T., 1997. "Functionalism Today" in Leach, N. (Ed), Rethinking Architecture. London, New York: Routledge. Pp.6-19

Agrest, D. *et al* (Eds), 1996. The Sex of Architecture. New York: Harry N. Abrams Inc.

Althusser, L., 1990. Philosophy and the Spontaneous Philosophy of the Scientists & Other Essays. London & New York: Verso

Altay, B. S., 2000. Professional Value Systems of Turkish Architects With Respect To Clients and Users in Contemporary Residential Design Practice . Bilkent University: Unpublished PhD. Thesis

Anderson, B., 1991. Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. London, New York: Verso.

Artun, A., 1999 [1978[. Fordizm ve Mühendisin Dönüşümü. Ankara: Turkish Union of Chambers of Engineers and Architects (TMMOB) Pub.

Aslanoğlu, İ., 2001. Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Mimarlığı. 1923-1938. Ankara: ODTÜ Mimarlık Fak. Yay.

Bachelard, G., 1970 [1958]. The Poetics of Space. Boston: Beacon Press

Balamir, A., 1996. "Mimarın Kimlik, Meşruiyet, Etik Sorunları ve Mimarlığın Disipliner Buhranı" in Kimlik, Meşruiyet, Etik. Ankara: TMMOB – Chamber of Architects Pub. Pp.24-30

Bauman, Z., 1998 [1995]. Life in Fragments: Essays in Postmodern Morality. Oxford, UK and Cambridge, USA: Blackwell

Baydar-Nalbantoğlu, G., 1988. The Professionalization of the Ottoman-Turkish Architect. UC Berkeley: PhD Thesis.

Beck, U., Bonss, W. & Lav, C., 2003. "The Theory of Reflexive Modernization: Problematic, Hypotheses and Research Programme" in Theory, Culture & Society Vol. 20 Number 2, April 2003. pp.1-34

Berger, J., 1984. Ve Yüzlerimiz, Kalbim, Fotoğraflar Kadar Kısa Ömürlü. İstanbul: Anadolu Yay.

Berger, P. & Luckmann, T., 1991. The Social Construction of Reality – A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge. London: Penguin Books

Bourdieu, P., 1977. Outline of a Theory of Practice. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press

Bourdieu, P., 1989 .Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste. London: Routledge

Bourdieu, P., 1990. The Logic of Practice. California: Stanford University Press

Bourdieu, P., Practical Reason- On the Theory of Action. California: Stanford University Press

Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L., 1992. An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology. Cambridge: Polity Press

Bozdoğan, S., 1996. "Living Modern: The Cubic House in Early Republican Culture" in Sey, Y. (Ed). Housing and Settlement in Anatolia – A Historical Perspective. İstanbul: The Economic and Social History Foundation of Turkey Pub. Pp. 313-328

Bozdoğan, S., 1997. "The Predicament of Modernism in Turkish Architectural Culture: An Overview" in Bozdoğan, S. & Kasaba, R. (Eds). Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press. Pp.133-156

Bozdoğan, S, 2001. Modernism and Nation Building: Turkish Architectural Culture in the Early Republic. Seatle &London:University of Washington Press

Cansever, T., 1994. Ev ve Şehir Üzerine Düsünceler. İstanbul: İnsan Yay.

Caygill, H., 1991. "Architectural Postmodernism: The Retreat of an Avant-Garde?" in Boyne, R. & Rattansi, A. (Eds), Postmodernism and Society. London: Macmillan. Pp.260-289

Certau, M. De, 1984. The Practice of Everyday Life. Los Angeles & London: University of California Press

Ciravoğlu, A., 2004 "Mimarlık Eğitimi Üzerine Güncel Tartışmalar: Girit/Hanya Toplantısı Notları" in Mimarlık Chamber of Architects Pub. No:320, pp.10-13

Colquhoun, A., 1990. Mimari Eleştiri Yazıları. Ankara: Şevki Vanlı Mimarlık Vakfı Pub..

Cook, J. & Klotz, H., 1973. Conversations with Architects. New York: Praeger Publishers Inc.

Çinici, B., 2005. "a letter" in Bülten. Chamber of Architecs, Ankara Branch Pub. February, 2005. No:29. pp.18-19

Davidoff L. *et al*., 1976. "Landscape with Figures: Home and Community in English Society" in Mitchell, J. & Oakley, A. (Eds). The Rights and Wrongs of Women. London: Penguin Books. Pp. 138-175

Davidson, C.C., 1999. "Introduction: Whose Times is it, Anyway?" in Davidson, C.C. (Ed), ANYTIME. New York: The MIT Press/Anyone Corp. pp. 8-11

Dostoğlu, N. T., 2002. "Mimarlıkta Kadının Rolü: Dünyaya ve Türkiye'ye Genel bir Bakış" in Mimarlık ve Kadın Kimliği. İstanbul: Boyut Yayın Grubu. Pp.9-25

Dussel, E., 1993. "Eurocentrism and Modernity: Introduction to the Frankfurt Lectures" in boundary 2 20:3 Fall 1993. pp.65-76

Eyerman, R., 1992. "Modernity and Social Movements" in Hoferkamp, H. & Smelser, N. (Eds). Social Change and Modernity. Berkeley: University of California Press. Pp. 37-54

Foucault, M., 1991 [1977]. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. England: Penguin Books

Foucault, M., 1997. "Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias" in Leach, N. (Ed), Rethinking Architecture. London, New York: Routledge. Pp.350-356

Frampton, K., 1992 (1980). Modern Architecture: A Critical History. London: Thames & Hudson (Third Edition)

Frampton, K., 2002. Labour, Work and Architecture: Collected Essays on Architecture and Design. London & New York: Phaidon Press Ltd.

Franck, K., 2000. "A Feminist Approach to Architecture: Acknowledging Women's Ways of Knowing" in Rendel, J. et al (Eds.). Gender Space Architecture. London, New York: Routledge, pp.295-305

Furneaux Jordan, R., 1993. Western Architecture. London: Thames & Hudson

Gadamer, H.G., 1997. "The Ontological Foundation of the Occasional and the Decorative" in Leach, D. Rethinking Architecture. London & New York: Routledge. Pp.126-138

Gellner, E., 1994a. Encounters with Nationalism. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers

Gellner, E., 1994b. "Nationalism and Modernization" in Hutchinson & Smith (eds). Nationalism. Oxford: Oxford University Press pp. 55-63.

Giddens, A., 1999 (1971). Capitalism & Modern Social Theory – An Analysis of the Writings of Marx, Durkheim and Max Weber. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press

Gleichmann, P., 1992. "Architecture and Civilizations: A Sketch" in Theory, Culture & Society. Vol. 9. 1992. pp.27-44

Goldman, L., 1999. Aydınlanma Felsefesi. Ankara: Doruk Pub.

Harvey, D., 1990. "Flexible Accumulation Through Urbanization" in SPECTRA no. 26. The Yale Architectural Journal. Pp.251-272

Harvey, D., 1996 (1990). Postmodernliğin Durumu. İstanbul: Metis Pub.

Harvey, D., 1996. "On Architects, Bees and Possible Urban Worlds" in Davidson, C.C. (Ed), ANYWISE. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press/Anyone Corp. pp.216-227

Ho, D., 2005. "A Memorable Touch" in ABSTRACTS Book of UIA XXII. World Congress of Architecture. İstanbul

Hobsbawm, E. J., 1990. Nations & Nationalism since 1780. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jameson, F., 2002. A Singular Modernity: Essay on the Ontology of the Present. London & New York: Verso

Jameson, F., 2003. “Future City” in New Left Review 21 – May/June 2003. pp.65-79

Jencks, C., 1985 . Modern Movements in Architecture. London: Penguin Books (2nd Edition)

Kant, I., [1784] 1996. “What is Enlightenment” in Schmidt, J., (Ed). What is Enlightenment?. Berkeley: University of California Press

Köse, H.A. & Öncü, A., 2000. Kapitalizm, İnsanlık ve Mühendislik: Türkiye’de Mühendisler, Mimarlar. Ankara: Turkish Union of Chambers of Engineers and Architects (TMMOB) Pub.

Kracauer, S., 1997. “On Employment Agencies: The Construction of Space” in Leach, N. (Ed) Rethinking Architecture. London, New York: Routledge. Pp.59-64

Kuban, D., 1996. “Scraps of Philosophy for Human Dwelling” in Sey, Y. (Ed). Housing and Settlement in Anatolia – A Historical Perspective. İstanbul: The Economic and Social History Foundation of Turkey Pub. Pp.1-5

Kuban, D., 2004. “Mimari tasarımda Etik-Estetik Karşıtlığı Var mı?”. in Şentürer, A. *et al*. (Eds). Etik-Estetik: İstanbul: YEM Pub. Pp.216-219

Larson, M. S., 1977. The Rise of Professionalism. Berkeley: University of California Press

Larson, M. S., 1993. Behind the Postmodern Façade. Berkeley: University of California Press

Le Courbusier, 1986. Towards A New Architecture. New York: Dover Pub. İnc.

Lefebvre, H., 1991. The Critique of Everyday Life. London: Verso

Lefebvre, H., 1998. The Production of Space. Oxford, UK, & Cambridge, USA: Blackwell Pub.

