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ABSTRACT

IMPACTS OF POLICIES AFTER 1980 ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS: THE "UNOCCUPIED" BUILDINGS OF EMLAKBANK, SÜMERBANK AND TEKEL IN ULUS IN ANKARA

Şahin, Özge
M. Arch., Department of Architecture
Supervisor: Assist.Prof. Dr. Berin Gür
Co-Supervisor: Assoc.Prof. Dr. Güven Arif Sargin

May 2008, 159 pages

This thesis examines the “unoccupied” buildings in Ankara, which are not refunctioned due to the social, political, and economic reasons after 1980s. 1980s can be accepted as the breaking point in the social, economic and political history of Turkey. The significant policy of this period is the privatization of the governmental institutions, which includes the institutions of service, production and also finance. The building stock of privatized institutions is sold or assigned to the other institutions, or demolished.

The object of the thesis is the unoccupied buildings in Ankara. The thesis particularly focuses on three of these buildings, which are Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL Buildings in Ulus. The thesis aims to understand the common points how these buildings become unoccupied. The possessions of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL were transferred from the public sector (government) to the private sector (business) after 1980s. Their buildings, which
were used as the central administration buildings are still unoccupied. Although they are physically present, their non-presence in terms of function can be considered to be creating “voids” of the city. For each building, related data is collected. The selected buildings and the institutions, they belonged to, are studied through their limited chronologies (their stories) by the help of the newspapers, interviews, laws, codes and regulations. The collected data helps to analyze the objects as a text, which provides evaluation of the total scene (i.e. the city of Ankara). By thoroughly investigating and discussing unoccupied buildings and their reasons of becoming unoccupied, this study makes an alternative reading of the transformation of Ankara.

**Keywords:** Unoccupied Buildings, *Emlakbank, Sümerbank, TEKEL*, Neo-liberal Policies after 1980.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

This thesis investigates the “unoccupied” buildings in Ankara. The unoccupied buildings, which are not re-functioned after they become unoccupied due to the social, political, and economic changes, will be discussed with the emphasis on the impacts of neo-liberal policies after 1980s. Although the unoccupied buildings exist physically in the city they are not used by the public, and in that manner they can be seen as “voids” of the city. Actually, the research on these buildings in relation to the city of Ankara helps to provide a base for the re-reading of Ankara; a base to understand the recent transformation of Ankara in physical and social sense.

Generally speaking, neither buildings nor city can be analyzed without their social, political and economic context. Transformation of a city affects (the conditions of) buildings, and in a similar way buildings define and affect the physical and social structure/character of a city. Considering the thesis’ problem, the unoccupied buildings are the physical / material signs of the changes in political, economic and social processes, which shape the city of Ankara.

In order to investigate the reasons why the public buildings become unoccupied, the thesis particularly focuses on the buildings, namely Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL buildings in Ulus in Ankara. These buildings are selected due to the fact that, they are the concrete representations of their institutions, which were
established as the State Owned Enterprises (SOEs) and played a significant role as the keystones of the social and economic development of the newly established Turkish Republic. Moreover, these buildings as the representatives of their institutions are located in Ulus, which was the city centre of Ankara in the Early Republican period, and they were the parts of the social, economic and political life in Ulus. Therefore, the thesis aims to understand the social, economic and political reasons that lead to transformation of these buildings, which results in the transformation of Ulus and the city of Ankara. Then, the thesis asks questions that are listed below in order to understand the conditions of these unoccupied buildings and the relations in between these buildings (micro scale) and the city (macro scale):

1. Why are these buildings unoccupied?
2. Under which conditions are they unoccupied?
3. What are the political/economic/social reasons that make these buildings unoccupied?
4. What are the related planning/architectural decisions that make buildings unoccupied?
5. What are the after effects of the condition of being unoccupied in urban scale?
   A. In terms of architecture of the city.
   B. In terms of the everyday urban experience

1.1. Procedure

The Chamber of Architects (UIA member) Ankara Branch organized the Architecture Week in 2-8 October 2006 with the theme “Metamorphosis: (The
transformation process of the city of Ankara). Güven Arif Sargin states that throughout the history, social and political interventions have caused the transformation of the city of Ankara both in physical and social sense; the identity of Ankara has changed too. In this context, the aim of the Architecture Week 2006 is to understand the metamorphosis of Ankara and also to make citizens aware of the transformation of the physical and social structure of Ankara.

The author of this thesis was responsible of all the events organized during the Architecture Week as charged with the secretariat of the Chamber of Architects Ankara Branch. During the Week, the Chamber organized workshops, forums, exhibitions, thematic site trips all around the city in order to acquire consciousness as the city-dwellers and architects about the fact that the “metamorphose” of the city of Ankara is not a coincidental process.

“Metamorfoz: Kentin Yok Anı” [Metamorphosis: The Lost Moment of the City] was one of the sub-themes of the Architecture Week 2006. In relation to this sub-theme, an exhibition was prepared and displayed in various locations in Ankara, and a trip was organized to the “unoccupied” buildings that were the subject and object of the exhibition. This exhibition was prepared by Berin Gür and Meltem Mimarsinanoglu; the data related to the limited chronology of these buildings was compiled by the author. Then, an article by Gür and Mimarsinanoglu entitled, “Metamorfoz: Kentin Yok Anı’ Sergi ve Gezisi: Ankara’nın Başkalaşım

__________________________

1 The context and concept of Architecture Week 2006 “Metamorphosis: The process of the transforming the city of Ankara” (in Turkish “Metamorfoz: Yitik Zamanların Kenti Ankara”) has been determined by Assoc. Prof. Dr. Güven Arif Sargin as the Vice President of the Chamber of Architects Ankara Branch. He is also the Present Chairperson of the Department of Architecture at Middle East Technical University (METU).


3 See also, www.mimarlarodasiankara.org/mimarlik haftasi/mimarlik haftasi 2006.
Süreçlerinin ‘Boş’ Binalar Üzerinden Okuması” [Metamorphosis: The Lost Moment of the City Exhibition and Trip: Reading the Transformation Process of Ankara through the Unoccupied Buildings],⁴ that presents the findings of the study, is published.

The Exhibition was taking the concept of the metamorphosis of Ankara into account with respect to the unoccupied buildings, whose construction processes have not been completed for many years, and which were used yet have been unoccupied for a long period of time.⁵ This exhibition consisted of nine buildings which were TEKEL Building, Emlak and Eytam Banking Building, Gar Gazinosu, Petrol Ofisi (Office) Headquarter Building, Türkiye Kızılay Association Rant Facility Building, Hotel Çankaya Construction (Grand Hyatt Ankara), Hotel Marmara Construction, Şekerbank Head Quarter Building and TEKEL Headquarter Building.⁶ One of the significant aims of the exhibition was to create a public attention about these buildings and their impacts in the city of Ankara.

Related to the exhibition, a trip was organized to the buildings listed above with the guidance of Berin Gür and the author during the week. The participants of the event were mainly architects and architectural students. The aim of the trip was

---


⁵ Berin Gür (Assist.Prof.Dr at METU) and Meltem Mimarsinanoğlu (Research Assistant at Gazi University), and the graphic design done by Gür and Mimarsinanoğlu, with the help of the students (of Architecture at METU) namely, Esatcan Coşkun, Ali Yücel Özdemir and Sertuğ Tanrıverdi.

⁶ These buildings which were selected for the exhibitions were mainly the ones whose data can be accessible.
to observe current situations of the unoccupied buildings and their neighborhood.\(^7\)

In the article about the exhibition and its further discussions, Gür and Mimarsinanoğlu ask questions in order to understand the transformation of Ankara. These questions are listed as follows:\(^8\)

1. Does architecture has a power to control the transformation processes of the city?
2. What are the reasons that these buildings are no longer in use or can not be completed?
3. What is the scale of the problem of re-functioning of these buildings (the building scale or the urban scale)?
4. Does the condition of being emptied or not completed create “voids” in the “collective memory”?
5. Concerning specifically the condition of being not completed, what kind of a role and identity is attached to these buildings?
6. What do these buildings mean for the city of Ankara merely with their visual and physical existence?

In light of these questions, they discuss the object/subject of the exhibition (the “unoccupied buildings”) from the social and political point of view. Their discussions refer to concepts such as relations between power and space, national and urban politics, collective memory and urban identity that enable detailed readings and further studies on this theme.

The public buildings, which are no longer in use, are taken as the objects of the thesis. Then, these buildings turn into the tools in order to understand the transformation of Ankara. The buildings are the parts of the city. Transformation in building scale helps to understand the transformation of Ankara (in urban

\(^7\) However, because of the security reasons some of the buildings could neither be visited nor photographed by the group.

scale). That is to say that a study on each building not only will provide us to understand the reasons behind the conditions of being unoccupied with the stories of the buildings but also will help us to understand and question the city in relation to economic, political and social processes.

1.2. Unoccupied Buildings in Ankara

There are many unoccupied buildings in Ankara, which can be grouped into three:

1. Buildings, the construction processes of which have not been / could not be completed for many years;
2. Buildings, which had been used for a period of time, then have been abandoned for a long period of time;
3. Buildings, which have been given new functions after such a long abandonment

The first group (of buildings whose construction processes could not be completed for many years) contains namely, Hotel Çankaya, Hotel Marmara, TEKEL General Directorate Building, Hacettepe University Ankara Conservatory Theater Building, Turkish Redcrescent Rent Building (Kızılay Rant Tesisleri), Atatürk Cultural Center (Atatürk Kültür Merkezi, AKM) area including Ankara Contemporary Art Center and Ankara Opera and Concert Hall, Akman Shopping Mall.

The second group (of buildings which were used for many years but have been abandoned for a long period of time) contains namely, TEKEL State Monopolies Old Headquarters Building (TEKEL İnhisarlar Umum Müdürlüğü) Emlakbank, Sümerbank, Gençlik Park (Gençlik Parkı), Ulucanlar Prison at Ulus District,
Railway Station Restaurant Building (Gar Gazinosu) Turkish State Railways 2nd Regional Directorate Building (TCDD 2.Bölge Müdürlüğü) at the Main Railway Station, Petrol Ofisi Headquarters Building at Çankaya District, Industrial Zone at Kazım Karabekir Street. Additionally, Gökkuşağı Recreation Area at Bahçelievler can be added to the list whose construction process has been completed at 2005 but cannot be functioned since then.

First and second groups include not only buildings but also areas such as the AKM area which consist of five sub-areas, and Gençlik Parkı (Park), which is the first Republican urban park, and has not been used for three years.

The third group of buildings includes those buildings, which are re-functioned, such as Şekerbank Building, which is used by the Union of Turkish Municipalities; Turkish Court of Accounts Building (Sayiştay), which is used by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, İş Bankası Headquarters Building, which is used by Banking Regulation and Supervision Agency (Bankacılık Düzenleme ve Denetleme Kurulu); Ministry of Environment and Forestry Building that is used by The Grand National Assembly General Secretariat.

