

TRANSFORMATION FROM REPRESENTATIONAL SPACE TO TOLERANCE SPACE: THE JUXTAPOSITION OF IDEAL AND REAL IN THE URBAN PUBLIC AREA

İnci BASA*

Received: 24.02.2016; Final Text: 04.10.2017

Keywords: Urban public space; tolerance; representation; culture; Ankara.

INTRODUCTION

Despite their apparent collective natures, cities generate social differences. They harbor different cultural and political values and varying economic and educational statuses. Due to their inherent qualities, they produce, manipulate or encounter social differences at changing levels. Yet, even cities that retain relative social cohesion cannot avoid the emergence of dissimilarity in today's diverse urban realities. Rather, most experience an appropriation of their essence from the influence of social differences, which can make strange spatial impacts on the urban fabric.

Urban public spaces, especially those with a cultural role in the "experience of modernity", generously display the multiple and fragmented spirits of a contemporary city (Berman, 1982). Recognizing differences, multiplicity and fragmentation through their negative or positive effects on cities is a major interest of urban studies and geographical research in different perspectives, contexts and scales (see Young, 1990; Garza, 1996; Sandercock, 1998; Sennett, 2003; Robinson, 2004; Fainstein, 2005; Amin, 2008; Brown, 2012; Bannister and Kearns, 2013). Interestingly, these effects can be easily discerned when they perform within a realm of formal consistency and within an "assumed stable situation" (Lefebvre, 2012, 182). Confronting something unexpected, unusual or different can be viewed both as an inspirational asset of urban life and as an instance of inconvenience. It is this paradoxical state that eventuates the paradigm of tolerance not only in social terms but also in the spatial realm. Within this framework, the present study attempts to cast light upon tolerance as a significant socio-psychological concept and a contemporary urban quality. It speculates that tolerance emerges as a practice of accepting the attitudes, habits and behaviors of the members of different social categories, adaptability to multiculturalism, and contacts among multiple social and cultural identities in the complexity of today's cities.

* Department of Architecture, METU, Ankara, TURKEY.

One can speak about the emergence of tolerance only when there are conflicts and contradictions that refer to different portrayals and perceptions of the same phenomena. Perhaps, the multifaceted nature of conflicts and contradictions cannot be precisely contoured due to the variety of joining points; however, assuming a dual state as their comprehensive representation would not be irrelevant or fictitious when there is a considerable overlap between two different practices of culture in the urban space depending on the binary meaning and perception of culture. To strengthen and develop these arguments within the particular context of urban public space, I investigate conflicting duality as a determining condition of tolerance and for this purpose, examine a contentious public space, the Ankara Atatürk Cultural Centre - an arena of sociopolitical and cultural conflict. This space has been the subject of many recent studies, having different viewpoints and theoretical frameworks; yet, the majority of these studies were intended for a Turkish-speaking academic and professional audience (see Basa, 2016; Sargın, 2012; Basa, 2011; Özgönül, 2010; Batuman, 2009; Bilsel, 2009; Saner, 2006; Ulusoy, 2006). In a sense, the lack of its discussion on a wider academic environment has motivated this study.

Ankara Atatürk Cultural Centre, originally envisioned to espouse high-cultural behavior (such as visiting art exhibitions, museum and library collections, various art performances), has experienced a contrary praxis of cultural events for decades without losing its genuine identity, thus displaying the potential to promote tolerance toward diversity. In line with its focus on tolerance, this study explores this space as a special urban environment that generates tolerance via its socially diverse users' overlapping spatial practices. Methodologically, on the one hand, official and professional discourses around the Centre have been substantiated by the statements uttered by politicians and professionals; and, on the other hand, an extended period of observations as well as a decades-long search on related publications, public news and related web sites that illustrate the ongoing social, cultural and recreational events have been a referential domain. The claims on the planning and design process of the Centre and its spatial practice have been supported by my successive personal interviews with the architects Filiz Erkal and Coşkun Erkal in 1988 and 2003, with whom I worked together during the late phases of construction of the Centre and design of its surrounding in 1986-87. To refine the ideas and observations of the sociopolitical complexity of the Centre, I analyze the architectural and social production of this space in the context of its associated representational qualities and spatial practices (Lefebvre, 2012). To focus on these aspects is to establish a link with political conflicts, which stem from the coexistence of different ideological prospects, each having different intentions for this area. A comprehensive examination of this space demands also the inclusion of binary semantic nature of the concept of culture and its reflections on the spatial practice of the Centre.

Thus, as reflections of this dual semantic character of culture, two spatial descriptions appear, which are dual to one another under the reciprocal transformation of the area's homogenized, monumental and ideal spatiality and its ordinary, fragmented and spontaneous spatiality. In its most extreme form, a spatial duality occurs by shattering the solitary existence of each description. Within this connection, I consider first, an analytical interpretation of the intertwined political and spatial occurrences and second, an identification of the status of this urban space as a dynamic agent of urban tolerance, to be the original contributions of this study.

In other words, this area's conflicted state is reciprocally identified as a potential for generating tolerance. This approach may lead to a confident reading of such conflict spaces as tolerance spaces that potentially possess both the energy and capacity to attribute a positive value to urban life by gathering urbanites of different cultures whose everyday practices have extremely limited intersection.

These arguments require an overview of the interrelated concepts of duality and tolerance, placing them in the context of urban spatiality with a focus on the social production of space. I address these two concepts as the constituents of a specific perspective (duality: the referent culture's dual semantic sphere; and, tolerance: coexistence of conflicting practices and a social phenomenon of embracing diversity) for developing a new critical understanding of the examination of urban public space in the following section titled as "Duality and Tolerance within the Context of Urban Public Space". I then investigate the production of Atatürk Cultural Centre as an urban public space through the interconnected realms of representations of space (architectural conceptions), representational space (associated symbols) and spatial practice (the society's use) in section three (Lefebvre, 2012). This section endeavors to contextualize the emergence of tolerance as an extraordinary consequence of the contradictions and conflicts between these three realms. I address the theoretical triad of spatial production with the purpose of structuring its observation of the political, architectural and cultural conflicts inherent in the examined space as the underlying context from which the concept of tolerance arises as an unpredicted valuable urban quality in the contemporary city. The concluding section discusses the argument about the dualities in the urban public space helping to foster tolerance and draws attention to the mutual constitution of space and social relations. It puts an emphasis on the social preparedness to live with others, hence by tolerance.

DUALITY AND TOLERANCE WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF URBAN PUBLIC SPACE

This section reviews several approaches to duality and tolerance that provide a general foundation for efforts to interpret the urban public space through the discursive mechanisms of these two concepts.

Duality: The Referent Culture's Dual Semantic Sphere

Duality generally refers to the quality or state of having two parts. Dictionary definitions describe duality also as "an instance of opposition or contrast between two concepts or two aspects of something" (see Merriam Webster, 2014 and Oxford Dictionaries, 2014 for the definitions). Urban studies have used and developed the concept of duality to offer arguments on urban space and its actors. As Chris Hamnett notes, "social polarization and the related issue of urban duality" emerged as the new research themes of the 1980s (2001, 164). He notes that the theoretical considerations of social polarization and duality were developed by John Friedmann and Goetz Wolff (1982), and particularly by Saskia Sassen (1984). British sociologist Antony Giddens' (1995) core concept of the duality of structure and agency (the former, formal rules and regulations of society, and the latter, the capability of individuals to produce a variety of casual powers and practices) in his social theory of structuration reinforced various approaches to the conception of duality. His views of these two concepts, more than their dual nature, are central to a multitude of theoretical

debates (Storper, 1985; Sewell, 1992; King, 1999; Zunino, 2006). The term duality within its social context, reveals its actual definition only when we realize that the two parts, (in Giddens' centre of interest, structure and agency) are different ways of looking at the same phenomenon, thus can not be conceived of separately – a subtlety central to the scientific and mathematical definition of the term.