Mannheim, K., 1936. Ideology and Utopia. New York: Harcourt, Brace

Marx, K., & Engels, F., [1846]. The German Ideology. Retrieved February 22, 2005 from http://www.marxists.org/archieve/marx/works/download/Marx_The_German_Ideology.pdf

McIntyre, L., 2005. Need to Know: Social Science Research Methods. New York: Mc Graw Hill Companies

Mimarlık Semineri, 1969. Ankara: TMMOB Pub.

MimarlıkHaberler. 2005. Chamber of Architects News Bulletin. Issue no:104, June, 2005

Motassian, M., 1994. "Ideologies of Delayed Development" in Nationalism. Oxford: Oxford University Press pp. 218-225.

Mugarauer, R., 1992. "Architecture as Properly Useful Opening" in Dallery, A.B. & Scott, C.E. (Eds). Ethics and Danger. New York: State University of New York Press. Pp. 215-226

Peker, M., 1996. "Türkiye'de Sosyal değişim ve Mesleki Hareketlilik: Mimarlık Örneği" in Kimlik, Meşruiyet, Etik. Ankara: TMMOB – Chamber of Architects Pub. Pp.98-107

Pekin, Ş., 2004. "Mimari Etik Mimari İçin Vardır". In Şentürer, A. *et al*. (Eds). Etik-Estetik: İstanbul: YEM Pub. Pp.90-109

Porteous, D., 1977. Environment and Behavior: Planning and Everyday Urban Life. Philippines: Addison Wesley Publishing Comp.

Rapoport, A., 1969. House, Form and Culture. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall

RIBA, 2003. Why Do Women Leave Architecture? In http://www.architecture.com

Ritzer, G.,1996. Modern Sociological Theory. Singapore: McGraw-Hill Book Co. (International (Fourth) Edition)

Rossler, M.,1994. "Berlin or Bonn? National Identity and the Question of the German Capital" in Hooson, D. (Ed). Geography and National Identity. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers. Pp.92-103

Schorske, C.E., 1998. Thinking with History: Explorations in the Passage to Modernism. Princeton University Press

Sennett, R.,1996 (1992). Kamusal Insanın Çöküsü. İstanbul: Ayrıntı Pub.

Sgoutas, V., 2005. "Göç ve Yoksulluk: Ortak Kader" in Mimarlık. Chamber of Architecs, Pub. No:323. pp.21-23

Simmel, G., 1984. On Women, Sexuality and Love. New Haven and London: Yale University Press

Simmel, G., 1997a. "The Sociology of Space" in Frisby, D. & Featherstone, M. (Eds). Simmel on Culture. London: Sage Pub. Pp. 137-170

Simmel, G., 1997b. "Metropolis and Mental Life" in Frisby, D. & Featherstone, M. (Eds). Simmel on Culture. London: Sage Pub. Pp.174-185

Smart, B., 1990. "Modernity, Postmodernity and the Present" in Turner, B.S. (Ed). Theories of Modernity and Postmodernity. London: Sage Pub. Pp. 14-20

Sözen, M., 1984. Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Mimarlığı. Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Pub.

Swingewood, A., 2000 [1984]. A Short History of Sociological Thought. Hounds Mill & London: Macmillan Press Ltd. (Third Edition)

Symes, M. et al, 1995. Architects and Their Practices: A Changing Profession. Oxford, UK: Butterworth Architecture

Şentek, A., 2005. "'Kitapsız' Bir Mesleği Seçmiş Olmanın Güçlükleri" in Bülten. No:30. Ankara: Chamber of Architects Ankara Branch Pub. Pp.54-56

Tanyeli, U., 1996. "Türk Mimarının Etik Sorumluluğu: Bir Tarihsel Değerlendirme Denemesi" in Kimlik, Meşruiyet, Etik. Ankara: TMMOB – Chamber of Architects Pub. Pp.108-112

Tanyeli, U., 2002 [1997]. "Modernizmin Sınırları ve Mimarlık" in Batur, E. (Ed), Modernizmin Serüveni. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Pub. Pp.63-71 (Fifth Edition)

Teber, S., 2005. "Practising Architecture and Urban Design as a 'Woman Architect' in Turkey" in ABSTRACTS Book of UIA XXII. World Congress of Architecture. İstanbul

Teymur, N., 1992. Architectural Education: Issues in Educational Practice and Policy. London: ?uestion Press

Teymur, N., 2000. "Those That Which Change, Do Not Change, Ought To Change" in Changing World, Changing Professional Practice. Chamber of Architects Bursa branch

Turkish Union of Chambers of Engineers and Architects (TMMOB) – Chamber of Architects, 1995. Beyaz Kitap (The White Book). Ankara: Chamber of Architects Pub.

TMMOB- Chamber of Architects İzmir Branch, 1996. Kamu Kesiminde Çalışan Mimarlar Arasında Yapılan Anket. İzmir: Chamber of Architects İzmir Branch Pub.

TMMOB – Chamber of Architects, 2002. Çalışan Mimarların 2001 Yılında Yaşanan Ekonomik Krizden Etkilenme Düzey ve Biçimleri Üzerine Bir Araştırma. İstanbul: Veri Araştırma

TMMOB – Chamber of Architects, 2004.Dünyada Mimarlık Mesleği Uygulaması. Ankara: TMMOB – Chamber of Architects Pub.

Tümer, G., 2005. "Mimarlığın Sevgilim Olma Süreci" in Bülten. Chamber of Architecs, Ankara Branch Pub. February, 2005. No:29. p26

Türk Serbest Mimarlar Derneği. 1999. Mimar, Anlam, Beğeni. İstanbul: YEM Yayın

Vanlı, Ş., 2005. "Mimarlık Sevgilim" in Bülten. Chamber of Architecs, Ankara Branch Pub. February, 2005. No:29. p23

Vassaf, G., 1995. Cehenemme Övgü – Gündelik Hayatta Totalitarizm. İstanbul: Ayrıntı Pub.

Vidler, A., 1998. "Space, Time and Movement" in Ferguson, R., At the End of the Century: One Hundred Years of Architecture. Los Angeles: MOCA Abrams. Pp.100-125

Werckmeister, O.K., 1997. "Hitler the Artist" in Critical Inquiry. 23/2 Winter. Pp.270-297

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

Personal Information

1. Place and date of birth
2. University graduated and the year of graduation
3. How many years has the architect been working self-employed?
4. Did the architect previously work in a different workplace?
5. Is the architect the owner or a partner of the present architectural office?
6. How many people work at the office?
7. Is it just a project office or is it also involved in the supervision and contracting fields?
8. Is there a specialised type of building structure?

Education

1. What are the reasons for which you chose architectural education?
2. Is there any other architect in the family or in your close circle?
3. Was there an architect whom you took as an example when you first started your education?
4. What type of an “architect” image did you have in mind throughout your education?
5. Who was the teacher you were most influenced by? Why?
6. Is the knowledge you have gained during your education sufficient for your work in the field?
7. What do you think was most lacking in the education you have received? How could it have been different?

8. When you look at the past today, do you think that you fit in with the image of the “architect” you had in your mind back then?
9. What was the greatest benefit conferred on you by the university?
10. Was the institution you graduated from any different from the others? If so in what ways?
11. Do you think the architectural education requires special talent?
12. Does the fact that there are many faculties of architecture affect the quality of the architectural profession?

The Architectural Discipline

1. How do you define architecture? What is architecture at its core?
2. What is the product of architecture? The finished building, the project?
3. What is the meaning and value of a building?
4. Can an understanding of architecture different from that of the architect’s world view be formed?
5. Can there be an autonomous ideology of the architectural profession that is separate from political ideology? If so, what is it?
6. Is the field of responsibility of architecture separate from the social field of responsibility?
7. Does there exist an architectural *ethics* in Turkey? Is this *ethics* created by professional ideology or by social responsibility?
8. Can architecture be an autonomous discipline? How?
9. What do you think were the developments in Turkish society which brought architecture to where it is now?
10. Is architecture in Turkey different from architecture in the world?
11. Can architecture change something in our present social system?
12. What are the reasons for the crisis that architecture is said to be undergoing at present?
13. Does the crisis of architecture in Turkey differ in aspects from the crisis said to be affecting architecture in the world?

Space

1. What is ‘space’ in the most general sense of the word?
2. What is the actual value of space?
3. Which criteria do you hold to be important when giving shape to space?
4. At the stage of spatial design, what aspect do you think needs to be solved first? What do you start your designs with?
5. Do you imagine yourself are living in the spaces you design?
6. What affects you the most when you enter any space for the first time? What do you look for first?
7. Is it always possible for the space which emerges in your own applied projects to be in line with the space you designed? Have you ever been disappointed with the space that has emerged after construction? Why?
8. What do you think about the concept of the “average user” which is applied in design of space when the actual user is left undefined?
9. How does it affect you if the user utilises the space you have designed in a way different from the one in which you thought it would be used?
10. Do you think of the spaces you create having an influence on human relations? How does this affect your design?
11. What do you feel most responsible towards when forming space?
12. What place in architecture should everyday spaces occupy?
13. Which is your favourite project or building? Why?

The Architectural Profession

1. Why did you choose to work independently?
2. What are the disadvantages of working independently?
3. Which factors and which people assisted you when setting up your office and when later getting work?
4. What sort of connections make it easier to get work today?