In the above mentioned lists, private properties (such as Sait Bektimur House) are not mentioned due to the fact that the conditions of the private properties can be changed by the intervention of the owner. The given examples are selected according to their functions and the scale of the buildings or the areas. In other words, the buildings that have an impact on the urban environment and on the public interest are given as an example. However, the conditions of the buildings in these lists can be changed according to the social, political and economic process of the city. For example, the status of Şekerbank Headquarter building
was changed from an unoccupied building to a re-functioned building or Gas Factory at Maltepe district was emptied in 1990, and demolished by the Metropolitan Municipality in 2006. For the following years, the Central Bank of Republic of Turkey building, Banking Regulation and Supervision Agency (Bankacılık Düzenleme ve Denetleme Kurulu) building, and Capital Markets Board of Turkey (Sermaye Piyasası Kurulu) building, Vakıfbank headquarter building, Halkbank headquarter building will probably be added to the list above because these establishments will move their headquarters to İstanbul.⁹

As it is listed above there are many unoccupied buildings and areas in the capital city. The whole list is tried to be given in order to illustrate what kind of buildings in the capital city are unoccupied. These buildings and areas can be called as “voids of the city” because the impacts of their condition are felt on urban scale. Although they are physically present, their non-presence in terms of function can be considered to be creating voids of the city.

Actually, the thesis approaches the voids of the city as a condition that defines a system, in which although each building differs from the other in terms of its location, scale and function and has a separate history, the reasons / conditions that make these buildings unoccupied are common. The common reason can be due to the social, economic and political changes after 1980s in other words due to the neo-liberal policies in Turkey. Another point to be underlined is the fact that the buildings which are not re-functioned after being unoccupied, are mostly the buildings of the Early Republican period Therefore, it is not by coincidence that these buildings become unoccupied after neo liberal policies, which will be

⁹ The discussions on moving the headquarters of the Central Bank, Vakıfbank, and Halkbank to İstanbul will be in the third chapter.
clarified in this study. Therefore, the relationships between the unoccupied buildings and also between these buildings and the city of Ankara will be defined. Whether they are public or private, their impact on their milieu and their power of transforming their neighborhood is discernible.

Figure 1-1. Top view of the city of Ankara (http://earth.google.com/)
Figure 1-2. Voids of the city of Ankara (prepared by the author)
1.3. Objects of the Thesis: The Main Buildings of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL in Ulus

The object of the thesis is narrowed to three of the unoccupied buildings, which are the main buildings of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL in Ulus. The reason behind this selection is the fact that they are the first main buildings in the new capital city, Ankara, constructed for the institutions namely, Emlakbank,
Sümerbank and TEKEL, which were the significant institutions in the economic development of the newly established Turkish Republic. In this respect, the first constructed main buildings of these institutions in Ulus are selected to understand the transformation of Ankara as the capital city in physical and social sense. Thus, the thesis aims to understand the common points between these buildings. The conditions of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL as institutions and their buildings have been transformed since the 1980s. This is the period, which can be accepted as the breaking point of the history of Turkish Republic with respect to social, economic and political changes, and will be explained in more detail in the following chapter. The significant policy of that period is the privatization of the governmental institutions, which consists of the institutions of service, production and also finance. The possessions of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL were transferred from the public sector (government) to the private sector after 1980s. The building stock of privatized institutions is sold or assigned to other institutions, or demolished. However it should be noticed that this thesis specifically dwells on the buildings of the above-mentioned institutions in Ulus in Ankara. Ankara as the capital city is where the central administration buildings of the governmental institutions are located. Yet, after 1980s the main administration buildings of the privatized institutions were whether moved from Ankara to İstanbul, like İş Bankası, Şekerbank and etc, or liquidated. İş Bankası is the first bank, which moved its main building to İstanbul in 2001.

The thesis analyzes the conditions of these selected buildings in two different scales. First, the buildings are not only the voids of the city, but also the traces of the social, political and economic changes of the city or even the country. The
transformation of the city or even the country can be read through the conditions of these buildings.

Second, the selected buildings are the public buildings that create an urban effect with their large scale within their context. These buildings with their abandoned conditions may affect their nearby environment and the city in social and economic ways. The decreasing value of stores and residential estate, and the decay in commercial life in the nearby environment may be among the examples of impacts on economic life of the neighborhood. In addition, these buildings may cause security and even health problems for the dwellers of the neighborhood. Considering their locations, they are mostly at the city center so their effect on urban scale and urban life can be recognizable.

**Emlakbank**

*Emlakbank* is essential considering the urbanization experience in Turkey. The history of *Emlakbank* as an institution is parallel with the political-social-economic history of Turkish Republic. *Emlakbank*, which was established in 1926, was the main institution that both built housing complexes and also provided loans for housing. The crucial changes in the administrative structure and in the aim of the bank were made by the intervention of the government in 1945, 1984, 1988, and finally 1998. These years are accepted significant also for the economic structure of Turkey. *Emlakbank* was closed in 2001 by Banking Regulation and Supervision Agency, and its 295 branches were transferred to *Ziraat Bank* and 96 branches were transferred to *Halkbank*.\(^\text{10}\) The main building of *Emlakbank* in

\(^{10}\) Esra Akdoğan, “Türkiye Emlak Bankası’nın Türkiye’nin Konut Politikasındaki Yeri” (MS diss., Akdeniz Üniversitesi, 2002) 138
Ulus became unoccupied after the liquidation of the bank. The process from the construction of the Emlakbank building till today is such as the following:

1933-1934: The building designed by Clemens Holzmeister was constructed.
2001: Emlakbank was liquidated.
2001- : The building has become unoccupied.

Sümerbank

Sümerbank was the primary institution of the industrial development of the newly established Turkish Republic. It was established as State Owned Enterprises (SOE) in 1933, which could be called “the school of industry.” Sümerbank established iron, cement, paper and cellulose factories throughout the country. After 1950s, Sümerbank focused mainly on developing textile sector till 1987, which was the year of the privatization of Sümerbank. The main building of Sümerbank was constructed as the concrete symbol of its institution according to the ideology of new Turkish Republic, and actively used until 2006. The procedure from its construction to today is as follows:

1938: The building, including the main administrative part and store, which was designed by Martin Elaesser was constructed.
1987: The privatization process began.
1993: The bank facility of Sümerbank was separated and transferred to the private firm.
2006: The main store building was closed.

State Owned Enterprises (SOE) is in Turkish Kamu iktisadi Teşebbüsleri (KİT). It is the government owned corporations and a legal entity created by a government to exercise some of the powers of the government.

Aylin O. Göçer, “The Impact of Privatization on the Organizational Culture: The Sumerbank’s Case”, (MBA diss. Bilkent University, 1990), 13
2007: The store building (i.e. the low rise building) was rented to LC Waikiki (private firm). Although it was rented, it could not be used since the Sümerbank building is the cultural and architectural heritage, and registered by the conservation council, and then every action related to this specific building must be checked and approved by the council.  

2008: The building is used as a store of LC Waikiki (private firm).

**TEKEL**

*TEKEL* was the significant institution in the agricultural development of the new Turkish Republic. It was established in 1932 providing the "monopoly" services related to tobacco, alcoholic beverages, salt, powder and explosives. The privatization of *TEKEL* by means of selling, renting, transferring of operation rights, and establishment of incorporeal rights on property was decided by the Privatization High Council (PHC) in 2002. The process of privatization endures since 2002. The process related with the *TEKEL* main building in *Ulus* from its construction to the condition of being unoccupied is as follows:

1928: The building designed as the headquarter building by Giulio Mongeri was constructed.

2002: The privatization process began.

2005: For the State Monopoly was privatized, all its properties were put up for sale.

2006: Restoration process was initiated by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism.

---

13 This material was collected by the author of the thesis through review of the laws and regulations and newspapers.
2007: Restoration process has continued under the control of the Central Bank in order to re-function the building as a Turkish Republic Money Museum.

2008: The building is still unoccupied.¹⁴

1.4. Political Processes after 1980s in Turkey

The unoccupied buildings in Ankara are significant because they create voids in the city. Ankara as the capital city is where the majority of the governmental building stock is. Hence, the change in the built environment must be discussed within the context of the political, social and economic changes in the country. 1980s has an important role in the history of Turkey in many ways. In order to study the selected unoccupied buildings in Ankara, recent political processes of Turkey is needed to be understood. By studying 1980s, the reasons why these buildings are emptied will be clarified.

In 24 January 1980, economic reform program was announced by the government, which was a turning point initiating the radical changes in economy. Yet, the reform program started to be applied after the Military Coup in 12 September 1980, which gave rise to the process of re-structuring the State. This period was crucial considering economy in Turkey in 1970s. There was an economic crisis, in which the growth in production had stopped, and the poverty of society had been growing. Similar to Turkey, most of the developing countries also struggled with the social and economic problems. In order to overcome the problem of poverty and provide economic growth, these countries have taken

¹⁴ This material was taken from the exhibition (Kentin Yok Anı) prepared for Architecture Week 2006. The material of the exhibition was collected by the author of the thesis through archive of Chamber of Architects Ankara Branch and also newspapers.
credits by the promotion of World Bank Group (WBG) and International Monetary Fund (IMF).\textsuperscript{15}

Actually, the hidden agenda is re-structuring these states by neo-liberal discourse in which the main target is to transform the state-base economy to the market-based economy. By doing so the responsibility of the state on economy and society is transferred to the private institutions both in global and local scale.\textsuperscript{16}

During such a process, Turkey had also signed the first Standby agreement in 1979 with IMF, and Five Structural Adjustment Loan (SAL) agreement with WBG.\textsuperscript{17} In this way, Turkey made commitment for the re-organization of the bureaucracy, the coherence between foreign market and local /domestic market, and lastly the eradication of the State Owned Enterprises (SOE).

Consequently, 24th January (1980) economic program influenced the Turkish policy.\textsuperscript{18} The period between 1980 and 1988 can be accepted as the base to the neo-liberal policy, which is, with some renovations, still valid today. As a result of the renewed agreement with IMF and WBG, and the economic sanctions that the government has to accomplish, the nation-state began to dissolve (e.g. the eradication of the State Owned Enterprises). Privatization (de-nationalization) is the way how the policy of economy is realized. The process brings about the

\textsuperscript{15} Erşat Akyazılı, “Kamu Kurumlarının Serbest Piyasa Politikaları Temelinde Kıçültülmesi ve Kapatılması Sorunu”. Madencilik Bülteni, October, 2002, 15

\textsuperscript{16} The nation-state turns into a global in terms of the state policy and administration (that is to be dependent to IMF, WBG, World Trade Organization), and becomes local in terms of the application of these policies. See also, Erşat Akyazılı, “Kamu Kurumlarının Serbest Piyasa Politikaları Temelinde Kıçültülmesi ve Kapatılması Sorunu”. Madencilik Bülteni. October, 2002, 15

\textsuperscript{17} Sector Adjustment Loan (SECAL) agreement in 1984 and its sub-agreements on agriculture, energy, finance claims that re-organization of state of Turkey is to be provided.

\textsuperscript{18} In this period (known as the period of ANAP -Anavatan Partisi-), the hierarchy in between the legislation and execution changed. Execution was acquired power against the legislation by the Republic of Turkey Constitution 1982.
hegemony of the finance instead of the social state. Privatization of the governmental institutions leads to the change in national social state ideology, and decreases the effectiveness of the central execution in Ankara. Ankara as the capital city of the State loses its effect, its power against Istanbul as the capital city of finance.