In a similar vein, I claim that cultural actuality within the case area of Ankara Atatürk Cultural Centre exists in the form of a duality, portrayed by two conflicting agencies, namely, two spatial practices. Before asking whether this phenomenon can be interpreted as “a special sense of toleration” (Crick, 1971, 152) generated by the Cultural Centre's spatial practice, the complex term “culture” needs clarification. Carefully defining culture is always compulsory (and of critical importance in the present context) and difficult due to the complicated nature of its abstract and vague referent (Archer, 1996; Williams, 1988; Bauman, 1999). As previously mentioned, this study theoretically positions itself according to its claim that the two prevailing meanings of this referent create equity in both uses of the Atatürk Cultural Centre, thus enabling the coexistence of conflicting practices in this area. Obviously, the adjective cultural that is occasionally added to better define or modify a public space may specify the character of this space as a dual sphere due to the semantic duality inherent in the term.

Edward Sapir comments on two noticeably distinct 1924 conceptualizations of culture: “individual refinement” and “socially inherited elements” (Mandelbaum, ed., 1951). Succeeding Sapir's famous dichotomy, culture has been mainly elaborated in two distinct ways. This dichotomy is deeply ingrained in this study's vantage point, but as a mechanism affording an interdependent dual state rather than polarized controversies. Raymond Williams (1988, 87) identifies culture as among the important keywords of social studies and states that it can be defined as “a general process of intellectual, spiritual and aesthetic development”, with a metaphorical bond to its original meaning of cultivating (plants) in “a physical sense”. The term also “describes the works and practices of intellectual and especially artistic activity”, including “music, literature, painting and sculpture, theater and film”; sometimes it also embraces “philosophy, scholarship and history” (Williams, 1988, 87). This use of the term is “in origin an applied form of sense: the idea of a general process of intellectual, spiritual and aesthetic development was applied and effectively transferred to the works and practices, which represent and sustain it” (Williams, 1988, 87). A government's ministry of culture, as Williams (1988) indicates, refers to these applied forms as political and administrative institutions of the modern world. A second and later use of culture, in line with Sapir's view, indicates “a particular way of life, whether of a people, a period or a group” (see Williams, 1988, 87-93). The origins of this second meaning can be seen as a terminological attack on the term's relationship to the history of Western civilization.

Within this conception, the dual structure of the term/referent culture can be viewed as an encouraging milieu, in which tolerance becomes an overriding and natural property of the public space. In fact, comfortably inserting a sense of toleration as a social virtue into a public space may seem an optimistic ideal. Although public spaces are generally defined as spaces “to which people have unrestricted access” (Fyfe and Bannister, 1996), whether “any space has ever held such a status”

(Atkinson, 2003, 1830) is central to urban debates. Turkey's heterogeneous political landscape has penetrated urban life and endorsed subtle genres of segregation and encountering. Within the capital's contentious sociopolitical climate, urban spatial practices, including the practices within the Atatürk Cultural Centre, alternate among diverse societal derivatives of various groups of people associated with one another for different purposes. The increasing variety of purposes and practices that are dependent on the increasing complexity of the urban community and its demographic structure unavoidably changes the informal, yet, influential previous norms of the urban public spaces. Due to the particular context of the Centre, the dual semantic state of culture and the energy of cultural practices further contextualize this situation.

At this point, the intangible link with the concept of tolerance may require us to recall that the present discussion is characterized by its comprehension of tolerance as a condition explicable by reference to duality. The doubly regulated nature of the cultural domain creates both coherence within certain social classes of people and distinction among different societal groups. The current state of the case area offers a spatial instance where different customs, values and semiotic interpretations of culture intersect. With an awareness of the limits of tolerance (and an awareness of the controlled tone of the tolerant, connecting approval and disapproval), this study aims to explore the potential of the cultural urban space in conditioning and extending social toleration in the urban environment.

Tolerance: Coexistence of Conflicting Practices and a Social Phenomenon of Embracing Diversity

Tolerance is the "willingness to accept feelings, habits, or beliefs that are different from your own"; it is "the ability to accept, experience, or survive something harmful or unpleasant" (Merriam Webster, 2014). To tolerate, thus, means "to allow the existence, occurrence, or practice of something that one does not necessarily like or agree with without interference" (Merriam Webster, 2014). A special issue of *Government and Opposition* (1971, 6(2)) conceptualizes tolerance within a political and social context, and establishes a comprehensive background for a broadened understanding of and further research on the topic. In that issue, political philosopher Bernard Crick (1971, 144) offers a rough definition of tolerance, "as the degree to which we accept things of which we disapprove", and emphasizes the necessity of elaborating on this simple definition. He extensively discusses the concept, for instance, within religious, civil-political and racial contexts. In line with Crick, Preston King (1971, 172) contextualizes tolerance as a problem of human relations and defines it as "to endure, suffer or to put up with a certain person, activity, idea or organization of which or whom one does not really approve". With a different viewpoint from Crick and King, Steven Lukes (1971, 224) underlines the important role of the tolerator's "moral beliefs" and interprets tolerance essentially as a moral concept and a social phenomenon.

More or less as an academic reaction to Crick's call in the early 1970s, simple definitions of the concept of tolerance have broadened, as it was recognized a research matter worth investigating in various fields. Social psychology has been one of these fields; studies have investigated, for instance, the relationship between intolerance of ambiguity and socio-political ideology (Sidanius, 1978), tolerance promotion among students

through extended contact (Liebkind and McAlister, 1999), the relationship between ambiguity tolerance and conservatism, as well as the value conflicts (Durrheim, 1998) and social discrimination and tolerance in intergroup relations (Mummendey and Wenzel, 1999). By addressing a variety of concepts such as multiculturalism, ethnic groups, social cohesion and diversity, in light of ingroup - outgroup paradigms, intergroup attitudes and psychoanalytic perspectives, researches in the field of social psychology have focused on identity patterns in society and tolerance for uncertainty, and analysed how social identity and outgroup tolerance overlap (Brewer and Pierce, 2005). What has been dominantly identified and investigated in several studies is people's (in)tolerance of outgroup members' attitudes. Through its conception as a condition and practice, tolerance has also become a significant topic in the geographical studies and in the fields of urbanism and urban experience, and thus the subject of a variety of recent research perspectives. A literature overview shows that several studies consider tolerance an important urban concept. These studies have settled arguments in a multiplicity of understandings, including the relationship between migration and tolerance (Wilson, 1991), misleading semantic and social signals of concept of tolerance within multiculturalism (Schirmer et al., 2012), lived diversity in urban space and tolerant attitudes (Wessel, 2009), function and foundations of urban tolerance (Bannister and Kearns, 2013). Institutional research projects and programs (for example, the EU-funded "Towards a Topography of Tolerance and Equal Respect" (2011) and the multidisciplinary Norwegian research initiative and symposia titled "Tolerance and the City" (2010)) focus on conflict and intolerance as general and fundamental problems of cities – and not only cities in developed countries but also in recently developed and developing ones, which unavoidably experience socio-economic differences among citizens.