5. What sort of advantages and disadvantages are conferred on you in general and on your practice by the city you presently are?
6. When carrying out practice of your profession, do you abide by any rules, which as part of a professional *ethics* you view as indispensable?
7. Are these rules only valid for your profession? Do you abide by certain rules in other areas of your life as well?
8. What are the primary problems of the architectural profession? In what ways, if any, does Turkey differ?
9. What are the reasons for the narrowing scope of influence of the architectural profession? In what ways does Turkey differ from other countries in this respect?
10. How do you view the relationship of the profession with the state in Turkey? It is being alleged that in its historical development the profession has developed through a dependence on the state. How should it have been otherwise?
11. Since the first years of the Republic, architects in Turkey have come across problems of legitimacy against foreign architects. Now, through new legislation, foreign architects will be free to work in Turkey. How do you think this will affect the profession?
12. Have you entered any competitions? Have you received any awards? Have any of your competition projects been implemented so far?
13. How do competitions affect the architectural profession?
14. Is there a certain architectural style which you have adopted? If so, why?
15. What are you searching after in architecture and what do you think were the points which you gave in on?
16. Is there a difference between men and woman in the practice of the profession? If so, what are they?

The following five questions were only asked to woman architects:

17. Do woman architects have a different understanding of design? If so, what are the reasons for this?
18. How do you think the fact that you are a woman architect has affected the way in which you practice your profession?
19. How do you get yourself accepted and listened to?
20. Are there any problems you come across in the profession for being a woman? If so what is the major problem?
21. Is there a need for different professional organisations for woman architects?

22. How do you think that organisation can help to alleviate professional problems?
23. Do you have relations with any other organisations?
24. What are your relations like with the Chamber of Architects?
25. How do you see the future of the profession?

The Architect Identity

1. In the most general sense of the word, what sort of a person is the architect according to you?
2. In terms of social status, where do you see yourself? Boss? Worker?
3. What sort of importance do you attest to your role as the architect amongst your many social roles?
4. Do you think that being an architect affects your outlook on life and your personality?
5. Have you noticed any differences or expectations in the way people perceive you due to you being an architect?
6. Do you think that being an architect gives you a superiority in social status?

7. What sort of differences have you observed in yourself as an architect as you have grown older?
8. It is said that architects represent a culture because of their training, practice and lifestyle. Under these circumstances is it possible to speak the same language with the user? How?
9. Since the first years of the Republic, architects have been important actors of social change in Turkey. Should the architect have such a role?
10. What are the differences between architects of the Early Republic and today's architects?
11. Do you think that architects form a homogenous group and that it is possible to talk about a shared architectural culture in Turkey?
12. Can it be said that architects in Turkey now have a certain tradition?
13. What is the greatest problem that architects face amongst their own community, in their relations with each other?
14. Are you happy for being an architect?

APPENDIX B

TURKISH SUMMARY

Türkiye'de mimar kimliğini ve mimarlık meslek pratiğini açığa çıkarmayı amaçlayan bu çalışma 6 bölümden oluşmaktadır. Giriş Bölümünü izleyen ikinci bölümde, mimar, mimarlık ve mekân konusunda genel bir teorik çerçeve konmuştur. Çalışmanın metodolojisi üçüncü bölümde açıklanmış, bu bölümü saha çalışmasında toplanan bilgilerin açıklandığı dördüncü bölüm izlemiştir. Beşinci bölümde teorik çerçeve ile saha çalışmasında toplanan bilgiler birleştirilmiş ve mimarlarınTürkiye'de sahip oldukları *ethos* ortaya çıkarılmıştır. Altıncı bölüm çalışmanın sonuçlarına ayrılmıştır.

Mimarlık, en genel bakış açısıyla, doğası gereği bilimle sanatın kesiştiği bir noktada yer alan bir disiplindir. Bilimsel açıdan bakıldığında doğayı yeniden biçimlendirmede, doğal afetlere dayanıklı yapılar üretmekte teknolojik olanakları kullanan, pozitif bilimlere dayalı bu disipline sanat açısından bakıldığında ise, estetik kaygılar taşıyan sanatçının nesnel koşulları kendi öznel tercihleriyle biçimlendirmesi ve ortaya çıkan ürünün kişisel bir beğeninin yansıtılması olduğu söylenebilir. Bu anlamda mimarlık özel bir düşünce biçimidir.

Ne var ki, mimarın ortaya çıkardığı sanat eseri yalnızca seyredilen, dinlenen ya da okunan bir sanat ürününden farklıdır. Mimarın hedef kitlesi üretilen ürünün içinde tüm yaşamsal faaliyetlerini sürdürür. Bu anlamda mimarlık daha tasarım aşamasında hedef kitlesinin gereksinimlerini göz önüne almak zorundadır; çünkü, ortaya çıkan ürün hedef kitlenin yaşamsal faaliyetlerini olduğu kadar, birbirleriyle olan ilişkilerini de belirler.

Bu anlamda mimari düşünce biçimini ortaya çıkarmak aynı zamanda toplumsal ilişkileri anlamanında bir yoludur. Bunu başarmanın en iyi yolu ise, mimari düşünce sisteminin üreticisi, taşıyıcısı ve uygulayıcısı olan mimarı anlamaktan geçer.

Mimar bir yandan yaşamını mimar olarak kazanıp sürdürmek isterken, diğer yandan da yapılı çevrenin esas sorumlusu olduğuna inanır. Ancak mimarın bu istek ve inançları çoğu zaman birbiriyle çelişir ve birinin gerçekleşmesi için diğerinin feda edilmesi gerekebilir. Thedor Adorno'ya göre bu durum, mimarlığın hem amaç yönelimli, hem de bağımsız bir sanat olmasından ve bu ikili karakterinin yarattığı iktidarsızlıktan kaynaklanmaktadır (1997). Bunun da ötesinde Charles Jencks'in söylediği gibi, günümüz mimarları, geçmişte olduğundan daha fazla devlet, belediye veya işadamları komitesi gibi ortak patronaja bağımlıdır (1985). Bu anlamda çatışan çıkarlar mimarın mesleğini bağımsız olarak icra etmesinin önünde ciddi engeller oluşturur.

Mimarın hem sanatçı hem de profesyonel olarak aldığı eğitim, yaşadığı koşullar ve mesleğin toplumsal statüsü belli bir mimarlık *ethos*u oluşturur. Mimarların ortak *habitus*larının bir ürünü olan bu *ethos,* mimarlara özgü özellikleri ortaya koyduğu gibi, mimarın mesleğini icra ederken uyguladığı kuralları da belirler. Bu nedenle mimarlık meslek pratiğini incelemek, mimarı ve *ethos*unu incelemekten bağımsız ele alınamaz.

Tüm dünyada olduğu gibi Türkiye'de de mimarlar, aldıkları eğitim ve sahip oldukları becerilerin maddi olarak ödüllendirilmesini, yapılı çevrenin sorumluları olarak kamu çıkarlarını korumaları karşılığında toplumsal bir saygı görmeyi ve aynı zamanda ülkelerinin sanat ortamına katkıda bulunmayı talep etmektedirler. Bu yüzden\ bu çalışmanın amacı da mimarlık mesleğinin sosyolojik bir çözümlemesini yapmak ve mimarların inşaat sektöründeki konumlarını, toplumsal rollerini, kendilerini sanatçı olarak görüp görmediklerini ortaya çıkarmak

için sahip oldukları *ethos*un toplumsal dönüşümlere bağlı olarak mimarlık mesleğindeki dönüşümleri biçimlendirişini gösterebilmektir.

Çalışmada, Türkiye'deki mimarların *ethos*larını ortaya koyabilmek için Bourdieu'nun *habitus* kavramı kullanılmıştır. *Habitus* belli bir alanda (Bourdieu bunu *field* olarak adlandırır) bilinçli eylemin ve konuşulan dilin altında ve irade ve dikkatin ötesinde faaliyet gösterir. Özgür iradenin değil ama tercihlerin ve eğilimlerin sonucudur. Bu tercihleri ise alanın yapısı belirler. *Field* ve *habitus* birlikte o alandaki pratiği ortaya çıkarır. *Habitus* hem bireyseldir hem de aynı sınıfsal pratiği paylaşan bireylerin benzer *habitus*lara sahip olması nedeniyle ortaktır. Bu çalışmada da mimarlık meslek alanında tek tek mimarların eğilimlerinin saptanmasının ve benzerliklerin bulunmasının mimarların ortak *habitus*larını ortaya çıkaracağı ve dolayısıyla da mimarlık *ethos*unun ve mimarlık meslek pratiğinin anlaşılabileceği öngörülmüştür.

Türkiye'de Ocak 2004 tarihinde Mimarlar Odası'nın 21 ildeki örgütlerine kayıtlı 29 695 mimar vardır. Kayıtsız mimarların varlığı da göz önünde bulundurulursa yaklaşık 31 000 mimar mimarlık alanında faaliyet göstermektedir. Ancak, bu mimarların hepsi doğrudan meslek pratiğinin içinde yer almamakta, büyük çoğunluğu, kamu ve özel sektörde, karar alma mekanizmalarının dışında teknik eleman olarak çalışmakta, bir kısmı ise akademide görev yapmaktadır. Mimarların bir bölümü ise sahibi veya ortağı oldukları bürolarda serbest olarak doğrudan mimarlık meslek pratiğini icra etmektedir. 2004 yılı sonunda, hepsinin aktif olup olmadıkları kesin olarak bilinmemekle birlikte, Mimarlar Odası'na tescilli 8958 büro vardır. Mimarların *habitus*larını ortaya çıkartmak için mekân ve pratik algılaması da önemli etkenler olduğu için bu çalışma, doğrudan meslek pratiğini uygulayan mimarlarla sınırlandırılmıştır. 6 değişik şehirde, 7 değişik mimarlık fakültesinden mezun, farklı yaş gruplarında 20 erkek, 11 kadın, toplam 31 mimarla, kendi bürolarında yüzyüze yapılan görüşmeler sonucunda

21. yüzyılın başlarında Türkiye'de mimarların sahip olduğu *ethos* ortaya çıkarılmaya çalışılmıştır.