Therefore, understanding the recent history of economy in Turkey is essential to understand how Ankara becomes “the city of voids”. As the government has transferred his authority to the private sector, the government loses its effectiveness, and the results can also be observed in the built environment / the physical structure of Ankara. Hence, it can be stated that there is a relation between architectural-spatial practices and the social-economic processes of the country. Voids of the city appear as a result of the economic and social processes after 1980s.

1.5. Approach and structure of the Thesis

[A]rchitecture pick[s] a site [...] and transfer[s] it to the political realm by means of a symbolic mediation.19

In order to understand the relation between architecture/built environment and political-economic-social processes, one of the key reference books is The Production of Space by Henri Lefebvre. Lefebvre asserts “(social) space is a (social) product.”20 He claims that space can not exist without the society that it belongs to.21 Each society and each mode of production produces its own

19 Henri Lefebvre, The Production of Space (London: Blackwell Publish Ltd., 1991), 48
20 Ibid, 26
21 Ibid, 30-31
architectural-spatial practices, and in turn, its own spaces, its own built environment. According to Lefebvre, “social space works as a tool for the analysis of society.” He claims that the object of interest should shift from things in space to the production of space. Here, the emphasis is more upon the process (of production of space) rather than the end product.

Then, considering the problem definition of the thesis, the buildings are socially “produced spaces”. They are produced according to the society or mode of production in question and the historical period. Concerning each building in question in the thesis, the process of change evolves with the material practices and experiences, which are interrelated with how these buildings are represented in a discourse or by the dominant mode of production, and used as representations. It is in this sense that the relationships and processes, through which the buildings are produced, reproduced, valued, viewed and changed in terms of its function, are significant. The production process of the buildings in the city is defined by the society and the dominant mode of production. The buildings that became unoccupied after 1980s can be taken as examples to illustrate how a society creates and transforms its own space. Therefore to understand the stories of the unoccupied buildings in the thesis and their relations with the city, the society and the mode of production become crucial.

The thesis aims to understand the reasons behind the conditions of the main buildings of the Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL as being unoccupied, in the context of social, economic and political changes after 1980s, and in relation to other unoccupied buildings, to Ulus and to the city of Ankara.

22 Henri Lefebvre, The Production of Space (London: Blackwell Publish Ltd., 1991), 33-34
23 Ibid, 48
The thesis selects those unoccupied buildings, which are located in Ulus. Ulus has a historical significance; it is a multi-layered urban space, from which it is possible to observe and read various political, social dominations. Specifically, the main buildings of Emlakbank, Sümerbank, and TEKEL in Ulus, which can be accepted as the clues of social, political, economic changes in the city and even the country, will be studied. These buildings are the representatives of the institutions that they belong to, and these institutions are the keystones of the Early Republican Period. In that manner, it is crucial to study these unoccupied buildings which are the examples of the architecture of the Early Republican Period. It should be pointed out that, although the thesis focuses on these specific buildings, selections of other buildings might also provide different data and each data might contribute to different readings of Ankara.

In the second chapter, the recent social, economic and political changes after 1980s will be mentioned. The thesis will review the political history of Turkey between 1923 and 1980 in order to better clarify how 1980 is accepted as the breaking point for the Turkish history. While studying the dominant neo-liberal policies after 1980s, the thesis will give special emphasis to the privatization of the state owned enterprises (SOEs), which is accepted as crucial for the thesis. Then, the reflections of the neo-liberal policies on the city of Ankara will be mentioned.

In the third chapter, the selected unoccupied buildings (of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL in Ulus) will be discussed in relation to Ankara (as a capital city) by taking consideration the social, economic and political changes after 1980. For each building, related data will be collected. The selected buildings will be studied through the history of institutions they belonged to with
their limited chronologies in reference to the books, newspapers, laws, codes and regulations. Then, the architectural significance of these buildings will be mentioned. The common points behind their conditions of being unoccupied will be discussed under the specific topics, namely the buildings of the “collective memory”, the dilemma between İstanbul and Ankara, change in the content and meaning of public interest and public service, and mutual effect between the unoccupied buildings (the main buildings of Emlakbank, Sümberbank and TEKEL) and their context (Ulus).

In the conclusion part, the new role and identity assigned to Ankara will be mentioned. 2023 master plan of the city of Ankara and Metropolitan Municipality Strategic Plan of 2007-2011, which is prepared by Metropolitan Municipality, will be referred in order to clarify the spatial practices of the neo-liberal policies and the new identity of Ankara. Here, the thesis aims to notice the fact that although the privatized institutions move their main buildings to İstanbul, Ankara is assigned a new mission that puts the city in a different place in the national and even the international scale.
CHAPTER 2

SOCIAL, POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC CHANGES IN 1980s IN TURKEY

This chapter studies the social, political and economic changes in Turkey after 1980. It aims to elaborate the discussions introduced in the previous chapter. This thesis accepts that “(social) space is a (social) product,” and the city as a (social) space, can not be understood without studying the social, economic and political processes of the society it belongs to. Therefore, in order to understand how some public buildings are unoccupied in Ankara, recent political, economic and social history of Turkey is needed to be explained.

Particularly speaking, the unoccupied buildings, namely Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL Buildings, were produced according to the dominant ideology of the period they belonged to. They are the architectural products of the newly established Republic, and stand as the main public buildings of the new capital city. 1923 is a crucial break point in the history of Turkey since it denotes the end of the Ottoman Empire and the foundation of the new Turkish Republic. In the same manner, the 1980s, which denotes the end of the “étatism” and the introduction of neo-liberal policies, is accepted as a break point in the history of Turkey. The hegemony of the new neo-liberal policies has produced its own “social spaces” and caused disposal of the spaces of the old ideology (i.e.

\[\text{\footnotesize 24 Henri Lefebvre, } \textit{The Production of Space} (London: Blackwell Publishe Ltd., 1991), 26\]
étatism). How these processes have affected the physical-social structure of the city, and particularly the capital city of Ankara, is also studied in this chapter. Due to the fact that, Ankara is intentionally constructed as a capital city, this chapter refers to its historical background, too. Consequently, this chapter studies the recent history of Turkey in order to discuss the reasons behind the unoccupied buildings in Ankara, which are produced by the society and the ruling ideology.

2.1. An Overview of Socio-Economic Policies of Turkey between 1923 and 1980

The 1980s is the period in which the economic decisions have caused social and political changes in Turkey. In order to understand how 1980s became the breaking point of the history of Turkey, it is necessary to study the transition period from the étatist approach to liberal approach and their effects to the city of Ankara. Utku Utkulu separates the history of Turkish Republic into four periods in terms of economic development. The first period is 1923-1929, in which the Turkish Republic was founded just after the Independence War. It was the recovery period of the postwar; hence it is called as the early years of the State. The second period is 1930-1950 in which étatism was the main policy of the government. In that period, not only the foreign debts of the old Ottoman Empire were paid back, but also the national industrial investments were done in order to supply the public service and domestic needs. 1950-1961 was the period, in which liberalism was started to be experienced. This is in the sense that it was the beginning of the multi party system, and the new government was against the étatist policy of the old government and tried to overcome this policy. It failed...
because of the economic crisis, which resulted in political crisis. In between 1962-1979, the fourth period after the military coup, the nationally planned economic development with étatist approach was applied. The new institutions were established in order to preserve national “mixed economy”. As a result, the economic policies shape the history of Turkey. It is crucial to understand these periods mentioned above, because each dominant economic policy can be recognized through the physical and social structure of the country and even the cities.

**The early years of the Turkish Republic: 1923-1929**

Turkey is a typical developing country, which was established in 1923. Ankara was chosen as the new capital city of the newly established Turkish Republic for many reasons. Gönül Tankut mentions these reasons as follows: First of all, geographically Ankara was a protected city by being in the middle of Anatolia. Secondly, Ankara was in the junction point of the transportation and communication network (namely, railways and telegraph). The last and the most important reason was that the new government wanted to establish a new modern and contemporary Republic that would replace the old Ottoman Empire, and then they decided to construct a new capital city with a new ideology and architectural style.  

---

26 Mixed economy is an economic system, which contains both private owned and state owned enterprises or capitalism and socialism, or as mix of market economy and planned economy characteristics. In other words, there is more than one system in mixed economy. Turkey has mixed economy which contains both private owned and state owned enterprises. Retrieved from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mixed_economy (accessed March 27, 2008)  

27 Gönül Tankut, *Bir Başkentin İmanı* (İstanbul: Anahtar Kitaplar, 1993.), 16-17
The economic issues of 1920s were different with respect to the étatist 1930s; in 1920s industrialization was based mainly on private entrepreneurship, and then the new emerging private sectors were decided to be supported by the leaders of the new Republic.  

Zivi Hershlag defined this period just after the Independence War as the “transitional period of trial and error”. In the post-war period the political issues played an important role like Lausanne Peace Treaty in 1923, which included the economic matters besides the political and social issues. In addition to the fact that the domestic needs were supplied by the national productions, the government decided to let free trade and finance policy. In that

---


period, bank buildings and also the new government buildings were started to be constructed in the center of the new capital city of the new Turkish Republic. Elvan Altan Ergut claims that, the reasons behind the simultaneous constructions of the government buildings and the bank buildings relate to the fact that the political matters were taken in to consideration in relation to the economic issues.  

The economic recovery with étatist approach: 1929-1950

1929 was the first turning point of the economic development of the new Turkish Republic. In that period, the government had started to pay back the foreign debts of the Ottoman Empire, and exportation was stopped and the primary commodities could not be supplied because of “the Great Depression”31. These conditions resulted in a new strategy, which is called “étatism”. According to “étatism”, the government would have to participate in economic affairs to raise the welfare as a major investor and producer.32 Therefore, Turkish heavy industries were founded by State Owned Enterprises (SOEs), which were the main institutions for the development of the Turkish economy. Türkiye Sanayi ve Maadin Bankası was the first example of SOEs, which later became Sümerbank in 1933 with the law 2262. During the first five year industrial plan (1934-1938), the public SOEs were established in the fields of industry, mining and energy. On the other hand, the private sector was active in manufacturing industry. The

31 “The Great Depression was a dramatic, worldwide economic downturn beginning in some countries as early as 1928. In that period International trade declined sharply, as did personal incomes, tax revenues, prices, and profits. Cities all around the world were hit hard, especially those dependent on heavy industry.” Retrieved from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Great_Depression (accessed date: 23 March 2008).
development of economy was interrupted by the Second World War. During the war, the government controlled the economy through the SOEs, and the military considerations became prior and the civilian economic development efforts were reduced.