Tolerance offers a broad research area for understanding the urban spatiality. Recent studies on the question of tolerance raise a variety of issues in urban space such as multiculturalism, multiethnicity, class differences and gender inequalities within everyday interaction. This field of research emphasizes managing cultural and societal conflicts, constructing intercultural sensibilities and cultural dialogues and draws attention to the existence of different religious and ethnic communities as the new dynamics of the contemporary urban space. Urban public spaces, within this perspective, inevitably associate with these discussions since they offer casual encounters among particular groups of citizens. Growth of immigrant-led population in cities gives rise to diversity amongst urban spaces and peoples' urban spatial practices (Fincher, 1998). However, it is questionable whether urban public spaces naturally serve for multicultural engagement; whether diversity is smoothly negotiated in urban public spaces (Amin, 2002). As the notable geographies of encounters, urban public spaces offer a fertile research territory for tolerance. It is mainly because overt prejudices against the different social and cultural groups reinforce the occurrence of tolerance (Valentine, 2010). In fact, the geographies of encounter, thus the value of tolerance, cannot be limited with the urban public areas. An interesting study, for instance, identifies the university campus environment as an important case (Andersson et al., 2012). Another research on the urban encounters with an ethnographic emphasis examines the semi-public residential areas of local and immigrant people through their potential for decreasing negative stereotypes, prejudice and conflict (Leitner, 2011). In this sense, urban cultural areas



Figure 1. The monumental building of the Ankara Atatürk Cultural Centre (Photograph by the author)

can be viewed and recast as geographies of tolerance and respect to the differences within the multicultural nature of the contemporary cities.

The next section discusses the interplay of duality and tolerance by reference to the spatial formation and practices of Atatürk Cultural Centre, a cultural public space originally envisioned to embrace a nationalized culture and high-cultural behavior as a homogeneous whole. Here, Rosdil's (2011, 3473) observation on culture seems relevant: "culture is not only spatially heterogeneous at any single point in time but various sub-national units may also evolve unevenly over time, thus exacerbating internal cultural divisions". Relatedly, a cultural heterogeneity, depending on a multiplicity of sociopolitical and economic facts and motives within the society, has become discernible in this public space. The binary meaning of culture has resonated with manifestations of collective intellectual achievements and displays of local customs and artifacts; consequently, both meanings, thus different cultural behaviors, have found a heterogeneous spatial expression in the Centre (**Figure 1**).

ATATÜRK CULTURAL CENTRE: THE INTERCONNECTED REALMS OF "ARCHITECTURAL CONCEPTION", "ASSOCIATED SYMBOLS" AND "SOCIETY'S USE"

Henri Lefebvre (2012) draws attention to the complex nature of space and suggests a unitary theory that links the conceptual, societal and material aspects of space. His triadic relations and distinctions reflect the variable facet of space as a medium of social production. This triple comprehension offers a perspective on the analysis of social space by focusing on how these three realms stipulate space in form, meaning and occupation. According to Lefebvre, space is, concurrently, an established conceptual model for a mode of (architectural/urban) practice based on knowledge (a "representation of space"), associated images and symbols dominated by inhabitants' lived experiences (a "space of representation") and a material environment practiced by society (a "spatial practice") (Lefebvre, 2012, 33, 38-9). His theoretical approach that perceives space as a simultaneous social production rather than a merely abstract or concrete entity, matches well with the present study's understanding of spatiality. Knowing the impossibility of constituting and constructing a "true space" (whether a

1. The author has produced an important number of scholarly works on the examined area from various perspectives throughout the years. The reference of Kale within the article is the author's surname before 1990 and the cited work here investigates the historical transformation of the hippodrome area of Ankara, which today accommodates the Cultural Center. Author's talk at METU seminars on architecture and urbanism on October 27th 2014, titled as "Unfolding the Discursive Nature of Architecture: Interplay of the Spatial and Semantic Realms", partially included this topic.

proposal by the political/ideological use of knowledge, or the scientific or aesthetic, or architectural or urbanist proposals by experts of space), I try to decipher the "truth of this space" (Lefebvre, 2012, 9); its overall reality, generated by the interpretation of the conceived, lived and perceived materiality of the space.

Representation of Space: Architectural Conception

The area now housing the Ankara Atatürk Cultural Centre, originally accommodated a hippodrome, designed by the Italian architect Paolo Vietti-Violi (1882-1965) in 1936. The hippodrome was successfully integrated into the city as an important constituent of the modernity project of the young Turkish republic established in 1923 (Kale, 1990) (1). For the new capital of Ankara, which replaced the Ottoman Empire's capital of Istanbul, the hippodrome area was a powerful spatial representation of Westernized urban life. The space played an essential symbolic role in the creation of a new urban elite through horse racing (called the Ghazi Races in Ankara, referring to Ghazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk (1881-1938), the founder of the republic). It also housed the national ceremonies, which aim to reinforce and ritually illustrate the social creation of a new nation. The ceremonies have continued for decades, however, for the sake of political populism within the ideological social democratic climate of the 1970s (Günay, 2009), horse racing was brought to an end in this area because it was perceived as a leisure activity reserved for the upper class. This decision was a catalyst for the reevaluation of the area as a cultural public space, one that would embrace all people in Ankara as "a creator of social ties" (Aubin, 2014), as well as protect and foster a representational role in the republican memory that was (and still is) in line with Turkish social democrats' republican and secular discourse. In fact, this space was suggested as an urban platform, where "public space as a creator of social ties" and "the public sphere as contributing to collective deliberation in questions of democracy, civil society, and public opinion" coincide (Aubin, 2014, 90), comparable to the broadly acknowledged structural and functional suggestion of Jürgen Habermas (1992) in his prominent book "The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere".

Lefebvre (2012, 38) describes the representation of space as the "conceptualized space of planners, urbanists, technocratic subdividers and social engineers – all of whom identify what is lived and what is perceived with what is conceived". According to him this is a dominant component of spatial production and play a substantial role in social and political practice (Lefebvre, 2012, 40). "Informed by effective knowledge and ideology", representations of space set up permanent relations between the constructed urban space (architectural projects) and people that "will not vanish into symbolic realms" (2012, 42). Ankara municipality's decision in the 1970s to stimulate urban cultural life via a new representation of the hippodrome area culminated with a national architectural competition for a cultural centre in 1981, which would be the first construction of a cluster of cultural buildings in Turkey, and includes a convention centre, an opera house and a theatre. By the initiation of the technocratic government's (1980-1983; due to the 1980 coup d'état and dismissal of parliament) ministry of public works, the Cultural Centre was to be devoted to the reforms of Atatürk on the hundredth anniversary of his birth (1881).