Mimarlık insanların sığınak olarak derme çatma barınaklar yapması ya da mağaraları kullanmaya başlamasıyla ortaya çıkmıştır. Toplumsal gelişmelere bağlı olarak ortaya çıkan imparatorluklar, dinler mimarlığı sosyal düzenlerinin simgesel bir göstergesi olarak kullanmışlardır. Geçmişten günümüze kalan pek çok mimari eser, o uygarlıkların yaşam biçimlerini anlamanın en önemli araçlarındandır. Ancak, mimarlık moderniteye kadar sivil mimari ile ilgilenmemiş, toplumun ve mimarın mutlak patronları olan imparatorların, kral ve sultanların, dinin himayesi altında gelişmiştir. Bu anlamda mimarlık her zaman egemen sınıfların ideolojik bir aracı olmuştur.

Her egemen sınıf hakimiyetini meşru gösteren bir ideolojiye sahiptir. Marx'a göre maddi üretimin kontrolunu elinde bulunduran sınıf, entellektüel üretimi de kontrol altında tutar. Mimarlığın aynı zamanda entellektüel bir üretim olduğu düşünüldüğünde neden egemen sınıfların ideolojik bir aracı olduğu anlaşılabilir. Bunun ötesinde, mimarlığın ürünü olan mekânın bazı özellikleri mimarlığın neden bu biçimde kullanıldığını açıklar.

Mekân yaşamın düzenlendiği fiziksel sınırları tanımlar. Bu sınırlar sayesinde insanlar, bir mekânın içinde nelerin yapılıp, yapılamayacağını bilirler. İnsanlar sosyal konumlarını ev kadını, fabrika işçisi gibi mekânla tanımlayabilirler ve bu tanımlamalar yüzyüze ilişkilerde belirleyici olur. Kamusal alanlardaki mekânların hiyerarşik düzenlenmesi, ofis binalarının, devlet dairelerinin, okulların özel tasarım şemaları otoritenin tanımlanmasına yardımcı olur. İşyerlerinin tasarımının çalışanların performansını etkilediği bilinen bir gerçektir. Mekânın bunları nasıl başarabildiğini anlamak için mekânın sosyolojik özelliklerine bakmak gerekir. Simmel'e göre her mekân kendine özgüdür ve mekânın bir parçası diğeriyle benzerlik göstermez. Her mekaânın çerçevesi, içinde kendi kuralları olan bir dünya olduğunu

belirtirken, aynı zamanda o dünyanın gerçekliğini ve etkilerini güçlendirir. Bir nesnenin mekânsal sabitliği onun etrafında belirli ilişkilerin kurulmasına yol açar. Simmel son olarak mekânsal yakınlık veya uzaklığın insanlarda farklı duygu durumlarına yol açtığını ve bunun da ilişkileri etkilediğini söyler (1997).

Mekânın sosyolojik özellikleri aynı zamanda insanların biyolojik ve psikolojik özellikleriyle de ilintilidir. İnsanlar kendilerini güvende hissetmek için içgüdüsel bir biçimde alan tanımlaması yaparlar. Bu alanı tanımlama ve kontrol altında tutma arzusu aynı zamanda insanlara bir kimlik kazandırır. Douglas Porteous'a göre pek çok toplum herkesin yerini bildiği bir sosyal düzenlemeyle bir arada durur (1977).

Mekân gücünü insanın bu özelliklerinden alır ve aynı zamanda bu özellikleri güçlendirir. Bu yüzden mekânlar insanların yaşam pratiklerini belirledikleri gibi, onların algılamalarını, tutumlarını ve değer yargılarını da yansıtırlar. Mekânsal deneyimler, sınıf, toplumsal cinsiyet ve etnisite gibi sosyal kategorilere göre farklı anlamlar içerirler (David Harvey, 1990). Bu farklı anlamlar farklı algılamalara, farklı algılamalar farklı tutumlara ve farklı tutumlar farklı değer yargılarına yol açtığı gibi (bunun tersi de doğrudur), bu sürecin tamamı sosyal yapının içselleşmesine hizmet eder. Pierre Bourdieu'nun (1984) *habitus* olarak adlandırdığı bu içselleştirme aynı zamanda toplumsal otoritenin devamlılığını sağlamanın bir aracıdır. Bu anlamda da mekân en sinsi ideolojik araçlardan biridir.

Ancak, mekân aynı zamanda çok soyut bir kavramdır ve fiziksel sınırlamalar olmadığı sürece algılanması zordur. Mimarlığın işlevi bu noktada başlar. Mimarlık Soyut mekânı elle tutulur, dokunulabilir hale getirir. Mimarın görevi de bütün farklı gereksinmelere cevap verebilecek somut mekânları yaratmaktır. Moderniteye kadar mimar bu görevini, egemen sınıflrın koruyuculuğu altında ayrıcalıklı bir konuma sahip olarak yerine getirmiştir.

18. yüzyılda Batı'da başlayan aydınlanma hareketinin getirdiği rasyonellik sanatı ve dolayısıyla mimarlığı da etkilemiş ve mimarın o güne kadar sahip olduğu ayrıcalıklı konumunu yitirmesine ve mesleğini sürdürebilmek için mühendisle rekabet etmesine neden olmuştur. Mimar bu durumda farklılığını mimarlığın sanat yönünü öne çıkarak korumaya çalışmıştır. O günden günümüze mimarın kendini sanatçı olarak görüp görmemesi ideolojik bir tercih sonucudur.

Modernite, tarihin sahnesine ulus-devletleri çıkarmıştır. Mimarlık, ulus-devlet için de ulusal bir kimlik ve bilinç oluşturmanın en önemli araçlarından biri olmuştur çünkü, ulusal mimarlık biçemleri yaratmak ulusal kültürün bir parçasıdır. Türkiye'de de "Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Mimarlığı" ulus inşa sürecinin önemli bir aracı olmuştur. Ulusal bir mimarlık yaratmak inancı, mimarın "medeniyet ajanları" olarak hedeflenen batılı yaşam biçiminin taşıyıcısı ve toplumsal dönüşümün önemli aktörlerinden olması nedeniyle mimar, devlet ideolojisinin taşıyıcısı olmuştur. Bu durum, mimarlık tarihçileri tarafından Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi mimarlarının mimarlığa sadece mimarlık olarak bakmayıp, ulusal kimliğin mesajlarını taşıyan daha geniş anlamlar yükledikleri eleştirilerinin yöneltilmesine neden olmaktadır. Özellikle mimarlık tarihçileri Gülsüm Baydar-Nalbantoğlu (1988) ve Sibel Bozdoğan (2001) çalışmalarında Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi mimarlarının devletin ideolojisiyle paralel meslek anlayışlarının, Türkiye'de mimarlığın bağımsız bir disiplin olarak gelişmesinin ve Türkiye mimarlığında avangard akımların oluşmasının önünde engel oluşturduğunu iddia etmektedirler. Mimarlığın bütün tarih boyunca egemenlerin ideolojisinin taşıyıcısı olduğunu bir kez daha tekrarlayıp, avangard akımların olmadığı iddiasına cevap vermek gerekirse, halk kitlelerini medeniyetten uzak, geri "öteki" olarak gören (ki Howard Caygill'e (1991) göre avangard sanatın en önemli özelliği budur) ve onları dönüştürmeye çalışan, üstelik savaş yorgunu, inanılmaz yoksul bir ülkede modern mimarlığın en güzel örneklerini ortaya koyan

dönemin Türk mimarları Batı'dakilere benzemese de kendi ülkeleri için avangarddır. Mimarlığın bağımsız bir disiplin olarak gelişemediği iddiasına gelince, sözü geçen tarihçilere göre bunun nedenleri Türkiye'nin modernleşme sürecinin yukarıdan aşağıya gerçekleşmesi ve modernleşmeyi talep eden bir sivil toplumun olmayışıdır. Mimarlık bu nedenle devlete bağımlı olarak gelişmiştir ve bir başka mimarlık teorisyeni Uğur Tanyeli'ye göre de Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi mimarları bürokratik elitlerdir (1996).

Bu görüşler, aslında, 1980 askeri darbesinden sonraki yıllarda ortaya çıkan ve Türkiye'nin yaşadığı bütün sorunların kaynağını cumhuriyetin ilanıyla başlayan "tepeden inmeci" modernleşme sürecine bağlayan "ikinci cumhuriyetçi"olarak bilinen düşünce sisteminin mimarlık alanına yansımalarıdır. Bütünüyle "avrupa-merkezci" bir bakış açısıyla modernleşmenin Avrupa'dakine uymayan biçimlerini yok sayan bu anlayış, aynı zamanda Avrupa modernleşmesini de "sivil toplum hareketi" olarak yüceltmektedir. Oysa, bugün, gittikçe daha çok açığa çıktığı gibi Avrupa modernleşmesinin öznesi de ulus-devlettir (Ulrich Beck, 2003) ve modernleşme kapitalizme ulaşma yolları olduğu için her ülkede kendine özgüdür (Frederic Jameson, 2002).