Figure 2-2. Nazilli Sümerbank Factory. (Archive of METU Faculty of Architecture, Photo: İnci Aslanoğlu)

Liberalization experience: 1950-1961

33 In the first five year industrial plan, the annual industrial growth during 1930s was about 10 per cent. But during the Second World War the production levels fell by an average of 5.6 per cent. Utku Utkulu, “The Turkish Economy: Past and Present” in Turkey since 1970: Politics, Economics and Society, ed. Denis Lovatt (New York: Palgrave Publishers, 2001), 12

In the late 1940s, the multi party system emerged, and the government was transferred from the étatist Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi (Republican Party) to the Demokrat Parti (Democratic Party), which advocated the liberal economy. In that period, the government supported primarily the private sector instead of SOEs, and liberalization of the domestic and foreign trade.\textsuperscript{35} It was the first time that the government planned to privatize the SOEs.\textsuperscript{36} In 1950s, in order to realize the economic policy, the substantial support of Marshall Plan, which included the financial aid on the agricultural products, was used.\textsuperscript{37}

The stabilization program was realized in 1958; hence the substantial foreign loans were taken according to the program, which included import liberalization, removal of price control and increase in SOEs prices. In that period, SOEs were re-organized politically by the “Ministry of Administrations”.\textsuperscript{38} In other words, it was the first time that étatism was criticized sharply, and the tendency of the government was to purge the state from the economic activities. In general, the economic policy of 1950s was called as inward-looking. Towards the end of the 1950s, the economic crisis resulted in political crisis, and the Democratic era was interrupted by the military coup in 1960.\textsuperscript{39}

\begin{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{36} Rıdvan Karlık, \textit{Türkiye’de Kamu İktisadi Teşebbüsleri ve Özelleştirme} (İstanbul: Esbank Yayınları, 1994), 25


\textsuperscript{38} Rıdvan Karlık, \textit{Türkiye’de Kamu İktisadi Teşebbüsleri ve Özelleştirme} (İstanbul: Esbank Yayınları, 1994), 25-26

\end{flushleft}
On the other hand, it was the period that the immigration from the rural to urban started. According to the State Statistical Institute surveys, the increasing ratio of the population in the cities were approximately %6.4 which was %1.8 in rural areas. The reasons behind this immigration were the industrialization of the cities, and the job opportunities created with the Marshall Plan. The social and political changes were directly related with the economic approaches. Moreover, in that period, the construction process of the modern capital city was interrupted. Ankara had been rapidly urbanized after 1950s; its social and spatial characteristics were altered. The capacity of the capital city was insufficient to accommodate increased population, and as a result, a new type of dwelling, *gecekondu* emerged in the city peripheries for low income groups. Additionally, the city center was shifted from *Ulus* district to *Yenisehir- Kizilay* district, to the south of the city. (Figure 2-3) According to Tuğrul Akçura, there were two groups of people who used these districts. First group was low-income and middle-income group who lived in north of the city and used *Ulus* as a city center. The south of the city was much more prestigious, and high-income group lived there and used *Kizilay* as a city center. (Figure 2-4)

---


Figure 2-3. Kızılay 1960s (Archive of METU Faculty of Architecture)
This shift was encouraged by the location of the new Parliament building, which was opened in 1961. *Ulus* district has begun to be emptied functionally as a city center. The image of Ankara as the capital city of Turkey was shifted from the planned and constructed modern capital city to the “created”, “lived” and “contemporary” city, which was integrated into the world. With the new plan (prepared by Nihat Yücel- Raşit Uybadin) in 1957, the present density of the city was increased by replacing existing building blocks with multi-storey buildings. It

---

43 Ibid, 52
was mentioned that, increase in the height of the buildings would not only provide economic benefits but also raise aesthetic quality of the city.\textsuperscript{44}

On the other hand, rapid urbanization has not only affected the capital city, but also İstanbul. The encouragement of the private sector was resulted in rapid industrialization of İstanbul with increase in its population. Private entrepreneurships preferred İstanbul for their investment projects. Considering development of cities, this preference caused inequalities and increased the gaps among the cities; and even the distinction between Anatolia and İstanbul emerged.\textsuperscript{45}

**National planning years with etatist approach: 1961-1979**

1960s was the period of national planning with étatist approach, which continued till 1979. State Planning Organization (SPO) was established with the duty of proposing and implementing socio-economic development plans.\textsuperscript{46} The domestic industries were protected, and the development of the trade was considered. According to Utkulu, the planning of the 1960s and 1970s were more comprehensive than 1930s. The consensus of that period was that the state had to play a leading role in order to realize the rapid development and industrialization of the country. On the other hand, the government continued to liberalize the labor market. Yet, the étatist approach collapsed after the first oil

\textsuperscript{44} Tansı Şenyapılı, ed., Özcan Altaban’a Armağan: ‘Cumhuriyet’in Ankara’sı (Ankara: ODTÜ Yayıncılık, 2005), 52


shock of 1973-1974, which resulted in the external debt crisis in 1978.\textsuperscript{47} This crisis prepared the end of the period in which the economic and social policies were dominated by the étatist approach.

2.2. Neo-liberal Policies after 1980

The economic crisis in 1970s stopped the economic development of the countries in the world. In order to overcome this economic crisis, the developed countries built up new economic strategies, and re-organized production processes with new technologies, using the new communication and informatics technological opportunities, which caused the flow of the finance and goods globally. So to speak, after 1970s, new accumulations of the capital and new regulation mechanisms have occurred in the world. Globalization is the result of all improvements in the communication and production technologies, in other words, it is a political process that unifies the national/local markets under the new regulations and organizations in the world.

Unlike many countries, Turkey continued its fast growth policy by inward looking strategies in economy, despite this global economic environment after the first oil shock in 1973-1974. For Turkey was a developing country with its “mixed economy”, the first oil shock could not be absorbed by the country, which resulted in social and political crisis. Between 1973 and September 1980, seven governments, which were all coalitions, took office in Turkey. The longest coalition was in charge for 14 months, and the shortest coalition was 10 days.\textsuperscript{48} The external debt crisis as a result of the first oil shock of 1973 appeared in 1978


\textsuperscript{48} Ibid, 33
in Turkey. There was poverty in the society, lack of employment and shortage of supplying needs of the society. After this crisis, the government took some precautions, but failed. As a result, the government declared, economic reform program in 24 January 1980. It was accepted as a turning point in the economic policy of Turkey. It proofs that economy directly influences the society, in other words, the date, 24 January 1980, was crucial in social and political history of Turkey. The economic reform program consisted of following objectives and arrangements:

- abandonment of an inward oriented ISI [Import-Substitution Industrialization] strategy and replaced with an outward-oriented one based on a more market based economy;
- reduction of direct government intervention in the manufacturing sector;
- lowering of barriers to foreign direct investment; […]
- gradual import liberalization
- public enterprise [SOEs] reform to reduce their heavy burden on the economy and improve their efficiency;
- encouraging privatization and limiting the extent of public enterprises [SOEs];
- de-regulation and rationalization of the public investment programme; […]
- more effective export promotion measures to encourage rapid export growth;
- steps to an improved external debt management and increased creditworthiness.49

As Utkulu claims, the 24 January 1980 economic reform program has brought radical changes to the Turkish economy and society. This program was not the first liberalization attempt; Democratic Party attempted liberalization in 1950s. Yet unlike the earlier liberalization attempt, this program was crucial because “[…] for

the first time the Turkish government actualized economic policies to create more liberal market oriented economy [...]".50

According to Hüseyin Şahin, the main target of the economic reform program was to organize the liberal market economies, and to decrease the role of the state on the economy.51 In other words, this program had long term targets, which were mainly re-organizing the economic institutions and changing the strategies of industrialization. Şahin also claims that the reform program was based upon neo-liberal policies, which, generally speaking, do not consider the social and political aspects. For instance, decreasing the expenses for the public interest and salary by pacifying Labor Unions, were among the main policies of the neo-liberal approach.52

After the military coup in 12 September 1980, the short term economic and social policies were realized according to the above mentioned economic program under the military government till December 1983.53 In 1983, the first elections after coup were done, and ANAP (Anavatan Partisi)54, the defender of the liberal approach, was established.

---

50 It is mentioned in the World Bank Study Reports that the government tried four times to liberate trade; in 1950, 1958, 1970 and 1980. They also claim that the last time the government committed the major programme of economic liberalization and trade reform, although the first reform programme was not the initiative of IMF or World Bank it had many similarities between the program that was proposed by IMF and World Bank. State in Utku Utkulu, “The Turkish Economy: Past and Present” in Turkey since 1970: Politics, Economics and Society, ed. Denis Lovatt (New York: Palgrave Publishers, 2001), 21-34

51 Hüseyin Şahin, Türkiye Ekonomisi: Tarihsel Gelişimi-Bugünkü Durumu (Bursa: Ezgi Kitabevi, 2006), 193

52 Ibid

53 Ibid, 196

54 In English, this is called Motherland Party. Motherland Party was established in 1983 by Turgut Özal. It is abbreviated as ANAP in Turkish. It is considered a centre-right party which supported restrictions on the role that government can play in the economy which favours private capital and enterprise, and which allows for some public expressions of religion.
economy and out-ward looking economic strategies, won the elections. The promises of the new Prime Minister, Turgut Özal, were increasing the living standards of the society, fulfilling privatization and liberalization program.\textsuperscript{55}

During that period, the problem of immigration and unemployment was increasing. The years between 1980 and 1985 was the period of the highest urbanization ratio with the population growth of %7,4 in the city, whereas -%1,0 in the rural area.\textsuperscript{56} In that period the population of the rural areas were decreased.

In the period of 1984-1991\textsuperscript{57} the government arranged the finance sector and its sub-institutions. They intended to decrease the effectiveness of the SOEs in the economy by limiting their financial sources and reducing their expenses. The government asked for the master plan for privatization of SOEs from the American company whose name was Morgan Quaranty Trust Company of New York in 1985.\textsuperscript{58} However, the expenses of the SOEs were not reduced, and the

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{55} Hüseyin Şahin, \textit{Türkiye Ekonomisi: Tarihsel Gelişimi-Bugünkü Durumu} (Bursa: Ezgi Kitabevi, 2006), 200


\textsuperscript{57} The government liberalized the importation, and the ratio of importation was increased. The ratio of exportation and importation raised from %16,3 and %8,3 to %21,7 and %14,9. On the contrary, the exportation ratio of the agricultural productions in the total ratio was decreased from %70 to %16,4. The external debts increased because of the outward-looking strategy, which supported exportation and importation. Turkey was the fifth developing country in 1987 with the largest amount of external debts. The growth in the sectors of construction, energy, transportation, trade and manufacturing increased. Employment opportunities at construction, transportation and tourism increased. Stated in Hüseyin Şahin, \textit{Türkiye Ekonomisi: Tarihsel Gelişimi-Bugünkü Durumu} (Bursa: Ezgi Kitabevi, 2006), 200-209

\textsuperscript{58} The company prepared the questionnaire to the bureaucrats in order to determine the main aims of the privatization. According to the results, allowing market forces to stimulate the economy was the primary aim of the privatization. See for further information, Esin Şenol, “Özelleştirmenin İş ilişkilerine Sosyal ve Hukuki Etkileri” (MS diss., Gazi Üniversitesi, 2006). and also Aylin O. Göçer
privatization of SOEs was not realized yet.\textsuperscript{59} In this period, the gap between different income groups was increased, and “the rich became richer, the poor became poorer”\textsuperscript{60}.