Coskun Erkal and Filiz Erkal, two influential Turkish architects, won first prize in the competition in 1981. From the competition to the construction, the formation process of the Centre was indicated as a successful example

2. In process of time, the building became a notable spatial reference within the collective urban memory of Ankara as an architecturally significant example of its period, furthermore became a popular public area of both occasional and scheduled cultural events; but still, its demolition has been enunciated by the political actors off and on with an overt appetite for the representation of some new ideals on this central urban land. Although the space has warmly encountered some diverse even contradictory activities, conflicts in the area of the Atatürk Cultural Centre gained momentum through the appropriation proposals of the politicians. Despite the area's frequent spatial usage by different clusters of urbanites and the building's architectural value, a certain tension interestingly remained there. An extreme example of this tension is the then minister of culture's harsh criticism of the building's architectural form and his threatening remark that they would tear down "this ugly structure" and build a new one that would architecturally symbolize the old Turkish civilizations (Hürriyet, 2009). In fact, this has been an ongoing debate since 2005 between the government and architectural associations, after the eclectic proposal of an Azerbaijani architect with a kitschy Disney aesthetic appeared in the media via Ankara municipality. The gap between the mental and material references of Turkish cultural symbols and the Centre's simple form has provoked a political authoritarianism that is endeavoring to conceptualize a space with certain codes of representation. An outrageous metaphorical description of the Cultural Centre building as "freak" has been pronounced by the then president of the assembly in 2012; furthermore, he has stated his wish of "getting rid of this ugliness as soon as possible, due to its misfit both to the capital and the government" (Hürriyet, 2013). The very recent 2016 proposal of the municipality, supported by the mayor, once again suggests the demolition of the building by negating the architectural, historical and economic questions, this time, for the creation of a park for various sports facilities (Sabah, 2016). That is to say, the authoritative reappropriation strategies on the area frequently show up as an agenda topic in the overpowering so-called care of politico-administrative agencies.

in Turkey (Güzer, 1985). Erkal's proposal was characterized by an elegant form and a clear spatiality with clean lines and simple surfaces. Massive and slanted facades were implying the preservation of the national collective memory by fashioning an unorthodox monumentality for the capital city. The long majestic walkway towards the monolithic building served as a mark for the celebration of national and high cultural virtues that would be featured by the Centre. In these years it would not have been easy to anticipate that within a few decades time, the building and this walkway would accommodate conflicting practices that would come side by side. Instead of having strict bonds with the urbanite by carrying out the building program's ideal of intellectual cultivation, today this space constitutes complex social bonds with a multitude of users within the complexity of urban everydayness.

The Ankara Atatürk Cultural Centre building, which comprises the Museum of the War of Independence and Atatürk's Revolutions, a library and exhibition and conference halls, was completed in 1987. A multitude of items within the museum part (pictures, writings, objects, wall inscriptions and models) exhibited the foundation of a national spirit during the construction of the republican Turkey and the development of the new state and its institutions. In accordance with its symbolic importance, the museum was located in the core of the square based pyramidal form of the building. This core was surrounded by the areas accommodating contemporary art and cultural performances. As the architects stated, this abstract geometrical form's ability to produce simultaneously the historical and contemporary interpretations, the monumental and cultural implications, was crucial. With its bold form and spatial organization, the building won several awards from architectural organizations as well as many sharp criticisms from the architectural milieu in Turkey (Karaarslan, 1989; Özbay, 1989; Kortan, 1982). Due to the politico-administrative constraints in the area's general development, the formation of other cultural buildings of the cluster has stopped after the completion of the Centre. The Opera Theatre and Congress Complex project of Azize Ecevit and Özgür Ecevit has been announced as the winner of the architectural competition in 1995, however, this complex has not been realized. Within this respect, it can be claimed that these criticisms have been facilitated, to a great extent, by the building's physically lonesome standing on the northeastern part of the vast hippodrome area (2).

Space of Representation: Associated Symbols

Representational spaces are "directly lived through their associated images and symbols" (Lefebvre, 2012, 39). Imagination appropriates the space; in other words, "representational space overlays physical space, making symbolic uses of its objects" (Lefebvre, 2012, 39). To refine its representational scheme, the Atatürk Cultural Centre was designed to embody a monumental and sculptural spatial quality, through an abstract truncated pyramid form and an elitist functional program (Kale, 1988). This triad (space/form/function) established (or expected to establish) a social bond with an ideal citizenry whose social identity is highly related to a modernist republican vision, thus fully prepared for high-cultural and nationalized activities. It may be possible to speculate that citizens in Ankara, who were imbued with intellectual cultural interests as the outcome of the republic's modernity project, espoused the Centre as a contemporary public space (Figure 2). If social identities can be recognized through certain "prototypical attributes" and if these attributes can be

defined as “the abstracted representations of central tendency of the members of a certain social category”, this tendency was in the direction of an ostensibly homogeneous modernist refinement in the case of the Cultural Centre until the clear appearance of other categories (Brewer and Pierce, 2005, 429). Intertwined with a socio-political symbolic meaning, as its name denotes, the Centre attempted to house a symbiosis of incessant republican emotion and contemporary art and cultural values. Especially in the earlier years of its establishment, various exhibitions representing Turkey’s national artistic heritage made these cultural claims and values explicit.

Conceptualization of the Ankara Atatürk Cultural Centre as a representational space can not be completely realized without the symbolic recognition of Ankara, since the republican capital itself has been considered as a space for representation of a modern nation and contemporary values (see Basa, 2015; Sak and Basa, 2012; Ergut, 2011; Cengizkan, 2010; Kezer, 2010, Bozdoğan, 2001). Lefebvre (2012) reminds us that “representational spaces need obey no rules of consistency or cohesiveness. Redolent with imaginary and symbolic elements, they have their sources in history”. Nevertheless, the Centre as a representational space obeyed rules of consistency that were informed by knowledge and ideology. A theoretical practice imposed and guided the symbolic codes of the space, and consequently, did not leave enough room for the social production of genuine codes. However, representational space is “alive, fluid and dynamic, it has an effective kernel” (2012, 41-42). This nature of space eventually displaced the ordained representational essence of the Centre, with a shift of emphasis to a contrary employment and praxis of culture (Basa, 2003). Over time, some unenvisioned events such as souvenir bazaars, commercial fairs, folkloric gatherings and even hairdressers’ talent shows replaced the Cultural Centre’s sterilized ideals and functional agenda, to the dissatisfaction of its architects who endorse the representative quality of the building (Erkal and Erkal, 2006).



Figure 2. Art exhibition in the interior space of the Ankara Atatürk Cultural Centre (Photograph by the author)

However, while the initial design of the space may represent a certain ideal, this does not detract from the tolerant quality of the space itself, which is in a state of continuous and unavoidable transformation. Hence, the imagination of the new (or unplanned for) users overlays both the physical and mental space by finding unpredicted symbolic uses for Atatürk Cultural Centre. Central here is, not surprisingly, the non-elitist cultural praxis that is a competitive dual part of the general and indistinct concept of culture. As Lefebvre (2012, 38) indicates, "the spatial practice of a society secretes that society's space; it propounds and presupposes it, in a dialectical interaction". From his analytical perspective, the spatial practice of a society is revealed through the deciphering of its space. The relevant argument in the particular conjuncture of the Ankara Atatürk Cultural Centre then may be the following: comparable to alive, fluid and dynamic nature of the representational space, coexistence of the multiple social groups and their typical values and tendencies in the contemporary urban life in Ankara signifies an alive, fluid and dynamic character thus an ambiguous heterogeneity. The ideal representation of modern and national cultural spirit in the Centre has been subjected to the complexity of political, religious, ethnic and educational diversities in the course of time. This situation, which is not unconnected to the reigning political practices, brings a multifaceted character to the Cultural Centre; therefore, requires another deciphering through the spatial practices of different social groups, who indirectly customize the space according to their societal identities and cultural choices.