Bu durumda, mimarlığı toplumun diğer kurumlarından bağımsız ele almak ve Türkiye'de Avrupa normlarına uygun bir gelişme göstermediğini söylemek, hem mimarlığın içinde bulunduğu tarihsel ve toplumsal durumdan bağımsız olabileceğini iddia etmek, hem de ülkelerin özgül koşullarını reddetmek anlamına gelmektedir. Ülkelerin özgül koşullarından kaynaklanan farklılıkları reddetmek ise beraberinde benzerlikleri de yok saymayı getirebilmektedir ve bugün Türkiye'de mimarlığın dünya mimarlığından farklı geliştiği düşüncesi bu bakış açısının sonucudur.

Mimarlığın bağımsız bir disiplin olabileceği inancı ise, dünya görüşlerinden bağımsız olarak,mimarlık teorisyenlerinin çoğunun paylaştığı bir inançtır. Modern mimarlığın ünlü mimarı Le Courbusier

toplumsal çalkantıların çözümü için "mimarlık ya da devrim" önerirken bu inancı taşımaktadır. Mimarlık tarihçisi Sibel Bozdoğan Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi binalarının mimarlık mirası içinde yerini alabilmesi için Kemalizmle bağlarını koparması gerekir derken de bu inanç vardır.

Mimarlığın Türkiye'de farklı geliştiği düşüncesi ve mimarlığın toplumsal yapıdan bağımsız olabileceği inancı mimarların *habitus*ları üzerinde önemli etkilere sahiptir. Bu düşünceler, mimarların eğitimleri, örgütlenmelerinin etkileri ve uluslararası etkileşim sonucu oluşturdukları "kendiliğinden profesyonel meslek ideolojisi"nin ürünüdür.

Louis Althusser bilimi ve bilim insanlarının durumunu tartışırken "bilim insanının kendilğinden felsefesi"nden söz eder (1990). Kısaca SPS (Spontaneous Philosophy of Scientists) olarak adlandırdığı bu düşünce sistemi, bilim insanının bilimsel pratik ve "bilim" hakkında, bilinçli veya bilinçsiz taşıdığı fikirlerden ve yüklediği değerlerden oluşmaktadır. *SPS*'in birbiriyle çatışan iki eğilimi vardır. Althusser bunlardan birincisini *materyalist* eleman olarak adlandırır ve bunun gündelik pratik içinde oluşan içsel inanç ve düşünceler olduğunu söyler. Althusser'e göre SPS'in ikinci eğilimi bilim insanının pratiğinin dışında teorisyenler tarafından oluşturulur. "Bilimin değeri", "bilimsel ruh" gibi çeşitli biçimler alan ve *idealist* eleman olarak adlandırılan bu ikinci eğilim pek çok durumda materyalist elemanla çelişir ve onu yönlendirir.

Bu yaklaşımı mimarlık alanına uyguladığımızda mimarların meslek pratiği içinde oluşturdukları kendiliğinden düşünce ve inançları olduğu gibi, mimarlık teorisyenlerinin genel olarak mimarlık hakkında oluşturdukları inanç ve fikirlerin de taşıyıcısı oldukları görülür. Bu çalışmada, Althusser'in *SPS*'i mimarlığa uyarlanmış ve bilimsel pratikle mimari pratik arasındaki farkı vurgulamak amacıyla "kendiliğinden profesyonel meslek ideolojisi" *SPI* (Spontaneous Professional Ideology) olarak adlandırılmıştır.

Daha önce bahsedildiği gibi "kendiliğinden profesyonel meslek ideolojisi" mimarların, mimarlığın dünyayı değiştirmeye muktedir

bağımsız bir disiplin olabileceği inancının temel kaynağıdır. Ancak *SPI* sadece bu konuda etkili değildir. *SPI* mimarların meslek eğitimi sonucunda edindikleri mekân kavramını da etkiler. Henri Lefebvre (1998) üç çeşit mekân olduğunu söyler. Bunların ilki fiziksel mekânın kendisidir. İkincisi uzmanların yani mimarların plancıların mekânıdır ve fiziksel mekânı haritalara, planlara, kesit ve cephelere indirger, üçüncüsü ise kullanıcıların mekânıdır. Lefebvre'e göre uzmanların mekânı her zaman kullanıcının mekânını yönlendirir ve marjinalize eder. Mimarın yarattığı mekâna müdahalelerden hoşlanmaması bunun en büyük göstergesidir. Bu, aynı zamanda, kendisini bir sanatçı olarak gören mimarın eserine müdahaleyi kabullenmeyişidir ki mimarın kendisini sanatçı olarak görüşü de sahip olduğu profesyonel meslek ideolojisinin bir sonucudur.

SPI, mimarın mimarlık mesleğinin meşruiyeti konusundaki düşüncelerini de etkiler. Meşruiyet mücadelesi bir güç mücadelesidir. Mimar aldığı eğitim ve pratiği sonucu yapılı çevrenin tek sorumlusu olmak ister. Oysa günümüzün değişen koşullarında inşaat sanayiinde tasarım ve uygulama alanında pek çok yeni uzmanlaşma ortaya çıkmıştır. Kentsel tasarım, peyzaj mimarlığı, iç mimarlık gibi uzmanlaşma alanları mimarlık mesleğinin faaliyet alanını daraltmıştır. Mimarlar Türkiye'de ayrıca uzman olmayan kişilerin (müteahhitlerin) yapılı çevrede söz sahibi olmalarıyla karşı karşıyadırlar ve mesleğin bu durumu mimarların en önemli sorunlarındandır.

Mimarlar mesleklerine büyük bir sevgiyle bağlıdırlar ve bunu aynı zamanda bir üstünlük olarak algılarlar. Müşteri ve kullanıcıyla ilişkilerinde bu üstünlük duygusu etkilidir. Bu ilişkilerde kabullendikleri etik kurallar da *habitus*larının önemli bir parçasıdır ve doğrudan *SPI* ile ilişkilidir.

Mimarın *habitus*unu dolayısıyla *ethos*u etkileyen faktörler *SPI* ile sınırlı değildir. Daha önce bahsedildiği gibi uluslararası etkileşim, mimarların dünya mimarlığı ile olan ilişkileri, değerlendirmeleri de

etkenlerden birisidir. Bunların dışında mimarların örgütlenmeleri, mezun oldukları okul, meslek pratiğini icra ettikleri şehir, mimarın yaşı ve toplumsal cinsiyette *habitus* üzerinde önemli etkilere sahiptir.

Örgütlenme mimarlık meslek pratiğinin ortak yürütülmesinin en önemli aracıdır. Türkiye'de mimarların 3 ayrı örgütünden bahsedilebilir: *Serbest Mimarlar Derneği*, *Mimarlar Derneği 1927 ve Mimarlar Odası*. İlk iki örgüt oldukça az üye sayısıyla daha küçük örgütlenmelerken, Mimarlar Odası en büyük kitlesel örgütlenmedir. Mimarlık fakültelerinden mezun olan her mimarın üye olmak zorunda olduğu Mimarlar Odası Türkiye'de 21 ilde örgütlüdür ve diğer küçük illerde de temsilcilikleri vardır. Mimarların meşruiyet mücadelelerinde uzun bir geçmişe sahip olan Mimarlar Odası, sadece meslek örgütü olarak değil, bir toplumsal muhalefet örgütü olarak da faaliyet göstermekte ve bu durum zaman zaman üyelerinin örgütten kopmasına neden olmaktadır. Ancak, mimarlar odasının politikayla ilgilenmesi de Türkiye'de bir gelenektir. Mimarlar Odası, üyesi olduğu Uluslararası Mimarlar Birliği (UIA) aracılığıyla uluslararası etkileşimi Türkiye'ye taşımanın bir aracı olmanın yanısıra yayınladığı ve üylerine ücretsiz gönderdiği yayınlarla meslekle ilgili her türlü bilgi ve tartışmayı da üyelerine aktararak profesyonel meslek ideolojisinin yaygınlaşmasına da katkıda bulunmaktadır.

Mimarların *habitus*larını etkiyen bir diğer faktör eğitimdir. Türkiye'de 20 devlet üniversitesinin yanısıra özel vakıf üniversitelerinin de mimarlık fakültesi bulunmaktadır. Bu fakülteler mimarlık eğitimine teknik eğitim, teorik eğitim, mesleki eğitim gibi farklı yaklaşımlar sergilemekte bu da mezunlarının meslek pratiğindeki yaklaşımlarını biçimlendirmektedir. Aslında Türkiye'de farklı okulların seçtikeri eğitim anlayışına göre farklı mimarlık geleneklerinden bile söz edilebilir. Bunun yanısıra okulların mimarlığı bir disiplin yada meslek olarak kabul edişleri bir gerilim yaratmakta ve mimarlık mesleğinde teorik pratik arasında kopukluğa da yol açmaktadır. Öte yandan eğitimin diğer

meslek eğitimlerinden farklı özellikleri örneğin tasarım eğitimin herhangi bir kitabının, şablonlarının olmayışı da genç mimar adaylarının *habitus*larını farklı etkilemektedir. Ancak aralarındaki farklılıklar ne olursa olsun mimarlık okulları öğrencilerinin meslek ideolojisine sahip olmalarının esas sorumlusudur.