In 1990, within the privatization program, Turkish Airlines, and some of the SOEs were taken in the process of privatization by the government decision.\textsuperscript{61} With the Gulf War in 1991, Turkish economy was again in a crisis. The new general elections were done in 1991; True Path Party (\textit{Doğru Yol Partisi}) and Social Democratic Populist Party (\textit{Sosyaldemokrat Halkçı Parti}) established a coalition. The new coalition prepared a reform program for the SOEs, which consisted of privatization and achieving autonomy. The privileges of SOEs in the economy were intended to be reorganized according to this reform program. While the government intended to reduce the effectiveness of SOEs in the economy, they founded new SOEs, namely \textit{Gümüşhane Cement Factory}, Lalapaşa Cement Factory, PTT Manufacturing, maintenance and equipment institution in 1991.

5 April 1994 was the announcement day of the new economic program. The government took new precautions and decisions in order to overcome economic instability. The most important precautions were about the expenses of the State.

\textsuperscript{59} On the other hand, the government prepared a legal base for privatization. From 1984 onwards, many laws, codes, government decisions are inured. They are the laws no.2983, 3291, 3701, 3987,4000,4161, 3096, 3974, 4046,4054 and the Statutory Instrument no.233, 304, 414 437, 473, 530, 531, 532, 533, 546, 509. See for further information Rıdvan Karlık, Türkiye\textit{\textsuperscript{\textdagger}} de Kamu \textit{\textsuperscript{\textsection} kesi Teşebbüsleri ve Özelleştirme} (İstanbul: Esbank Yayınları, 1994)

\textsuperscript{60} Durmuş Yağan, et al. \textit{Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi II} (Ankara: AKDTYK, Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 2005), 349

\textsuperscript{61} The SOEs which were re-organized according to the privatization program in 1991 were Petrol Ofisi Anonim Şirketi (POAS) and Türkiye Petrol Rafinerileri Anonim Şirketi; in 1992 Et ve Balık Kurumu (EBK), Orman Ürünleri Sanayi Kurumu, Türkiye Süt Endüstrisi Kurumu (SEK), Yem Sanayi T.A.Ş., Denizcilik Bankası T.A.Ş. and Türkiye Çimento ve Toprak Sanayii T.A.Ş.
They decided to sell the mass housing and the resort places of the State in the country; they also intended to continue to privatize the SOEs which had great effects on the general economy. These precautions were mostly for raising the incomes of the State. They restricted the salaries of the employees, in that way in order to gain control over the domestic needs, they decreased the purchasing power of the society.

The new Privatization legislation with the number 4046 was inured in 27 November 1994. In this law, the privatization of SOEs was seen as a tool to heal the economy by creating extra financial sources. The government and some of the politicians declared that by inuring privatization legislation, the last socialist state was demolished, and saw this law as one of the most important reforms in the Turkish history comparing it to the Republican reforms.\(^{62}\) They programmed the privatization process of SOEs. By the 5 April program, the government declared that if a SOE could not be privatized it would be closed down in order to re-organize the state.\(^{63}\) But the government could not succeed in the privatization as much as they expected by the end of the 1999. In 1998 a new South Asia economic crisis emerged and Turkey was affected. Yet not only the world economic crisis but also the Marmara and Düzce earthquakes influenced the economy negatively. The purchasing power of the society was decreased and the

---


\(^{63}\) The SOEs planned to be closed were Karabük Demir Çelik Fabrikası, 7 enterprises of Sümerbank, Ziraat Donatım Kurumu, Devlet Malzeme Ofisi, some of the production services Et ve Balık Kurumu and some of the factories of TEKEL. See Ridvan Karluk, *Türkiye'de Kamu İktisadi Teşebbüsleri ve Özelleştirme* (İstanbul: Esbank Yayınları, 1994), 48
state could not fulfill the public services. The stability in the economy was so-so coped in 2003.\footnote{Hüseyin Şahin, \textit{Türkiye Ekonomisi: Tarihsel Gelişimi-Bugünkü Durumu} (Bursa: Ezgi Kitabevi, 2006), 245}

2000s were not different from the 1980s or 1990s. Turkey was responsible for great foreign debts which were taken from the IMF and World Bank. International finance institutions prepared the legal bases in three points.\footnote{Duran Gökkaya, \textit{Özelleştirmeye bir bakış: Türkiye ve Azerbeycan örneğinde} (Ankara: Gün Yayıncılık, 2007), 58.} Reducing the effects of the State in the production / manufacturing and industrial sectors was the primer aim of the new regulations. Second aim was reducing the budget of the State consisting of taxes, the salaries of employees, the costs of institutions, and supporting the private entrepreneurs instead. Third aim of these agreements between the IMF, World Bank and Turkey was privatizing the international circulation of finance, goods and services in the local markets. The aim of the government was to re-structure the State with a neo-liberal approach in re-organizing the economy. The effectiveness of the State on the economy was reduced with the help of the privatization policy of SOEs. But the public resistance to their policies slowed down the privatization of SOEs in practice.

\subsubsection{Privatization of State Owned Enterprises (SOEs)}

Although the government planned to eliminate the State from the economy for many years, their intentions have not been realized till mid 1990s. By the trend of globalization and regional integration, the government had a new economic reform program which helped to re-structure the Turkish economy and integrate it to the world. After 1970s most of the developed countries in the world have
finished its privatization process. On the contrary, Turkey had étatist approach in the economy, which was mainly inward-looking economy and state had an active role in 1970s. By the rise of the neo-liberal policies, in 1980s the government decided to decrease the activity of the State in the economic market and increase the private entrepreneurships.

Privatization, which is considered in parallel with “de-nationalization,” is defined as “the transfer of ownership or control of an enterprise from government to private sector”. In other words the process brings about the hegemony of the private sector instead of the social state. Marcie J. Patton defines the privatization in Turkey in two tracks: First of all, “the transfer of state owned productive assets to private ownership”, secondly, “the development of incentives to encourage and sustain an export drive propelled by large export trading companies in the private sector”.

In order to understand the process of privatization and how this process is actualized in Turkey, it is crucial to mention about SOEs, since they were the dynamics of the Turkish economy all through the history. After the Independence War in 1923, the government decided to produce the domestic needs and also support the private entrepreneur. Since the beginning of the 1950s there have been problems with SOEs about its high employment, interest expenses and production prices below market level. The government intended to sell out the enterprises due to the reasons above. Besides their role in economy, the building

---

66 Aylin O. Göçer “The Impact of Privatization on the Organizational Culture: The Sumerbank’s Case” (MBA diss., Bilkent University, 1990), 3

stocks (state properties) of the SOEs took crucial role in also urbanization. As they were seen as the prestigious institutions of the state and the promoter, regulator and basis of the economy, their built environment became significant in the formation of the cities. These institutions and their service buildings spread all through the country. They have helped establishment and/or development of many small-sized cities, economic life of which is depending upon. However, an opposite development perspective was pursued in the state policies and programs after 1980s as explained in the previous pages. The governments declared that Privatization was necessary to realize the following objectives: “Reduction of the State dominance in the economy by transferring the SOEs which have pioneer role, to the private sector; establishment of a market economy based on competition; reduction of final burden on the state budget; development of capital markets and inclusion of the idle savings to the economy.”

The purposes of privatization can be better understood by clarifying its economic, political and social reasons. The economic reason of the privatization is developing the liberal market economy, liquidation of the monopolies, increasing the ratio of employment, and increasing the effectiveness of the finance sector. The financial reasons of the privatization can be specified as; increasing the incomes of the state budget and invalidating the debts of the SOEs. The political

68 However, as the city developed the spaces of SOEs, their buildings/establishments at the outskirts of the city became areas in the center of the city, For example, Ayancık-ORÜS, Nazilli - Sümerbank, Yenice - ORÜS, İskenderun - ISDEMİR, Bursa -Sümerbank Merinos.


and ideological reasons for privatization was decreasing the effectiveness of the state, providing global demands, decreasing the political effectiveness of the Labor Unions. In that manner the social reasons are explained as follows: There are inequalities of the incomes in the social and industrialized states. The reasons behind inequality are the distributions and the use of the capital sources of the state. In order to overcome this problem, the incomes of the privatization of SOEs can be distributed to the society. Since the transfer of the revenues to the society will result in the discourse of the “propriety to the people” which was used to create consensus of privatization.

Considering privatization, the characteristics of Turkish case from the other countries should be mentioned. Every privatization experience has its own dynamics and accepted as a unique case, and then the practice in Turkey differentiates from the world examples: First of all, under the same legislation, Turkey exercised privatization, donation, liquidation, and socialization. Secondly, privatization is mainly the privatization of public lands. Thirdly, as a nodal intervention, privatization has direct impacts on urban planning and the planned growth of the cities. The privatization covers public goods (movable and immovable) and public services.

The main commodity in the Turkish case of privatization or liquidation is the “private properties of the state”. These public immovable goods (lands, buildings) are those possessed or owned by SOEs or just used, but owned by another institution or a person. Furthermore, the lands or buildings where the facility is

---

71 Şirin G. Eren, “Impacts of Privatization on Urban Planning: The Turkish Case (Ankara),”, (Phd diss., Middle East Technical University, 2007), 4

72 Ibid. p.6
located; lands or buildings left vacant for future investments; lands, buildings or parcels owned but located anywhere else than the production area; and lands or buildings owned by some other public institution but used by the enterprises in the Privatization Program are also privatized. Between 1986 and 2001, 36711 activities of the Privatization Administration cover transfer of immovable properties in the form of partial or block privatization. The transfer of public land or buildings ownership was the central administrative policy of privatization process: For both public and private sectors, “every public land or building is transferable.”

According to the data of Privatization Administration, between 1985 and 2008, 246 institutions which are partially owned by the state, 22 incomplete institutions, 393 immovable public propriety, 8 highways, 2 Bosporus Bridges, 103 institutions, 6 Harbor, the license of lotteries and mobile consultation stations are in the Privatization Program. Additionally, 23 institutions, which are partially owned by the state, and 4 immovable goods were liquidated or unified with other SOEs, which are not in the privatization program. More than half of these institutions in the program were privatized completely since 1985. (See Appendix A)

The neo-liberal policies and the globalization of the goods, capital and services, with the developed communication and informatics technologies, have dissolved the borders of the nations. In the history, States were the rulers of the

---


relationships of the production and consumption processes. Yet the effects of the Social State have been decreased on the economy.\textsuperscript{75} Also Turkey was transferred from the étatist approach in the economy to the neo-liberal approach. Privatization has been the primer policy of the State. In other words, the privatization of the SOEs changes the economic structure of Turkish Republic and also the social and political structure.