Spatial Practice: Society's Use

Spatial practice, from a societal viewpoint, corresponds to citizens' situating themselves in the space within the daily urban reality; and, as Lefebvre (2012, 38) states, spatial practice produces space "slowly and surely as it masters and appropriates it". He claims that "a spatial practice must have a certain cohesiveness, but this does not imply that it is coherent in the sense of intellectually worked out or logically conceived" (Lefebvre, 2012, 38). It can be argued that the current societal picture of the Atatürk Cultural Centre displays the dynamics of the spatial practices through which the static oppositions dissolve and different patterns of social behavior become apparent. A personal and experiential observation of the area for nearly three decades in terms of the various activities, primarily the monthly festivities of the Anatolian towns, have made the identification of socio-political and spatial appropriation possible.

In the 2000s, conservative and neoliberal policies of Turkey's government and Ankara's municipal government, as well as the initially unintended social groups as the users of the Centre, redefined the meaning of the Atatürk Cultural Centre as a public space. Becoming more confident and authoritarian with successive wins in local and general elections, governing bodies, such as the Ankara municipality and the ministry of culture, promoted the use of the area as a place for festivals, fairs and entertainments and reappropriated it as a fest area of popular culture that would be appealing for a large number (and variety) of people. The previous policy of the Centre, which was obsessed by high-culture refinement practices, has changed to allowing recreation-oriented, popular cultural activities and entertainment.

The Centre, which was assigned to institutionalizing high-cultural performances for the societal development, has started to accommodate a multitude of cultural expressions. Its previously selective and sober



Figure 3. Entrance of the Ankara Atatürk Cultural Centre, decorated for the festival of an Anatolian town (Photograph by the author)



Figure 4. Ornamented entrance ramps of the Ankara Atatürk Cultural Centre (Photograph by the author)

attitude regarding the display of local values converted into provincial gatherings. Monthly fests lasting four or five days, each celebrating a different Anatolian town, such as Bolu, Mersin, Niğde, Rize, Siirt, Trabzon, exhibit that area's local food, artwork, folklore, customs and history. During these fests loud folkloric music swirls in the open air and the elegant marble facades of the Atatürk Cultural Centre unwillingly accompany the music in a backdrop of colorful balloons and kitschy ornaments (**Figure 3, Figure 4**).

The majestic walkway leading to the Centre's monumental body serves as a marketplace for local vegetables. The venue's greenspace accommodates tentative architectural replicas and modernist interior spaces, with bare concrete walls, provide a contrasting setting for the naïve representations of a certain Anatolian town's way of life through local products (**Figure 5**). Not surprisingly, Ankara, a city with a significant migrant population, responds to these fests enthusiastically, with intense interest and pleasure by various socioeconomic and cultural strata of society (**Figure 6**). At night, a popular band or a live concert entertains the crowd in the open area.

In a sense, the Atatürk Cultural Centre, which was committed to sustaining collective/national memory and to practices of intellectual development, tolerates the exercise of this cultural expression, thus experiences the coexistence of conflicting practices and intergroup relations among different groups of people. It allows a variation on its authoritatively prescribed conventions through a diverse set of usages of its indoor and outdoor spaces for the events indicating emphases on different socio-cultural values. A particular tolerance takes place within a socio-politically produced spatial framework, where the institutionalized and absolute cultural discourse that sublimates spatial practice into a cultivation process (through contemporary art exhibitions, conferences, library and museum activities) vanishes. In a more general sense, within Ankara's current heterogeneous context, the area redefines itself as a 'site of urban consciousness', in accordance with the criticism of Michel de Certeau on cultural centres' elitist ways of managing and displaying culture. He maintains that "cultural centres in principle can become sites of urban consciousness that are displaced into theatrical productions and art centres, places where experts gather with a "cultivated" public" (Certeau, 1997, 120). This intellectual elitist model in fact very well corresponds with Turkey's republican reliance on contemporary ideals and values.



Figure 5. Traditional carpet selling in the Ankara Atatürk Cultural Centre (Photograph by the author)



Figure 6. Interior space of the Ankara Atatürk Cultural Centre during the exhibition of an Anatolian town (Photograph by the author)

Despite the intellectual elitist approach's narrow tolerance, which, in Turkey, has been protected by a firm confidence about contemporariness since the foundation of the republic, the public spatiality of the Atatürk Cultural Centre seems to have developed a broadmindedness about the present differences, viewing the changes as a new urban asset. The area accommodates various distinct and incompatible cultural actions with different souls, elements and motives, thus, distinct spatial practices. From time to time, these practices overlap in the Cultural Centre, one group standing for the mental-spiritual, artistic challenge that culture can provide, and the other for collective patterns, customs, norms and values that traditional culture offers.

THE ANKARA ATATÜRK CULTURAL CENTRE AS A TOLERANCE SPACE

What makes a certain urban space a space of tolerance can be best identified through its spatial capacity of acceptance and adaptability. Needless to say, this capacity suggests something beyond the physical and tectonic quality of the space in question. It is related to its spatial ability and potential for generating new relations in time that draws attention to differences in life. This kind of an understanding requires the conception of space as a social entity rather than a physical architectural outcome. What renders a public space as a tolerance space thus needs a quality that dissolves all types of uncompromising and single-minded approaches about its imagination and usage. Thinking as such enables one to identify the current spatial character of the Ankara Atatürk Cultural Centre as a pluralist lived space rather than a static and symbolic structure dedicated to high cultural activities. It attracts people from different segments of the city and allows the construction of various bonds depending upon the activities that display a simultaneous multiplicity (3). The socially produced space adapts itself to the new and light cultural activities that were absolutely not intended at the outset; it provides places for a wide range of events from popular bands' open-air concerts to fests for new times' indispensable activity of shopping. Its new real-life essence becomes a remarkable sign of the multiple arrays of social agencies that include differences in education, age, ethnicity, habits, taste and economic status.

3. Undoubtedly, new transportation systems in Ankara enabled masses to reach the area easily.

The complexity of the situation in the Centre, as of all other urban matters, necessitates taking a wider perspective, transcending the professional and political appropriations. This situation can be understood within the context of the complexities of everyday urban practices of a socio-economically, politically, ethnically, religiously, educationally and culturally diverse population, rather than by tracking the operative agents of politics, architecture, urban decision-making actors and tailored programs. The complexity inherent in the Ankara Atatürk Cultural Centre in the particular framing of this study, then, is identified as a situation of coexistence of diversities. Furthermore, it has been recognized as the main reference to and source of the theoretical (and speculative) emergence (reading) of the area as a tolerance space, the core discussion of this paper. This section aims to raise concern over the asymmetrical coexistence of conflicting cultural practices that oscillate between the ideal cultural virtues and casual everydayness of popular culture within the area.

Two presumed roles (one, structured and organized cultural practices aiming at refining the individual, and the other, populist cultural patterns of ordinary public reality) have been interchangeably initialized in the Centre. The first role, once structured as an important policy of the state's modernization project, has now become a common reflex by a certain segment of the society; the second, ostensibly a disorderly initiative of various social groups, has been systematically patterned by the current political discourse employing traditional and ethnic values; and a local culture myth has been popularized through various political mechanisms with mostly a partisan wish of consolidating potential voters within an easily controllable cultural realm. From this standpoint, the Atatürk Cultural Centre area has been regarded as an excellent place to practice the particular cultural patterns. Under these circumstances, the area was envisioned as a delicious urban portion to be politically organized and appropriated. However, the point seems to be of ultimate significance for any operative effort that considers public space in its basic intrinsic sense: its plain and inherent power in terms of constituting complex social bonds with a multitude of users within the contemporary urban everydayness. Based on this assumption, the surviving spatial power of the Atatürk Cultural Centre area seems to change the political template(s), whose object was to unify and structure the area according to (this or that) established sociopolitical frontier.