Mimarların *habitus*ları mimarın toplumsal cinsiyetlerinden bağımsız oluşamaz. Mimarlık genelde erkek egemen bir meslektir. Kadın mimarların sayısı az olduğu gibi (Türkiye'de oda üyesi kadın mimarların oranı %33'dür) mimarlık alanında faaliyetleri de genellikle tasarım alanıyla sınırlıdır. Örneğin Türkiye'de kadınların şantiye mimarı olarak çalışmaları zordur ve bunun nedenleri de erkek egemen sistemin kadınlara yükledikleri rollerdir. Feminist mimarlar ayrıca kadın mimarların farklı tasarım anlayışları olduğunu ve müşteri ve kullanıcılarla olan ilişkilerinde de farklı etik anlayışları olduğunu iddia etmektedirler. Bütün bunların *habitus* üzerindeki etkileri çok önemlidir.

Mimarın meslek pratiği içindeki konumu da *habitus*unu etkiler. Bu konumun en önemli belirleyicilerinden biri de meslek pratiğini icra ettiği şehirdir. Farklı şehirler farklı kültürel, sosyal ve ekonomik özellikler taşır. Mimarlık bu özelliklerle birebir ilişkide olan bir meslek olduğu için pratiğide bunlardan etkilenir. Bu bağlamda içinde yaşanılan ve çalışılan kentin mimarın uygulayacağı stratejiler üzerindeki etkilerinden söz etmek mümkündür.

Son olarak mimarın yaşı *habitus* üzerinde etkidir. Bourdieu herhangi bir alanda *(field)* bireyin uygulayacağı stratejileri sadece *habitus*la açıklamaz. Aynı zamanda alan *(field)* içinde bireyin sahip olduğu sermaye de etkilidir. Bourdieu'ye göre ekonomik, sembolik ve kültürel sermaye çeşitleri vardır. Kültürel sermaye meşru bilgi birikimiyken, sembolik sermaye onur ve prestijle ilgilidir. Bourdieu'nun [(habitus)(sermaye)]+(alan)= pratik şeklinde formüle ettiği bu yaklaşımda mimarın yaşı sermayelerinin artmasını sağlayacağı için önemlidir.

Bu teorik çerçeve ışığında, bu çalışmada ethosu ortaya koyan faktörler aşağıdaki tahminlerle formüle edildi:

Tahmin 1: Uluslararası etkileşim mimarların *habitus*unu kendi pratiklerinin ve mimarlığın Türkiye'de dünyadan farklı olduğunu düşünmelerine neden olarak etkiler. Bazı kültürel ve ekonomik farklılıkların dışında Türkiye'de mimarlığın gelişmesi ve şu anki durumu dünyadaki mimarlıktan çok büyük farklılıklar göstermemektedir. Türkiye'deki bazı uygulamaların farklı oluşu bu düşünceye neden olmaktadır.

Tahmin 2: Mimarların kendiliğinden "profesyonel meslek ideolojisine" sahip oldukları düşünüldüğünde bu ideolojinin mimarları mekân, mimarlığın bağımsız bir disiplin oluşu, mimarlığın sanat bileşeni, mimarlığın meşruiyeti, mimarın mesleğine bağlılığı, mimarın müşteri ve kullanıcı üzerindeki hakimiyeti ve etik kuralları hakkındaki düşüncelerini belirlediği görülmektedir. Bu meslek ideolojisi mimarlık eğitiminin, örgütlenmenin ve uluslararası etkileşimin etkileriyle biçimlenir ve mimarların sembolik sermayesini artırır.

Tahmin 3: Mimarlık eğitimi profesyonel meslek ideolojisinin oluşmasında önemli rol oynar. Farklı mimarlık fakültelerinden mezun olmak bu profesyonel ideolojide bir farklılığa yol açmazken, edinilen ve meslek pratiğinde kullanılan bilginin düzey ve biçiminde farklılıklar yaratır. Eğitim mimarın kültürel sermayesini oluşturur.

Tahmin 4: Mimarların örgütlenmesi profesyonel meslek ideolojisinin pekiştirilmesinde ve uluslararası etkileşimin yayılmasında önemli rol oynar.

Tahmin 5: Mimarların sosyal ve ekonomik ilişkileri meslek pratiklerini icra ettikleri şehire göre değişir.

Tahmin 6: Mimarın meslek pratiğinde sahip olduğu kriterler, yaşla birlikte değişir ve bu değişim mimarın ekonomik, kültürel ve sembolik sermaye birikiminde farklılık yaratır.

Tahmin 7: Toplumsal cinsiyet farklılıkları, kadın mimarlar açısından meslek pratiğinde tasarım ve uygulamada farklılıklar yaratır.

Bu tahminlerin doğrulanması amacıyla 2004 yılında bir saha çalışması yapıldı. Ankara, Antalya, Bursa, İstanbul, Konya ve Kastamonu'da toplam 31 mimarla derinlemesine mülakat tekniğiyle yüzyüze görüşmeler gerçekleştirildi. Mimarların yirmisi erkek, onbiri kadındı. Şehir seçiminde farklı özelliklere sahip şehirler olmasına dikkat edildi. Ankara ve İstanbul'un dışında Bursa, Antalya ve Konya hem Türkiye'nin farklı bölgelerinde bulunmaları hem de farklı sermaye gruplarının ve farklı yatırımların merkezi olmaları nedeniyle seçilirken, Kastamonu da küçük kentlere örnek olarak seçildi. Ankara'da 12 mimar, İstanbul'da 9 mimar, Bursa ve Kastamonu'da üçer mimar ve Antalya ile Konya'da ikişer mimarla bürolarında görüşüldü.

Mimarların 11'i büronun sahibiyken 20 mimarın genellikle bir ortağı vardı ve kadın mimarlarda bu ortak genellikle eşleri oluyordu. 11 mimar 46-50 yaş grubunda çoğunluğu oluştururken, onları 6 mimarla 41-45 yaş grubu izliyordu. En yaşlı mimar 58 yaşında Ankara'lı bir mimarken, en genç mimar da 28 yaşında Konya'lı bir mimardı. 8 mimar Ortadoğu Teknik Üniversitesi (ODTÜ) mezunu, 11 mimar İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi (İTÜ) mezunu, 3 mimar Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi (YTÜ), 3 mimar da Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi (KTÜ) mezunuydu. Gazi Üniversitesi (GÜ) mezunu 2 mimar, Selçuk Üniversitesi (SÜ) mezunu 2 mimar ve şimdiki ismi Mimar Sinan Ünversitesi olan Güzel Sanatlar Akademisi mezunu 2 mimarla da görüşüldü. Gazi Ünversitesi'nden bir ve Selçuk Ünversitesi'nden bir mimar aslında bu üniversitelerin önceli olan Devlet Mimarlık Mühendislik Akademilerini mezunuydu. 10 mimar 16-20 sene serbest çalışma deneyimiyle çoğunluğu oluştururken, 2 mimar sadece 1 yıldır serbest çalışıyordu. En yaşlı mimar ise 34 yıldır büro sahibiydi.

Bürolar genellikle 2-3 kişiden oluşurken, 2 mimar bürolarının farklı yan dallarda (mobilya üretimi, malzeme satışı ve diğer mühendislik hizmetleri) da faaliyet gösterdiğini ve bu nedenle 25-30 kişinin çalıştığını belirttiler. Bürolarında sadece mimari tasarım yapan mimarların sayısı 5 iken, tasarım, kontrol ve müteahhitlik işlerini birlikte yürüten mimar sayısı 17 idi. 9 mimar ise tasarım ve kontrol aşamalarında faaliyet gösteriyor, ancak müteahhitlik yapmıyordu. Mimarlar konuttan otele, hastaneye, resmi binalardan alışveriş merkezlerine kadar değişen alanlarda uzman olduklarını belirtirken, 8 mimar herhangi bir uzmanlaşmalarının olmadığını ve her projeyi yaptıklarını söylediler.

Mülakatların yapıldığı şehirlerin seçiminde farklı özelliklere sahip olmalarının göz önünde tutulduğundan bahsedilmişti. Bu seçimde mimarlara ulaşılabilirlik de rol oynadı. Ancak, mimarların seçiminde, bilinçli bir tercihle, görüş ve düşüncelerini ve eserlerini dergilerde, kitaplarda yayınlayan ve dolayısıyla Türkiye'deki mimarlık teorisi ve söyleminin bir parçası olan ünlü mimarlar yerine, mesleğin "sessiz çoğunluğunun" temsilcileriyle mülakat yapılmasına karar verildi. Böylece teori ve pratik arasında bir kopukluk varsa bunun da ortaya çıkabileceği öngörüldü.