2.3. Reflections of the dominant policies to the city of Ankara

As stated by Gür, according to Lefebvre, “space as a form is simultaneously both a medium of social actions and a product of a society.”\textsuperscript{76} Lefebvre points out a mutual relationship between space and society, which lives in it. “New social relationships call for a new space and vice versa.”\textsuperscript{77} Every society, with its own particular social, economic and political dynamics that define social relationships, creates its own space and its city. Since the city is “produced space”, the dominant policies, which affect the society through the history, affects the cities. In this sense, the social, economic and political changes through the history of Turkish Republic have been affecting Ankara in many ways. Ankara, was constructed with the dominant policy of the 1920s (étatism), and has been transforming with the dominant policy of 1980s (neo-liberalism). In other words, Ankara has two specific transformation periods. Since the construction of Ankara has the symbolic meaning considering the transition from the old Ottoman Empire to new “modern” Turkish Republic, it has a specific condition in the history of


\textsuperscript{76} Berin Gür, “Reconstruction of urban space through the dialectics of global and local: evolution of urban space in Sultanahmet-Istanbul” (Phd diss., Middle East Technical University, 1999), 27

\textsuperscript{77} Henri Lefebvre, \textit{The Production of Space} (London: Blackwell Publish Ltd, 1991), 59
Turkish Republic. It is the seat of the national government, the head of the State. Yet, as it was mentioned in the above sections, the economic system of Turkish Republic has transformed sharply in 1980s from the State dominancy to the private entrepreneurs dominancy. This transformation in the economic system has brought about crucial changes in the social and politic aspects of the country and in turn in the spatial characteristics of the capital city, Ankara, where the main buildings of the State and entrepreneurs are located.

This thesis studies the unoccupied main buildings of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL in Ankara. These main buildings are located in the old city centre of Ankara, namely Ulus. Ulus has a specific role in the history of Turkish Republic because it was the first city center of the “modern” capital city of Turkey. The buildings were designed by foreign architects, who were invited by the early Republican government. This attempt of the government proves the importance of construction of the new modern capital city with the new ideology. Actually, the Early Republican period represents the efforts for the modernization of the built environment (and also the society) in Turkey, and particularly in Ankara. However, the urbanization period after 1980s with the neo-liberal policies, has started to change the character of built environment in Ankara.

Consequently, two periods, namely étatism and neo-liberalism are significant in the transformation of Ankara. This significance was the result of the two opposite and dominant policies. In order to clarify these oppositions and their effects on the city of Ankara, the construction of Ankara as a capital city in the Early Republican period and reflections of Neo-liberal policies to the capital city of Ankara are studied.
2.3.1. Construction of Ankara as the Capital City of New Turkish Republic

With the end of the Ottoman Empire and the construction of the new Turkish Republic, the capital city was moved from İstanbul (the capital city of Ottoman Empire) to Ankara. Not only the governmental institutions were moved to Ankara, but also the political, social and economic system was transformed as a whole. This was important because the new Turkish government gave significant concern for equal public services in every part of the country, and Ankara was in the middle of Anatolia at the intersection of the transportation and communication network. During the establishment of Republic, the population of İstanbul decreased, while the population of the Ankara increased. On the other hand, İstanbul, which was re-constructed with the urban planning experience of the 19th century, represented the old Ottoman urban structure. The government preferred creating a newly constructed city, which was suitable for the new modern society and new life style, rather than the restoration and renewal of the old urban structure. Newly created/planned physical environment in Ankara was the stage/scene of the new contemporary life style. Ankara was not only the image of the new Turkish Republic, but also a capital city, which was to fulfill the requirements of the new modern life style. The political intentions initiated the construction of Ankara with a new style different from the old Ankara. Ergut states that when Ankara was chosen as the capital of the national government, “the construction of the state was put into the action by the construction of its
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78 For the reasons of moving the capital city from İstanbul to Ankara, see Gönül Tankut, *Bir Başkentin İmari* (İstanbul: Anahtar Kitaplar Yayınları, 1993)

79 Gönül Tankut, *Bir Başkentin İman* (İstanbul: Anahtar Kitaplar Yayınları, 1993), 45

80 Ibid, 44
Ankara was the image of the nationalist, progressive, modern, contemporary Turkish Republic. The establishment of Ankara as the capital city was accepted as one of the most important “Kemalist” revolutions, which is called the “modernization project” of the Republic.  

Ankara became the capital city of Turkish Republic in 13 October 1923. In order to create the symbolic, modern and contemporary capital city with its physical structure for the new modern life, the private properties (lands) in Ankara were

---


82 Gönül Tankut, *Bir Başkentin İmanı* (İstanbul: Anahtar Kitaplar Yayınları, 1993), 43
expropriated in order to construct the public buildings. Till 1927, the city of Ankara had grown irregularly. In 1927, the urban plan of Hermann Jansen, the German urban planner and architect, was chosen by the competition in order to create the urban plan of Ankara. The city has developed through the north-south axis according to the Jansen plan. (Figure 2-6) The new city centre was designed at periphery of the old city center, with its newly constructed, prestigious, buildings and boulevards.

Figure 2-6. Ziraat Bank Construction and Bankalar Street. (Archive of METU Faculty of Architecture)

Ankara was rapidly urbanized with its prestigious city centre, namely Ulus where the Assembly (1st and 2nd Assembly buildings), Ankara Palas\(^{83}\) (the most

\[^{83}\text{designed by Vedat Tek and Kemaleddin Bey}\]
prestigious hotel), and the central buildings of the banks (*Ziraat Bank*[^84], *The İş Bank*[^85], *Ottoman Bank*[^86] etc.,) were situated, and with the increasing population. (Figure 2-7) The Exhibition Halls[^87] (after called as Opera House[^88]), Peoples House[^89], the ministry of Foreign Affairs building[^90], and Ankara University Faculty of Letters[^91] were some of the examples of the prestigious and symbolic buildings of the Nation, located on the north-south axis in Ankara. The new governmental buildings were designed by foreign architects in order to construct the capital city as a “modern “city.[^92] Since the state of new Republic aimed to construct the “modern identity”, its capital city had to be constructed with new buildings as the symbols of modernization project. Being the seat of the new government, many governmental buildings were constructed in Ankara as the concrete symbols of the modern Republic.

### 2.3.2. Consequences of Neo-Liberal Policies in the city of Ankara

The construction process of the modern capital city project was interrupted by the economic crisis in 1950s. On the other hand rapid urbanization with increasing population resulted in lack of housing. *Gecekondu* type of settlement started to

[^84]: designed by Giulio Mongeri
[^85]: designed by Giulio Mongeri
[^86]: designed by Giulio Mongeri
[^87]: designed by Şevki Balmumcu
[^88]: designed by Paul Bonatz
[^89]: designed by Arif Hikmet Koyunoğlu
[^90]: designed by Arif Hikmet Koyunoğlu
[^91]: designed by Bruno Taut
appear in that period. Such changes did not occur only in Ankara but the other cities in Turkey as well. But specifically considering Ankara, its city centre was moved from Ulus to Yenişehir and Kızılay. It was the first time that Ulus (Early Republican Period city centre) became functionally unoccupied in the 1950s and 1960s, during the first attempt of decreasing the effectiveness of the State. The prestigious development on the south part of the city was the clue of the transformation of the Turkish Republic. As Ergut mentions, “the period also witnessed Turkey’s fuller integration into the new world economic system of capitalism, which reinforced liberal policies and emphasized the role of the private sector in all fields”. 93

Figure 2-7. (left) The first main building of Turkish Is bank in Ulus (Archive of METU Faculty of Architecture), (right) The second main building of Turkish Is bank on Ataturk Boulevard (Archive of METU Faculty of Architecture)

It was the period when the banking sector competition also occurred. Ergut continues that in that period Turkish İş Bank, the first republican bank, moved its headquarters from Ulus to a new skyscraper, which has a symbolic meaning with its new technology and modern architectural style, on Atatürk Boulevard. (Figure 2-7) That proves the effectiveness of the private sector specifically finance sector. The crucial note about the Turkish İş Bank is that the bank headquarters was once more moved to İstanbul in 2001 in order to be placed in its fashionable and again currently highest skyscraper of the country in that period. It exemplifies the different point of view in economic as well as spatial developments of Turkey’s integration to the global context, whereby power is to be located in cities that are “global” namely, İstanbul. This example is crucial to understand the whole transformation process of Ankara as the capital city of Turkish Republic. Turkish İş Bank is an example of the modernization process during the Early Republican Period with its attempts to engage in the international system in economic terms.94

Neo-liberal approaches in 1980s have not only affected the financial markets and the national and regional politics, but also affected the spatial and social characteristics of the most of the cities in Turkey, and Ankara in particular. (Figure 2-8) The rapid urbanization and increasing number of construction of commercial spaces, namely shopping malls, are the results of the neo-liberal policies in Ankara, like all other cities. With the shift in priorities (from the state to private entrepreneurs), local governance together with private entrepreneurs

becomes the main decision maker in the re-construction of the cities. Authority is
distributed between the public, private and the local governance. Moreover
increase in the number of new housing projects at the peripheries of Ankara and
the urban transformation processes in the old city centers are almost the same
with the other cities in Turkey. (Figure 2-9)

Figure 2-8. Ankara specifically Ulus after 1990s (Archive of METU Faculty of
Architecture, Photo: Olgu Çalışkan)
Considering the neo-liberal policies, what is specific to Ankara, as a capital city of the state, can be explained as follows: For the control of the economy is taken from the state and given to private sector, the state becomes smaller. Privatization of the governmental institutions has caused to changes in the national social state ideology, and decreased the effectiveness of the central execution in Ankara. From the Early Republican Period to 1980s, the physical environment of Ankara mostly consisted of the “private properties of the State” specifically, the headquarter buildings of the SOEs. As the dominant policy of the government was the privatization of the SOEs after 1980, whether they were liquidated or privatized, the headquarters of them were rather moved to İstanbul or closed. Private properties of the State (lands and buildings) in Ankara have been unoccupied or sold for further investments to private entrepreneurs. Actually, these unoccupied large scale buildings, which were designed with a particular architectural program, were the symbols of the power of the State. Consequently, the physical environment of Ankara, as the seat of the
governmental institutions, has changed deeply via privatization comparing to the other cities in Turkey.

By the end of 1970s, the cities started to become prior than the countries. The competition between the countries has been turned into the competition between the cities in the global scale. Their spatial characteristics and also their positions and roles in the social, economic and political structure of the country determine the new missions of the cities. In that manner, in Turkey, İstanbul has become the center of the capital, in other words, the most of the institutions of the financial issues have been gathered in İstanbul in order to compete globally. Although the further discussions on this subject will be done in the following pages, it should be remembered that, because of that reason (i.e. the competition between İstanbul as the center of finance and Ankara as the political center of the state), the headquarters of Turkish İş Bank was moved to İstanbul from Ankara in 2001, then the headquarters of Şekerbank was moved in 2005. In the near future, the others (Ziraat Bank and also Halkbank) whose headquarters located in Ankara are planning to move İstanbul in order to compete with the others under the same conditions. (Figure 2-10) It is in this respect that, with the privatization policies, the urbanization of Ankara as a capital city differs from the urbanization of the other cities in Turkey.
To conclude this chapter, every dominant policy creates its own society and so its own space and its own city. In order to understand these dominant policies and their effects on Ankara, the social, economic and political history of Turkish Republic were studied in five periods. These periods are, the early years of the Turkish Republic (1923-1929), the economic recoveries with étatist approach (1929-1950), liberalization experience (1950-1961), national planning years with étatist approach (1961-1979) and neo-liberal policies after 1980. Considering the objects of the thesis namely the main buildings of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL constructed during the Early Republican period as the symbol of the new Republic, and privatized or liquidated after 1980, which will be discussed in the following chapter with respect to the thesis problem, particularly reflections of the
dominant policies of the Early Republican and the Neo-liberal Periods on Ankara were mentioned. Ankara has a specific role in the history of Turkey as the constructed capital city of the new Republic. As the headquarters of all state owned enterprises are located in the capital city, these buildings start to be emptied as a result of their privatization or liquidation process. Understanding the social, political and economic history of Turkey and its effects on Ankara and SOEs prepares the basis, which enable further discussions in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 3

DISCUSSION ON THE UNOCCUPIED MAIN BUILDINGS OF EMLAKBANK, SÜMERBANK AND TEKEL IN ANKARA IN THE CONTEXT OF DOMINANT POLICIES AFTER 1980

In the previous chapter, the social, economic and political histories of Turkey were mentioned in general. However, this chapter particularly focuses on the three unoccupied buildings of SOEs, namely Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL in Ulus in Ankara.