Like all other urban public places, the Atatürk Cultural Centre outperforms its architectural formation by being socially produced in an unsteady continuity, both through the everyday practices of people in Ankara and the meanings and symbols they attach to the place. The complex and multi-layered network of the social production of space (Lefebvre, 2012) is paradoxically buttressed by the contrasting natures of spatial practices, high culture activities and the local, cultural, popular and recreational events. Culture, with its twofold semantic essence, manifests this process with dual alternative routes in the Ankara Atatürk Cultural Centre with a remarkable ability of connecting different social segments, which cannot be achieved through politicized processes. As an unsurprising consequence and indispensable social code of today's urban life, urbanites maintain a state of openness to multiple intergroup relations and responsiveness to other social political, religious, ethnic identities. Consistent with this assumption, the case area of Ankara Atatürk Cultural Centre contextualizes tolerance for diversity rather than securing its genuine and exclusive focus upon the ideal of representing high cultural gestures.

As mentioned above, for over three decades, the Ankara Atatürk Cultural Centre area has been associated with political intervention. Perhaps authoritative appropriation and reappropriation attacks on the area by incompatible political and official practices limit positive urban thinking and set political intolerance as the area's defining spirit. However, an undisputed synchronization of the dynamics of space with political exercises needs further examination and interpretation, as do all such absolute reflections. Here, I think that the Centre's social energy as a public space tend to shift towards distinctive patterns in connection with the present diverse nature of urban capacity for pluralism. This condition is something that can be extended to another consciousness, particularly to a value of spatial tolerance as an urban virtue, if I can contribute to Crick's (1971, 152) "special sense of toleration". If we wish to understand the truth of the Atatürk Cultural Centre area as a tolerance-generating condition, we must not limit its essence to political, institutional, philosophical or architectural interventions for forming an "ideal space" or "space of ideas" (Lefebvre, 2012, 260). The truth of social space within the modern and complex urban life is its emergence through a social production of society as a fragmented whole. For this case of Ankara, this truth is the outcome of the reconciliation of different procedural ideals and society's and individuals' social relationships embedded in this public space. It does not imply an uncanny parity of all ideals, opinions and interests; rather, it suggests a tolerance that allows a multiplicity of conjectural and practical patterns. As Crick reminds us, "toleration springs partly from doubts" and "to be tolerant is never to accept fully" (1971, 169). The Ankara Atatürk Cultural Centre does reflect some twofold doubts, due to, for instance, the cohabitation of modern art exhibitions and local Anatolian food presentations. Yet, the space embodies both functions so that while an urbanite visits the museum located in the core of the building, another one (or exactly the same person shortly after) may enjoy the Trabzon butter or the baklava of Gaziantep in the outdoor and indoor spaces of the Centre after waiting for minutes in long queues for the local products. The space allows one, who is interested in architecture, to investigate the tectonic character of the pure and modernist language of the building, whereas at the same time one may enjoy the natural color kilim rug of Afyonkarahisar or Kütahya-made tiles and ceramics, or Denizli-Buldan's cotton-fabrics in the Anatolian days within this space. The space corresponds to the fragmented nature of the population of this complex city through its everyday practice by the Ankara urbanites with different lifestyles and habits. The current dynamics of the space (of the Atatürk Cultural Centre) changes its earlier status by removing it away from its very sterilized sphere and transform into a porous public realm. More or less this space is socially and culturally reconstructed in a more realistic way by providing a set of opportunities and circumstances to its users that are not necessarily in compatibility. In its current spatiality the Atatürk Cultural Centre embraces today's diverse urban realities, which very well may be thought of as a form of adaptability to multiculturalism. It creates an interface, where the very rare contact among multiple social and cultural identities in today's cities becomes possible in the capital Ankara.

As there is no one single and ready meaning of culture, this public cultural space establishes multi-faceted relationships and (spatial) procedures between acceptance and disapproval. And, as there is a large sweep of pendulum between the differences, the Atatürk Cultural Centre area functions as a catalyst for tolerance (for example, between the pleasures

of the elite democrats' aesthetic sublimations and the conception and presentation of simple arts and crafts products as supreme cultural representations of the countercultures/lower social strata). The pivot of this pendulum, which constrains its motion to regular oscillations, is the fragmented whole of Turkish society, and not one a particular political attitude. The enhancement of toleration through society's intertwined spatial practices in the Cultural Centre area seems to be very meaningful in an urban context of increasing cultural, religious and social discrepancies, as well as growing conflicts and polarizations fostered by Turkey's political climate.

CONCLUSION

Social separation between groups of citizens can be traced through their spatial practices. Their daily routines are empirically established by their private and public lives, their work and leisure spaces. For social sustainability, a state's or political power's responsible role might be assumed to propose unification. However, Ankara's current political context is a long way away from regulating any unifying efforts or tolerating the other; there are no attempts to reduce the social contradictions or the spatial fragmentation engendered by contrasting stances. On the contrary, the political hegemony embraces an antagonistic discourse entailing irreconcilable tastes, values and identities, and witnesses the codes of ideal spaces. What is overlooked by these spatiopolitical strategies is that public space, particularly the cultural space, may destroy such manicured manipulations over time and invent itself autonomously through its incoherent physical, mental and social self-evidence. The spatial autonomy of the Ankara Atatürk Cultural Centre is thus achieved by its own dynamics within the hostile struggle among various political conceptualizations of space, culture and, to an extent, life (4).

It must be stressed here that the Centre's spatial dynamics are not proscribed by the existing social, political, cultural, urban or economic systems, although these systems do affect the conceived, perceived and directly lived aspects of the space. The emphasis, then, comes to be placed on a tolerance space, springing not from representations and materiality of space, not from abstract and symbolic associations and not from the directly experienced and practical nature of space; but rather, as Lefebvre indicates, from an oscillation among these realms. My proposition in this final stage is the following: the emergence of the Atatürk Cultural Centre as a tolerance space stems from a fluid intermixing and braiding between these domains, each of which is under the unorchestrated and sometimes conflicting control and operation of institutional authority, political influence, statecraft, urban knowledge, conception of culture and individuals' urban experiences. This confusion paradoxically but naturally and transparently connects and reconnects citizens with different patterns of social behaviour. Not as an abstract concept but as a practice, toleration – in varying degrees of acceptance and adaptability – appears in the Ankara Atatürk Cultural Centre as an urban virtue. This particular observation of urban public space advances a more general suggestion that contemporary urban life is directly interconnected by the social preparedness to live with others, hence by tolerance.