Kişisel bilgilerin dışında mimarlara 73 açık uçlu soru soruldu. Kadın mimarlar toplumsal cinsiyet ve meslek ilişkisini ortaya çıkarmak amacıyla beş farklı soruya daha cevap verdiler. Sorular kişisel bilgilerin dışında beş bölümden oluşmaktaydı. 2. Bölüm mimarlık eğitimi ile ilgili 12 soruyu içermekteydi. Bu sorularla mimarların mesleği neden seçtikleri, eğitim sırasında kafalarında oluşturdukları mimar imajı, bunun gerçekleşip gerçekleşmediği, eğitimde neleri eksik buldukları, mezun oldukları okulların avantaj ve dezavantajları ortaya çıkarılmaya çalışıldı. 3. Bölüm mimarlık disipliniyle ilgili 13 sorudan oluşmaktaydı. Bu soruların cevapları, mimarların, mimarlığı bağımsız bir disiplin olarak görüp görmedikleri, Türkiye'de bir meslek ideolojisinin olup

olmadığı, etik kuralları, mimarlığın Türkiye'de ve dünyadaki durumuyla ilgili düşüncelerini açıklıyordu. 4. Bölüm mimarların mekân tasarımı, kullanıcıyla olan ilişkileri, mekânın insan ilişkileri üzerindeki etkileri hakkında 13 sorudan oluşmaktaydı. 5. Bölüm, mimarlık mesleği ile ilgili 21 sorunun cevaplarıyla meslek sorunları, örgütlenme, yaşanılan kentin etkileri, mimarların sorunları nasıl çözdükleri gibi konuları açığa çıkarttı. Son bölümde ise, mimarlara mimar kimliği ile ilgili 14 soru sorularak kendilerini nasıl tanımladıkları, Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi mimarlarını nasıl gördükleri anlaşılmaya çalışıldı. Her bölüm, yukarıda bahsedilen varsayımların test edilmesini sağlayacak çeşitli soruları içeriyordu. Mülakatlardan alınan cevaplar her tahmine göre değerlendirildi ve mimarların ortak *habitus*ları ortaya çıkarılmaya çalışıldı. Mimarların mülakatlarda verdikleri cevaplar şöyle özetlenebilir:

- Mimarlar sebest çalışmayı kişilik özelliklerine uygun olduğu için seçmekte ve büro sahibi olmanın ticari boyutundan hoşlanmamaktadır.
- Serbest mimarlar, bürolarında çalıştırdıkları elemanları olsa bile, kendilerini işveren olarak görmemekte ve mimari proje üretiminin bütün süreçleriyle bizzat uğraşmaktan, inşaat alanında çalışmaktan keyif almakta, bu anlamda işçi hem de çok çalışan bir işçi olduklarından övünerek söz etmektedir.
- Eğer, tasarladıkları bina ile inşaat sonucunda ortaya çıkan bina uyuşmazsa, mimarlar hatayı kendilerinde bulmaktadır.
- Türkiye'de mimarların mezun oldukları okullara bağlı olarak sahip oldukları bir mimarlık geleneği vardır.
- Serbest çalışan mimarlar, ekonomik koşulları ne olursa olsun ayrıcalıklı bir sosyal konuma sahiptir.

- Türkiye'de bir mimarlık etiğinin olmadığından yakınan mimarların hepsinin meslekle ilgili kendi kişisel etik kuralları vardır.

  - Bu etik kurallar daha eğitimlerinin başından itibaren oluşturmaya başladıkları profesyonel meslek ideolojilerinin bir ürünüdür.

- Mimarlar Türkiye'de genel bir mimarlık meslek ideolojisinin var olduğunu kabul etmeseler de, *SPI,* müşteri, kullanıcı ve diğer meslek insanları karşısında onları kendiliğinden birleştirmektedir ve bu durum mimara bir üstünlük duygusu vermektedir.

- Mimarların meslek ideolojileri nedeniyle mesleğin meşruiyeti konusunda endişeleri vardır ve yapılı çevrenin esas sorumlusunun mimar olması gerektiğini düşünmektedirler.

- Serbest çalışan mimarlar, mimarlığın bağımsız bir disiplin olabileceğine inanmamaktadır. Ancak, iyi bir mimarlığın toplumda bir şeyleri değiştirebileceğine inandıkları için, toplumsal değişimin önemli aktörleri olmaları gerektiğine inanmaktadırlar.

- Türkiye'de mimarlığın teorisi ve pratiği arasında bir kopukluk vardır. Mimarlık teorisyenleri ve tarihçileri mimarlığın bağımsız bir disiplin olabileceğine, toplumsal sorumluluk alanından bağımsız salt bir mimarlık sorumluluk alanının varlığına ve sadece mimarlık için geçerli bir mimari etik kavramına pratiğin içindeki mimarlardan daha çok inanmaktadır.

- Serbest çalışan mimarlar, toplumsal sorumluluk alanından bağımsız bir mimarlık sorumluluk alanının varlığına inanmamaktadır.

- Mimarlar, mimarın dünya görüşünden bağımsız bir mimarlık anlayışı olabileceğine inanmamaktadır.
- Küçük şehirde yaşayan sebest mimarlar daha avantajlı bir konuma sahiptir ve beklentileri de büyük şehirdeki meslekdaşlarından farklı olduğı için yaşamlarından daha memnundur.
- Mimarların büyük çoğunluğu, mimarlık eğitiminin, özellikle de pratiğe yönelik kısmının yetersiz olduğunu düşünmektedir.
- Mimarlar, Türkiye'de mimarlık fakültelerinin sayıca çok oluşunun mesleğin kalitesini olumsuz etkilediğini düşünmektedir.
- Mimarların büyük çoğunluğu, örgütlenmenin meslek sorunlarını çözmede çok önemli rolü olduğuna inanmaktadır, ancak, Mimarlar Odası'nın bugünkü durumunu da şiddetle eleştirmektedir.
- Mimarların büyük çoğunluğu, mimarlık pratiğinin Türkiye'de dünyadakinden farklı olduğuna inanmaktadır, ancak, dünya ile ilgili bilgileri Batı ile sınırlıdır.
- Mimarlar mesleklerini çok sevmektedir. Açıkça dile getirmeseler de mimarlığın sanat bileşeni onlar için çok önemlidir ve eserlerine bağlılık duymaktadırlar.
- Kadın mimarlar meslekte yaşadıkları güçlüklerin kadın mimar olmalarından değil, erkek egemen bir toplumda kadın olmaktan kaynaklandığına inanmaktadır. Yaşadıkları güçlükler sadece mesleğin inşaat sürecinde, inşaat alanında yaşadıklarıyla sınırlıdır.
- Mimarların uzmanlıklarından kaynaklanan farklı bir mekân anlayışları vardır ve kullanıcının o mekânı mimarın tasarımından farklı bir biçimde kullanması, kendilerinde en azından hayal kırıklığı yaratmaktadır.

- Mimarlar homojen bir grup olduklarına inanmamaktadır ama kendiliğinden gelişen meslek ideolojileri onları diğer meslekler karşısında homojen hale getirmektedir.
- Mimarlar, Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi mimarlarıyla, mimarlık teorisyenlerinin olduğundan daha barışıktır. O dönem mimarlarının toplumda sahip oldukları saygın konuma ve sahip oldukları büyük ideallerine gıpta etmektedirler.
- Mimarlar, mimarlığın içinde olduğu söylenilen krizin, Türkiye'deki nedeninin tamamen ekonomik olduğunu düşünmektedir.
- Mimarlara göre Türkiye'de devlet hala en büyük işverendir. Mimarlar devletin, mesleğin konumunun iyileştirilmesi için gerekli düzenlemeleri yapmasını beklemektedir.
- Mimarlara göre,Türkiye'de mimarlık camiasının kendi içindeki en büyük sorunları haksız rekabet, mesleki dayanışmanın olmayışı ve iletişimsizliktir.
- Mimarlar, Türk toplumunun yapılı çevre ve onun önemi hakkında bilgisiz olduğuna ve bu bilgisizliğin mimarın meşruiyeti konusunda sorunlar yarattığına inanmaktadır.
- Mimarlar kendilerini öncelikle müşterilerine karşı sorumlu hissetmekte, bunu sırasıyla kendilerine karşı sorumluluk ve çevre ve tarihe karşı sorumluluk izlemektedir.
- Mimarların çoğu mesleklerinin geleceği hakkında umutsuzdur.

Mülakat sonuçları bu tezin 7 tahminini doğrular nitelikteydi. Bunun da ötesinde Türkiye'de mimarlık teorisi ile pratiği arasında bir kopukluk olduğunu da ortaya çıkardı. Örneğin meslek pratiğini doğrudan uygulayan büro sahibi/ortağı mimarlar, mimarlığın bağımsız bir disiplin olabileceğine inanmıyorlardı. Etik kuralları sadece mimarlık için geçerli

değildi. En büyük sorumluluğu müşterilerine ve daha sonra kendilerine karşı hissediyorlardı. Mimarın toplumsal dönüşümlerin önemli aktörlerinden birisi olması gerektiğini düşünüyorlar ve Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi mimarlarının yaptıklarını doğru buluyorlardı. Kadın mimarlar yaşadıkları sorunların mimar olmalarından kaynak lanmadığını, sadece erkek egemen toplumda kadın olmanın bazı zorluklarını yaşadıklarını ve tasarım yaklaşımının zaten her mimar için farklı olduğunu söylüyorlardı.

Butün bunlar akademik çevrelerle, meslek pratiğini uygulayanların *habitus*ların farklılıklarını ortaya koyuyordu. Ayrıca mülakatlarda her mimarın kendi farklı eğilimleri de ortaya çıkmıştı. Bu durumda ortak bir *habitus*dan nasıl bahsedilebileceği önemli bir sorundu. Ancak Bourdieu aynı sınıfsal konumu paylaşanların benzer durumları yaşamalarının farklı sınıfsal konumdakilerden daha büyük bir olasılık olduğunu (1977) ve bunun da ötesinde aynı sınıfsal konuma sahip bireylerin *habitus*larınının bir çeşit uyum içinde olduğunu (1990) söyler. Bu uyumu sağlayan ise, Bourdieu'ya göre, üretim faaliyeti içinde hemen algılanabilen ve öngörülebilen ve bu nedenle sorgulanmadan kabullenilen şemalardır.