Since buildings are constructive elements of a city, and the physical and social structure of a city is affected by the dominant mode of production, any change in the mode of production can be read through the buildings. Specifically, the social, political and economic change in Turkey can be recognized through studying how these particular buildings become unoccupied. As a result, Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL are worth for studying in order to understand the reasons why some public buildings and areas become unoccupied.

This chapter is divided into two parts. In the first part, for the sake of the discussions, the brief institutional histories of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and Tekel are mentioned in order to understand their specific roles in the history of Turkish Republic with respect to the reasons for their establishment. In addition to this, the architectural significance of each building is given briefly.

In the second part, the impacts of the dominant policies after 1980s on three SOEs - Emlakbank, Sümerbank, TEKEL- and on their main buildings in Ankara,
which are still unoccupied, are discussed. The arguments of Henri Lefebvre (his argument on “space as a social product,” power of the space/architecture), Michel Foucault (his argument on “space of the power”) and Christine Boyer (her arguments on “collective memory”) form the conceptual basis of the discussions on these buildings. Discussions are pursued under the specific topics by taking the following questions into consideration:

1. Why are these buildings unoccupied?
2. Under which conditions are they unoccupied?
3. What are the political/economic/social reasons that make these buildings unoccupied?
4. What are the related planning/architectural decisions that make buildings unoccupied?
5. What are the after effects of the condition of being unoccupied in urban scale?
   A. In terms of architecture of the city.
   B. In terms of the everyday urban experience

The specific topics to be discussed are such as the following:

- The buildings of the “collective memory”,
- The dilemma between İstanbul and Ankara: İstanbul as the financial center versus Ankara as the political center,
- Change in the content and meaning of public interest and public service
- Mutual effect between the building and its context.
3.1. *Emlakbank, Sümerbank* and *TEKEL* as an institution and their main buildings in *Ulus*

3.1.1. **Brief Institutional History of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL**

The objects of this thesis, *Emlakbank*, *Sümerbank* and *TEKEL* were the important SOEs, which were established at the beginning of the Turkish Republic. *Emlakbank* was the main institution in supplying the housing requirements by giving loans for housing and by building housing complexes; *Sümerbank* was main industrial institution which supplied domestic needs; and *TEKEL* was the monopoly of production of the alcoholic beverages, cigarettes and salt. These institutions are all either liquidated, privatized or in the privatization process. Also their immovable properties in Turkey were privatized or transferred to the private sector or a person, or left vacant for further investments. Understanding the brief institutional history of *Emlakbank*, *Sümerbank and TEKEL* in Turkey is crucial, because it can give clues about not only the process of the privatization practices and economic changes in Turkey but also the reasons why the majority of the main SOEs buildings is unoccupied in the capital city of Turkey.
Emlakbank

_Emlak ve Eytam Bankası_ (Estate and Orphans Bank) was established in 1926 by the state in order to manage the orphans savings, and give loans. Yet it should be pointed out that, _Emlak_ and _Eytam_ Bank did not provide loans for construction; on the contrary, it gave loans only if the estate was mortgaged.\(^95\)

The Bank was a governmental institution, the capital of the _Emlak_ and _Eytam_ Bank was 20.000.000TL. Bank and its loans were mostly used for the capital city of Turkey, Ankara; hence the Bank became insufficient to serve for the needs of the public. In 1946, _Türkiye Emlak Kredi_ Bankası (Turkish Estate Loan Bank) was established instead of _Emlak_ and _Eytam_ Bank. Although it seems that the _Emlak Kredi_ Bank was the successor of _Emlak_ and _Eytam_ Bank, the main aim behind its establishment was different. The aim was mainly to provide loans to public for

\(^95\) This was mentioned in the report that was prepared to supply capital to the _Türkiye Emlak ve Kredi Bankası_ by The Ministry of Public Works and Settlement in 1964. It was quoted in Murat Güvenç and Öğuz Işık, _Emlak Bankası 1926-1998_ (İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 1999), 3
housing. It became more related with the urban problems of the cities, like migration and shortage of housing.\textsuperscript{96}

Depending on the changes in social, political and economy policies in Turkey, the structure and the status of Bank was modified. Although the \textit{Emlak Kredi} Bank provided housing for the low-income group in 1946, after 1984 the Bank diverged from this main aim.\textsuperscript{97} In 1984, following the liberalization policy of the government after 1980, \textit{Emlak Kredi} Bank was transformed to SOE, and named \textit{TEK-BANK} (\textit{Türkiye Emlak Kredi Bankası}). The aim of \textit{TEK-BANK} focused primarily on financial operations rather than housing projects, which were the primer aim of the \textit{Emlak Kredi} Bank. Consequently, by re-organization of \textit{Emlak Kredi} Bank in 1984, the agenda on supplying low-income housing was over.\textsuperscript{98}

\textsuperscript{96} Murat Güvenç and Oğuz Işık, \textit{Emlak Bankası 1926-1998} (İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 1999), 132

\textsuperscript{97} Esra Akdoğan, “Türkiye Emlak Bankası’nın Türkiye’nin Konut Politikasındaki Yeri” (MS diss., Akdeniz Üniversitesi, 2002), 28

\textsuperscript{98} Ibid, 120
TEK-BANK was unified with Anadolu Bank in 1988 with the capital of 225 billion TL, and was re-named Türkiye Emlak Bankası A.Ş (Turkish Estate Bank Joint Stock Company). After the unification, the main aim of Emlakbank was redefined so as to focus on foreign trade and housing. In other words, Emlakbank was adapted to the foreign trade in the world by the government, the responsibility of the Bank on housing kept as it was.

---

99 In Turkish shortly named Konutbank.

100 Esra Akdoğan, “Türkiye Emlak Bankası’nın Türkiye’nin Konut Politikasındaki Yeri” (MS diss., Akdeniz Üniversitesi, 2002), 127
Figure 3-3. Levent (Güvenç M. and İşık O. Emlak Bankası 1926-1998. Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, İstanbul 1999, 155)

Figure 3-4. Yenimahalle (Güvenç M. and İşık O. Emlak Bankası 1926-1998. Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, İstanbul 1999, 140)
The Bank developed large housing projects, which were significant for big cities such as, Bahçeşehir, Bizimkent, Ataköy and Levent in İstanbul, Deniz Bostanlısı in İzmir, and Konukkent, Bilkent and Elvankent in Ankara.101 (Figure 3-2,3-3,3-4)

In 1998, according to the decision of High Planning Council102 Emlakbank stopped to develop housing projects, and continued as a trade bank, which gave property loans.103 Emlakbank was closed in 2001 by Banking Regulation and Supervision Agency, and its 295 branches were transferred to Ziraat Bank, and 96 branches were transferred to Halkbank.104

**Sümerbank**

In 1925, Sanayi ve Maadin Bankası (Industry and Metal Bank) was established to which the industrial institutions were transferred. This bank was divided into two sub-institutions, which were Devlet Sanayi Ofisi (State Industry Office) and Türkiye Sanayi Kredi Bankası (Turkish Industry Loan Bank). In 1933, Sümerbank was established as SOE with the unification of Devlet Sanayi Ofisi and Türkiye Sanayi Kredi Bankası.105

The role of etatism was defined by Halil Bey106 as setting up a base for public affairs, which could not have been done by private sector in the Early Republican


102 Also seen as Supreme Planning Council, in Turkish *Başbakanlık Yüksek Planlama Kurulu*

103 Esra Akdoğan, “Türkiye Emlak Bankası’nın Türkiye’nin Konut Politikasındaki Yeri” (MS diss., Akdeniz Üniversitesi, 2002) 137

104 Ibid, 138


106 *Halil Bey* was Turkish National Assembly 4th Term member of the Parliament from İzmir, who declared his views about the establishment of Sümerbank.
Period. Then, it was important to establish Sümerbank to contribute industrialization of new Turkish Republic, and to encourage private sector.¹⁰⁷ (Figure 3-5)

![Figure 3-5. The notes of M.K.Atatürk in the opening ceremony of the Sümerbank Merinos Woolen Factory (http://www.sumerhali.gov.tr/iskender.htm, May, 11,2008 )](image)

The mission of the Sümerbank was defined as follows:

“...To work between the public and private sector in the area of industry with the specific aim of encouraging the foundation of major industries...”

“...To foster the education of personnel, who will take part in the development of Turkish Industry...”

“...To take active measures to improve Turkish Industry...”

“...To monitor industrialization in its accomplishment by means of a more harmonious and effective use of all national resources and economic factors...”

“...To improve urban/regional balance...”

“...To maintain and improve employment opportunities...”¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁷ Halil Bey. Cited in Serkan Tuna “Türkiye’dede Devlet İşletmeleri (1930-1940),” (Phd diss., İstanbul Üniversitesi 2002), 114

¹⁰⁸ Aylin O.Göçer, “The Impact of Privatization on the Organizational Culture: The Sumerbank’s Case”, (MBA diss. Bilkent University, 1990), 12-13
Sümerbank established iron, cement, paper and cellulose factories throughout the country in order to accomplish its aims mentioned above. Therefore, it was called “the school of industry”.\textsuperscript{109} The first public investment of the government was the Sümerbank Kayseri Fabric Factory with its mass housing in 1935. (Figure 3-6)

\begin{center}
\textbf{Figure 3-6. Kayseri Sümerbank Factory} (Fotoğrafı Türkiye, Matbuat Um. Md. Ankara)
\end{center}

In 1950s, the main focus of Sümerbank was the textile sector, and then the other industries related to Sümerbank were transferred to other enterprises or private sector. In 1987, Sümerbank was privatized with all factories all over the country,

\textsuperscript{109} Aylin O.Göçer, “The Impact of Privatization on the Organizational Culture: The Sumerbank’s Case”, (MBA diss. Bilkent University, 1990), 13
and became Sümerbank Holding A.Ş. (Sümerbank Holding Joint Stock Company). In 1993, the bank unit of Sümerbank Holding was separated, and became independent as Sümerbank Joint Stock Company (Bank). In 1995, Sümerbank Joint Stock Company was sold to Garipoğlu Group with the price of 101,460,000 $.\(^{110}\) In 1999, Sümerbank Joint Stock Company was transferred to the Savings Deposit Insurance Fund (Tasarruf Mevduati Sigorta Fonu- TMSF) from Garipoğlu Group. In 2001, it was sold to Oyak Group. It has been registered to the Oyakbank A.Ş since 2002.