4. Political authorities' hostility to the building (even wishing for its destruction motivated by various agendas they may have) complicates the understanding of the situation and one may ask if this space is generating urban tolerance why would someone attempt to demolish it. However, one has to clarify that the politically regulated negative discussions upon the building, which stem particularly from the special circumstances created by the current political authority in Turkey (and various maneuverings to replace the early or late products of twentieth century modernist cultural ideals of the country with conservative patterns), do not invalidate the autonomy of either particularly this space or of cultural spaces with a similar quality in general somewhere in another geography.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AMIN, A (2008) Collective Culture and Urban Public Space, *City* 12(1) 5-24.
- AMIN, A (2002) Ethnicity and the Multicultural City: Living with Diversity, *Environment and Planning A* 34(6) 959-80.
- ANDERSSON, J., SADGROVE, J., VALENTINE, G. (2012) Consuming Campus: Geographies of Encounter at a British University, *Social and Cultural Geography* 13(5) 501-15.
- ARCHER, M. S. (1996) *Culture and Agency, The Place of Culture in Social Theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- ATKINSON, R. (2003) Domestication by Cappuccino or a Revenge on Urban Space? Control and Empowerment in the Management of Public Spaces, *Urban Studies* 40(9) 1829-43.
- AUBIN, F. (2014) Between Public Space(s) and Public Sphere(s): An Assessment of Francophone Contributions, *Canadian Journal of Communication* (39) 89-110.
- BANNISTER, J., KEARNS, A. (2013) The Function and Foundations of Urban Tolerance: Encountering and Engaging with Difference in the City, *Urban Studies* 50(13) 2700-17.
- BASA, İ. (2016) Sosyopolitik Zıtlığa İnat Açık Aklın Mekanları: Zor bir Önerme olarak Ankara Atatürk Kültür Merkezi, *Mimarlık* (391) 56-60.
- BASA, İ. (2015) From Praise to Condemnation: Ottoman Revivalism and the Production of Space in Early Republican Ankara, *Journal of Urban History* 41(4) 711-38.
- BASA, İ. (2011) Kültür Göndergesinin Karmaşıklığı: Kentsel (Gündelik) Yaşamın Aydınlanma Mekanı veya Şenlikçi Alanı olarak Ankara Atatürk Kültür Merkezi, *Dosya* (27) 32-40.
- BASA, İ. (2003) Unpublished interview with Coşkun Erkal.
- BATUMAN, B., ed. (2009) *Hasar Tespiti*, *Dosya* (13) 41-5.
- BAUMAN, Z. (1999) *Culture as Praxis*, Sage Publications, London.
- BERMAN, M. (1982) *All That Is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity*, Verso, London.
- BİLSEL, C. (2009) Ankara'da Kentsel Başkalaşım Karşısında Kentsel Kimlik Sorunu, *Dosya* (10) 33-46.
- BOZDOĞAN, S. (2001) *Modernism and Nation Building*, University of Washington Press, Seattle.
- BREWER, M. B., PIERCE, K. P. (2005) Social Identity Complexity and Outgroup Tolerance, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 31(3) 428-37.
- BROWN, K. M. (2012) Sharing Public Space Across Difference: Attunement and the Contested Burdens of Choreographing Encounter, *Social and Cultural Geography* 13(7) 801-20.
- CENGİZKAN, A. (2010) The Production of a Mise en Scene for a Nation and its Subjects, Clemenz Holzmeister et al. in the Ministries Quarter for Ankara, Turkey, *The Journal of Architecture* 15(6) 731-70.

- CERTEAU, M. DE (1997) *La Culture au Pluriel* (1974) *Culture in the Plural*, trans. T. Conley, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- CRICK, B. (1971) Toleration and Tolerance in Theory and Practice, *Government and Opposition* 6(2) 143-71.
- DURRHEIM, K. (1998) The Relationship between Tolerance of Ambiguity and Attitudinal Conservatism: A Multidimensional Analysis, *European Journal of Social Psychology* 28(5) 731-53.
- ERGUT, E. (2011) The Exhibition House in Ankara: Building (up) the 'National' and the 'Modern', *Journal of Architecture* 16(6) 855-84.
- ERKAL, C., ERKAL F. (2006) Projeler: Ankara Atatürk Kültür Merkezi (Projects: Ankara Atatürk Cultural Centre), *Bülten* 39 (March-April).
- FAINSTEIN, S. S. (2005) Cities and Diversity, *Urban Affairs Review* 41(1) 3-19.
- FINCHER, R. (1998) Population Questions for Australian Cities: Refraining our Narratives, *Australian Geographer* 29(1) 31-7.
- FRIEDMANN, J., WOLFF, G. (1982) World City Formation: An Agenda for Research and Action, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* (6) 309-44.
- FYFE, N., BANNISTER, J. (1996) City watching and closed circuit television surveillance in public spaces, *Area* 28(1) 37-46.
- GARZA, G. (1996) Social and Economic Imbalances in the Metropolitan Area of Monterrey, *Environment and Urbanization* 8(2) 31-41.
- GIDDENS, A. (1995) *The Constitution of Society*, Polity, Cambridge.
- GÜNAY, B. (2009) Conservation as an Ontological Problem, *METU Journal of the Faculty of Architecture* 26(1) 123-56.
- Hürriyet (2013) *Cemil Çiçek'ten 'Ucube' Mesajı* ('Freak' message from Cemil Çiçek). [<http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/cemil-cicek-ten-ucube-mesaji-22650694>] Access Date (27.03.2014).
- Hürriyet (2009) *Ankara'da AKM Yıkılıyor* (Demolishing AKM in Ankara). [<http://hurarsiv.hurriyet.com.tr/goster/haber.aspx?id=12551613&tarih=2009-09-25>]. Access Date (27.03.2014).
- GÜZER, A. (1985) Atatürk Kültür Merkezi, *Mimarlık* (7) 32-5.
- HABERMAS, J. (1992) Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit (1962) *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, trans. T. Burger, 1989), The MIT Press, Cambridge.
- HAMNETT, C. (2001) Social Segregation and Social Polarization, *Handbook of Urban Studies*, ed. R. Paddison, Sage, London; 162-76.
- KALE, I. (1990) *Physical and Social Transformation of Urban Green Space*, unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Architecture, METU, Ankara.
- KALE, I. (1988) Unpublished interview with Filiz Erkal and Coşkun Erkal.
- KARAARSLAN, M. (1989) Piramit Kurgusu ve AKM, *Mimarlık* (3) 80-1.
- KEZER, Z. (2010) The Making of Early Republican Ankara, *Architectural Design* (203) 40-5.
- KORTAN, E. (1982) Eleştiri: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi, *Mimarlık* (7) 26.