Mimarlar açısından baktığımızda bu şemaların büyük ölçüde mimarların kendiliğinden gelişen profesyonel meslek ideolojisi (*SPI*) aracılığıyla sağlandığını görmekteyiz. Bu ideoloji Althusser'in deyimiyle her ne kadar bireyin dünya görüşüyle sıkı bağlar içinde olsa da, ondan bağımsız olarak ele alınması gereken, sadece meslek pratiği ve disiplini ile ilgili bilinçli ya da bilinçsiz düşünceleridir. Yani, sadece, mimarın meslek pratiği ve genel olarak mimarlık hakkında düşündüklerini ortaya koyar. İşte bu bağlamda toplumsal yapının her bireye yaşattıkları aynı olmasa bile ortak bir *habitus*tan bahsetmek mümkündür ve bu da *ethos*u biçimlendirir. Çünkü, *ethos*, Bourdieu'ya göre, bireylerin bilinçaltında, nesnel düzenin, bu düzene göre mantıklı ya da mantıksız eylemin ne olduğunu öğrenme süreçlerinin bir

ürünüdür (1977). Türkiye'de meslek pratiğini uygulayan mimarların *ethos*u da, çalışmanın yedi değişkeninin etkisiyle biçimlenmekte ve mimarların meslekle ilgili değerlerini ve inançlarını belirlemektedir. Bu çalışmada kendileriyle görüşülen mimarlar Türkiye'de ortak bir mimarlık kültürü olduğuna inanmıyorlardı. Oysa çalışmanın doğrulanan tahminlerinin işaret ettği gibi, bu inanışın tersine, Türkiye'de mimarlık fakültelerinin, örgütlenmenin ve Batı'nın etkisinin yarattığı bir ortak mimarlık kültürü vardır.

Bu çalışma, Türkiye'de mimarların *ethos*unu belirleyen en önemli faktörün, sahip oldukları kendiliğinden işleyen profesyonel meslek ideolojileri olduğunu ortaya çıkartmıştır. Bir meslek ideolojisine sahip olunması yanlış bir şey değildir, üstelik bir meslekte uzmanlaşma özel bir bilgi birikimi gerektirdiği için kaçınılmazdır. Ancak, her şeyi mesleğin daha doğrusu disiplinin dar sınırları içine indirgemek tehlikelidir. Böylesi bir durum, özellikle mimarlık teorisyenleri açısından teori ve pratiğin çelişmesiyle sonuçlanabilir. Althusser'in deyimiyle "bilim insanının kendiliğinden felsefesi" barındırdığı idealist eğilimle, bilim hakkında yanılsamalara yol açabilmektedir. Mimarlık alanında "bağımsız mimarlık disiplini", "mimarın dünya görüşünden bağımsız mimarlık anlayışı", "toplumsal sorumluluk alanından bağımsız mimarlık sorumluluk alanı", "salt mimarlık için etik" gibi yaklaşımlar bu türden yanılsamalara örnektir. Bu yanılsamalar sosyal gerçeklikten uzak bir mimarlık söylemi yaratmakta ve farklı düşünceleri ve eleştirileri olsa da, bu söylem bütün mimarları etkilemektedir. Oysa, değişen dünya koşullarınad mimarlık için artık farklı yaklaşımlar gerekmektedir. Bu farklı yaklaşımların bir örneği XXII. Dünya Mimarlık Kongresi'nde ortaya konulmuştur.

XXII. Dünya Mimarlık Kongresi, "Kentler: MimarlıkLARın Pazaryeri" teması altında 3-7 Temmuz 2005 tarihleri arasında İstanbul'da yapıldı. Kongre sonunda yayınlanan İstanbul Deklarasyonu'nda yanlış uygulamalar sonucunda birbirlerinden ayrı düşen kentler ve mimarlığın

tüm dünyada yeniden buluşmasının öncelikli koşulları:

> -yaşamı ve çevreyi tahrip eden tüketim ekonomisinin yerine yoksulluğu önleyecek bir üretim ekonomisi;
> -toplumların kültürel kimliğini yok etmeyen bir mimarlık ve çevre öğretisi;
> -barışın bütün politikalardan önce gelen mutlak varlığı;
> -ulusları köleleştiren bir uluslararası egemenlik mekanizması yerine, öz kaynakların talanına izin vermeyen bir uluslararası işbirliği;
> -ve bilginin evrenselliği.

olarak belirlendi ve "bu ilkelere dayalı insancıl, kültürel ve uygarlıkları gözeten bir küreselleşme için ulusal ve uluslararası tüm ortamlarda, tüm kesimler arasında işbirliği ve ortaklık" önerildi.

Bu talepler, kesinlikle, kendilerini sadece mimarlığa karşı sorumlu hisseden mimarların talepleri değildir. Bunlar insanlığa ve dünyaya karşı sorumlu "yeni bir mimarlık" talepleridir. Bu talepler, aynı zamanda, mimarlığın yine ideolojik bir araç olarak, farklı bir "hâmi"nin hizmetinde olacağı yeni bir dünyayı öngören politik ve ideolojik taleplerdir. Dünya mimarları, artık, dünyada mimarlık hizmetlerinden yararlanabilen %2lik mutlu azınlığın değil, sessiz çoğunluğun hizmetinde olmayı güçlü ve ortak bir biçimde talep etmektedirler. Dünya mimarları, artık, kaybettikleri ayrıcalıklı konumu sadece prestij binaları yaparak değil, büyük ölçekli kitlesel projelerle kazanabileceklerini anlamaya başlamıştır.

Bu çalışmadan çıkan sonuçlardan biri de Türkiye'de mimarlarının çoğunun mesleklerinin geleceğinden umutsuz olduklarıdır. XXII. Dünya Mimarlık Kongresi mimarlığa yeni bir umut ve yol göstermektedir. Ancak bunun için mimarlığın eğitimden başlayarak yeniden yapılandırılması ve kavramlaştırılması gerekmektedir. Disiplin ve meslek pratiği arasındaki ikilik giderilmeli ve bunun eğitim üzerindeki etkileri silinmelidir. Genç mimar adayları kitlesel mimarlığın gerekleri doğrultusunda eğitilmelidir. Mimarların sık sık kendilerini karşılaştırmaktan hoşlandıkları tıp ve hukuk meslekleri gibi, mimarlığın

da bir teknik servis hizmeti olduğu gerçeği kabul edilmelidir. Şüphesiz, diğer mesleklerden farklı olarak, mimarların ülkelerinin sanat ve kültür ortamına katkıda bulunma talepleri vardır, ama, mimarın önceliği bu olamaz. Mimarlığın doğası gereği içinde barındırdığı sanatsal yön, mimar işini söz konusu yeni mimari söyleme göre yaptığı zaman, kendiliğinden ortaya çıkacaktır ve mimarlık teorisyenlerinin olası itirazlarına rağmen iyi tasarımın garantisi budur.

Bourdieu, h*abitus*un tarihsel koşullara bağlı olduğunu ve bu koşulların değişmesiyle değişebileceğini öngörür. Bu çalışmanın gösterdiği gibi, Türkiye'de serbest çalışan mimarların *habitus*ları zaten bazı yönleriyle teorisyenlerin h*abitus*undan değişiktir. Bu anlamda bütün mimarların bugünkü koşullarda sahip oldukları *habitus* ve dolayısıyla *ethos* gelecekte değişebilir. Belki de bütün mimarların kendilerine sormaları gereken soru, mimarın yeni rolünün ne olduğu sorusudur. Belki de cevap, mimarın inşaat sektöründe teknik servis elemanı olduğu gerçeğini kabul etmektir. Eğer mimarlıkta değişim isteniyorsa bu noktayı kabul etmek çok önemlidir. Bu da, ancak, hakim ideolojinin aracı olan ve aynı türden mimarlığı ve mimarı yeniden üreten mimarlık söylemi ve pratiği yerine, daha insancıl bir mimarlığı köklerinden yeşertmek için politik bir mimarlık yaklaşımını benimsemekle mümkündür.

Bu çalışma, mimarların kendilerini ve meslek pratiklerini nasıl algıladıklarını sosyolojik açıdan ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlayan durum tanımlayıcı bir çalışmadır ve sadece serbest çalışan mimarlarla sınırlıdır. Bireylerin *habitus*larının aynı alan içinde farklı konumlara göre de değişebileceği göz önüne alındığında, mimarlık alanının diğer konumlarında (özel ve kamu sektöründe ve akademide) çalışan bütün mimarları kapsayan ve bu çalışmanın paralelinde bir anket çalışmasının, varılan sonuçları daha genelleştirilebilir kılmak amacıyla, yapılması önerilmektedir.

VITA

Nilgün Fehim Kennedy was born in Ankara in 1957. She received her BA degree in Architecture from the Middle East Technical University in 1993. In 1999 she obtained her MS degree from the Department of Gender and Women's Studies of the same university. She has worked in various jobs, including running her own architectural office. From 2001 to 2005, she worked as a part-time instructor at Bilkent and Atılım universities. She is currently an instructor at the Bilkent University Department of Political Sciences. Her main areas of interest are architecture, sociology of space and sociology of art and culture. She is married with two children.

Contact address: nilgunke@bilkent.edu.tr