- KING, A. (1999) Against Structure: A Critique of Morphogenetic Social Theory, *The Sociological Review* 47(2) 199-227.
- KING, P. (1971) The Problem of Tolerance, *Government and Opposition* 6(2) 172-207.
- KOCH, R., LATHAM, A. (2013) On the Hard Work of Domesticating a Public Space, *Urban Studies* 50(1) 6-21.
- LEFEBVRE, H. (2012) La Production de l'Espace (1974) *The Production of Space*, trans. D. Nicholson-Smith, Blackwell Publishing., Oxford.
- LEITNER, H. (2011) Urban encounters with difference: the contact hypothesis and immigrant integration projects in eastern Berlin, *Social and Cultural Geography* 12(7) 717-41.
- LIEBKIND, K., MCALISTER, A. L. (1999) Extended Contact through Peer Modelling to Promote Tolerance in Finland, *European Journal of Social Psychology* 29(5,6) 765-80.
- LUKES, S. (1971) Social and Moral Tolerance. *Government and Opposition* 6(2) 224-28. MANDELBAUM, D. G., ed. (1951) *Selected writings of Edward Sapir in language, culture and personality*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Merriam Webster (2014) duality [<http://www.merriam-webster.com>] Access Date (28.03.2014).
- Merriam Webster (2014) tolerance [<http://www.merriam-webster.com>] Access Date (30.03.2014).
- MUMMENDEY, A., WENZEL, M. (1999) Social Discrimination and Tolerance in Intergroup Relations: Reactions to Intergroup Difference, *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 3(2) 158-74.
- Oxford Dictionaries (2014) duality [<http://www.oxforddictionaries.com>] Access Date (28.03.2014).
- ÖZBAY, H. (1989) Müze Kavramı ve Ankara Atatürk Kültür Merkezi, *Mimarlık* (3) 82-4.
- ÖZGÖNÜL, N. (2010) Ankara AKM Alanı Üzerine Güncel Tartışmalar, *Mimarlık* 352 (Mart-Nisan).
- ROBINSON, J. (2004) In the Tracks of Comparative Urbanism: Difference, Urban Modernity and the Primitive, *Urban Geography* 25(8) 709-23.
- ROSDIL, D. (2011) Civic Culture, Sub-Cultures, Non-Traditionalism and Progressive Policy: Using Value Change to Explain New US Development Strategies in the 21st Century, *Urban Studies* 48(16) 3467-86.
- Sabah (2016) *AKM Yıkılıyor* (AKM is being demolished). [<http://www.sabah.com.tr/ankara-baskent/2016/07/04/akm-yikiliyor>] Access Date (24 March 2016).
- SAK, S., BASA, I. (2012) The Role of the Train Station in the Image Formation of the Early Republican Ankara, *Journal of Urban History* 38(4) 777-802.
- SANDERCOCK, L. (1998) *Making the Invisible Visible: A Multicultural Planning History*, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

- SANER, M. (2006) Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Alanlarındaki İkilem, *Bülten* (39) 18-9.
- SARGIN, G. A. (2012) Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Alanı, *Dosya* (28) 21-31.
- SASSEN, S. (1984) "The new labor demand in global cities" in M. P. Smith (ed). *Cities in transformation: class, capital and the state* (139-171) Beverly Hills: Sage.
- SCHIRMER, W. WEIDENSTEDT, L., REICH, W. (2012) From Tolerance to Respect in Inter-ethnic Contexts, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 38(7) 1049-65.
- SENNETT, R. (2003) *Respect: In an Age of Inequality*, Norton, New York.
- SEWELL, W. H. (1992) A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency, and Transformation, *American Journal of Sociology*, 98(1) 1-29.
- SIDANIUS, J. (1978) Intolerance of Ambiguity and Socio-Political Ideology: A Multidimensional Analysis, *European Journal of Social Psychology* 8(2) 215-35.
- STORPER, M. (1985) The Spatial and Temporal Constitution of Social Action: A Critical Reading of Giddens, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 3(4) 407-24.
- tolerance. *Merriam-Webster.com*. 2014. Retrieved from: <http://www.merriam-webster.com> (30 March 2014).
- ULUSOY, A. (2006) AKM Alanları Üzerinde Oynanan Tehlikeli Oyunlar, *Bülten* (39) 16-17.
- VALENTINE, G. (2010) Prejudice: Rethinking Geographies of Oppression, *Social and Cultural Geography* 11(6) 519-37.
- WESSEL, T. (2009) Does Diversity in Urban Space Enhance Intergroup Contact and Tolerance? *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* (91) 5-17.
- WILLIAMS, R. (1988) *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*, Fontana Press, London; 87.
- WILSON, T. C. (1991) Urbanism, Migration, and Tolerance: A Reassessment, *American Sociological Review* 56(1) 117-23.
- YOUNG, I. M. (1990) *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- ZUNINO, H. M. (2006) Power Relations in Urban Decision-Making: Neo-Liberalism, Techno-Politicians and Authoritative Redevelopment in Santiago, Chile, *Urban Studies* 43(10) 1825-46.

Alındı: 24.02.2016; Son Metin: 04.10.2017

Anahtar Sözcükler: Kentsel kamusal mekan; tolerans; Ankara; temsil; kültür.

TEMSİL MEKANINDAN TOLERANS MEKANINA DÖNÜŞÜM: İDEAL VE REELİN KENTSEL KAMUSAL ALANDA BİTİŞİKLİĞİ

Bu makale tolerans kavramını kamusal mekan çerçevesinde önemli bir kentsel değer olarak tartışmaktadır. Kentsel araştırmalardaki yaygın yaklaşım, kamusal mekanları, kentlilerin, farklı kültürel ve sosyal

grupları tolere etme yönündeki beceri ve isteklerinin düzeyine uygun bir fon olarak göstermek şeklindedir. Bu çalışma ise, kentsel tolerans bağlamında kamusal mekanların yansız ortamlar sunmanın ötesinde, karşılaşma coğrafyaları olarak önemli rol oynadığını savunmaktadır. Bu anlayışla, makale tolerans kavramını Ankara’da düşündürücü ve sorunlu bir kamusal alan olarak öne çıkan Atatürk Kültür Merkezi’ne atıfla araştırmakta ve bu alanın mekansal üretimindeki çelişkili süreçleri, mimari ve toplumsal bağlamlarda tartışmaktadır. Kentsel kamusal mekanlar bir ikililik barındırdıklarında hepten ilgi çekici olmaktadır; ele alınan örnekte söz konusu ikililik, ideal olan ve reel olanın birlikte var olması şeklinde belirmektedir. Bugün alan, yüksek kültürel niteliklerin ve milli değerlerin anıtsallıkla işaretlendiği bir temsil mekanını ve değişen sosyopolitik koşulların etkisinde gelişen sıradan gündelikliği farklı etkinlikler aracılığıyla barındırmaktadır. Bu durum, Ankara’nın türlü zıtlıklar ve müştereklikler üreten karmaşık politik koşulları bağlamında, Atatürk Kültür Merkezi alanını bir tolerans mekanı olarak gözlemleme önyak olmaktadır.

TRANSFORMATION FROM REPRESENTATIONAL SPACE TO TOLERANCE SPACE: THE JUXTAPOSITION OF IDEAL AND REAL IN THE URBAN PUBLIC AREA

This article discusses the concept of tolerance as an essential urban quality within the bounds of public space. The prevalent approach in urban research reveals that public spaces backdrop the level of urbanites’ ability and willingness to tolerate different cultural and social clusters. As a further contribution to this observation, this study aims to develop the understanding that public spaces play a significant role in urban tolerance as geographies of encounters rather than serving as neutral settings. Within this understanding, the article explores the concept of tolerance by referring to a thought-provoking urban public area in Ankara, the Atatürk Cultural Centre, and through a discussion of this area’s conflicting processes of architectural and societal production. Urban public spaces are especially intriguing when they reflect a duality, such as that of a representational character (in this case, embodying ideal and monumental gestures of a certain national or cultural virtue) and a casual social reformatting (containing everydayness and popular low culture). In Ankara this dual state initiates an examination of the Cultural Centre’s status as a tolerance space within an arduous political context that generates systematic contrasts and associations.

İNÇİ BASA; B.Arch, M.Sc., PhD.

Received her bachelor’s degree (1986), master’s degree (1990) and PhD. degree (2000) in architecture from Faculty of Architecture at Middle East Technical University. Major research interests include architectural discourse, architecture and language relationship and urban public space. basa@metu.edu.tr