### TEKEL

Tobacco and salt products were for the first time monopolized by the Ottoman Empire in 1862.\(^{111}\) Due to the Rusumu Sitte\(^ {112}\) of 1879, the income from the salt, tobacco and alcoholic beverages were first left to the foreign bankers, and then in the 1883 to Düyun-u Umumiye\(^ {113}\). Later, the income was left to the company (Memaliki Osmaniye Duhanları Müsterek Menftaa REJ Şirketi), which was a subsidiary of the Tobacco Monopolies. There were many factories like Cibali, İzmir, Adana, and Samsun Tobacco Factories, which were founded between 1884 and 1897.\(^ {114}\)

---

\(^{110}\) Günnur Yılmaz, “Özelleştirme Yöntemleri ve Türkiye’de Kamu Bankalarının Özelleştirilmesinde Sümerbank ve Etibank Uygulamaları,” (MS diss., Gazi Üniversitesi 1997)


\(^{112}\) In order to collect the debts from Ottomans, they established “Rusumu Sitte İdaresi”. This administration collected debts from duties of income of the salt, tobacco and alcoholic beverages etc. For further information http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=183884 (accessed February, 2008)

\(^{113}\) Düyun-u Umumiye was a board of creditors, whose aim was to preserve benefits of creditors. The members of the board consisted of Ottoman Galata bankers, Britain, Austria, France, Germany, Netherland and Italy. It was also called public debts.

After the foundation of the Turkish Republic, the control and sale of tobacco and its by-products were executed by the State in 1925. In 1926, tobacco, tobacco products and alcoholic beverages were monopolized by the State. Consequently, the "monopoly" services related to tobacco, alcoholic beverages, salt, powder and explosives were issued to the Monopolies Public Directorate (TEKEL), which was established in 1932. In 1946, TEKEL became TEKEL Headquarter Directorate as SOE. In 1987, TEKEL Headquarter Directorate was renamed as Tobacco, Tobacco Products, Salt and Alcohol Trade Headquarter Building, in short TEKEL.\footnote{http://www.tekel.gov.tr/default.asp?islem=tarihce (accessed February 01, 2008)}

The privatization of TEKEL by means of selling, renting, transferring of operation rights, and establishment of incorporeal rights on property was decided by the Privatization High Council (PHC) in 2002.\footnote{http://www.oib.gov.tr/portfoy/tekel.htm (accessed February 01, 2008)}

The Alcoholic Beverages Industry Management and Trade Co. was sold to the joint venture of Nurol-Limak-Özaltın-Tütsab with a price of 292.000.000 $ with the decision by PHC in 2003. A contract has been signed with Che Tobacco and Tobacco Products Alcoholic Beverages Industry and Trade Lt. Co. with a price of 1.325.000 U.S. dollars. The cigar brands and belongings of TEKEL were given to the Teka Cigar Production and Trade Co. in 2005. Three lake salinas in the area of Tuz Lake, and the Kaldırım, Kayacık and Yavşan Salt Establishments were privatized in 2006.\footnote{http://www.oib.gov.tr/portfoy/tekel.htm (accessed February 01, 2008)} TEKEL Cigarette Industry, Management and Trade Co. was sold to British American Tobacco (BAT) with the price of 1 billion 720 million U.S.
dollars in 2008. The process of privatization of the idle facilities and properties owned by TEKEL is continuing.

3.1.2. Architectural Significance of the Buildings of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL

The new economic processes in Turkey after 1980 have caused the fact that the most of the SOEs were re-organized or sold to private sector or closed down. As it was mentioned in the previous chapter, the main headquarter buildings of the SOEs were in Ankara as the capital city in order to administer the SOEs centrally by the state. In that manner, the headquarter buildings of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL, which served to public since the foundation of Turkish Republic, become unoccupied after the privatization process. These buildings are important and have a symbolic meaning in the history of modern architecture in Turkey because they are the early examples of the construction years of Ankara as a capital city and the new Turkish Republic.

The main buildings of these three SOEs are located at Ulus. Ulus was the main city center of Ankara particularly during the early republican period, where all the governmental buildings and also the First Assembly Building were located. As it was mentioned in the previous chapter, the efforts of the government to construct Ankara as the modern capital city went in parallel with the construction of the new modern society. It is believed that when the modern physical environment was constructed, the modernization of the society could be realized. It was aimed to construct “modern nation”, “modern human” through “modern city”. Then, Ankara started to be constructed according to the needs of the new State and the new

society. The governmental buildings (Sümerbank and Tekel), bank buildings (Ziraat Bank, İş Bank), housing projects (Saraçoğlu Mahallesi), the urban parks (Gençlik Parkı), the cultural and social spaces (Opera House, Exhibition Hall and Halkevi) were built in order to fulfill the public services of the modern society. The construction of Ankara was a model for the other cities in the country. These buildings as architectural products are “the representative of the nation”.\textsuperscript{119} It was accepted that the architectural practices were to be the integral part of the construction of the “unified modern nation”.

\textbf{Figure 3-7. EmlakBank Building} (Archive of METU Faculty of Architecture, Photo: İnci Aslanoğlu,)

\emph{Emlakbank, Sümerbank} and \emph{TEKEL} buildings were part and result of the modernization project of the Early Republican period. As the representatives of the modern identity of the state, these buildings were designed by the foreign

\textsuperscript{119} Elvan Ergut, “Making a National Architecture: Architecture and the Nation-State in Early Republican Turkey” (Phd diss., State University of New York, 1998)
architects, who were invited to apply their experience and knowledge on modern buildings.120 The detailed architectural record of the buildings is not given in this thesis however the ideology beneath the architectural practices during the Early Republican period is significant, which gives rise to further discussions on the current conditions of these specific buildings.121

Figure 3-8. Sümerbank Building. (Aslanoğlu, İ. Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Mimariği 1923-1938, ODTÜ Mimarlık Fakültesi Yayınları, Ankara, 2001, 262)


121 For the detailed architectural record of the Early Republican architectural products, see İnci Aslanoğlu, Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Mimariği 1923-1938 (Ankara: ODTÜ Mimarlık Fakültesi Yayınları, 2001)
Emlakbank (Emlak ve Eytam Bankası) building, which was designed in 1933-34 by Clemens Holzmeister, is located on the Bankalar Street. (Figure 3-7) This street is where the headquarter buildings of the banks were located especially in the Early Republican period. A design competition for the Sümerbank headquarter building including the main store, to which many Turkish and foreign architects participated, was organized in 1936. (Figure 3-8) Although the winner was the Turkish architect namely Seyfi Arkan, the building was designed by Martin Elaesser who did not participate the competition, and constructed in 1938. It remained as the main administration building and the main store of the Sümerbank until the privatization of the institution. TEKEL, State Monopolies, Headquarter Building was constructed in 1928 on the Bankalar Street. It was a corner building designed by Giulio Mongeri. (Figure 3-9)

Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL buildings are also the symbols of the power and the ideology of the State like the other buildings of the Early Republican period. These three representative buildings were used for many years by the institutions they belonged to. In general, after the privatization process of SOEs their head offices whether were moved to İstanbul or closed down, and the

122 The building is an example of the Early Republican Architecture. Most of the public buildings were designed as a monumental building in that period. İnci Aslanoglu claims that the Emlakbank building has the characteristics of the design of Holzmeister. The building was designed in the international functional-rational style/ attitude instead of the national style. Comparing to T.İş Bankası Building at Ulus which was designed by Giulio Mongeri in 1929, Emlakbank building has much simpler façade with its symmetry and prismatic mass without the ornamentations/decorations.

123 İnci Aslanoglu, Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Mimarlığı 1923-1938 (Ankara: ODTÜ Mimarlık Fakültesi Yayınları, 2001), 261

124 The building is an example the First National Architectural Style. Aslanoğlu claims that national tendencies affected architecture, became more popular especially after the Second Constitution in 1908, and continued its popularity during the early years of Turkish Republic. Holod, Evin and Özkan state that, there is a balance between the scale of TEKEL Building and the old city pattern therefore TEKEL Building can be accepted as the one of the good examples of that period. Nationalism resulted in the revival of the old elements like Seljukid patterns, and Ottoman architectural and decorative elements. For example, the common points of the buildings are the symmetry of the mass, the facade ornamentations/decorations in other words, history oriented formalistic attitude. İnci Aslanoğlu, Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Mimarlığı 1923-1938 (Ankara: ODTÜ Mimarlık Fakültesi Yayınları, 2001), 141
buildings of the SOEs were assigned to other governmental institutions or sold to the private sector. Yet the problem is that the main buildings of these institutions (Emlakbank, Sümberbank and TEKEL) are still unoccupied, and cannot be re-functioned after the privatization.

These buildings are the concrete representations of their institutions, which were indented to fulfill development plans of the country till 1980s. Sümberbank and TEKEL were the pioneer institutions for the rural development in the country by processing, controlling and supporting the production of the agricultural products (like tobacco or cotton etc.), and for the promotion of the society by creating employment opportunities. Moreover, together with their buildings, they supported the construction of the modern social and physical environment in the rural areas. In other words, these institutions, Sümberbank and TEKEL, were the cores of the state policy in the establishment of the balance between the rural
and urban development. Additionally, Emlakbank controlled the urbanization by providing shelter to the citizens with housing projects. These three institutions worked cooperatively for the sake of the public, till 1980s. Then, the main buildings, being the first constructed buildings of these institutions, are the symbols of the Early Republican official ideology, which aimed for the modernization of the society and its space, and also for the establishment of the balance between the urban and rural. Therefore, these buildings appear as the representations of the social, economic, political ideology of the state in the Early Republican period.

3.2. Discussion

The relevance of the arguments of Lefebvre, Foucault and Boyer comes from their concern with space by emphasizing different points: “space as a social product”, “power of the space/architecture” (that is Lefebvre); “space of the power” (that is Foucault); and space of the “collective memory” (that is Boyer). Their arguments support the discussions on the impacts of the neo-liberal policies on the selected SOE’s and their unoccupied main buildings.

The conceptual ground of Lefebvre’s discussions on “the social production of social space” is established by linking the space (the production of space); time (the making of history) and social being (the society). Lefebvre builds a matrix for the conceptualization of space, which is crucial to comprehend “social space”.

---

125 Berin Gür, “Reconstruction of urban space through the dialectics of global and local: evolution of urban space in Sultanahmet-Istanbul” (Phd diss., Middle East Technical University, 1999), 36
The components of the matrix are “spatial practice”, “representations of space” and “representational space or the space of representations”.126

1. Spatial practice, which embraces production and reproduction and the particular locations and spatial sets characteristic of each social formation. Spatial practice ensures continuity and some degree of cohesion. In terms of social space and of each member of a given society's relationship to that space, this cohesion implies a guaranteed level of competence and a specific level of performance.127
2. Representations of space, which are tied to the relations of production and to the ‘order’ which dose relations impose, and hence to knowledge, to signs, to codes and to ‘frontal’ relations.
3. Representational spaces, embodying complex symbolisms sometimes coded, sometimes not, linked to the clandestine or underground side of social life, as also to art.128

In his matrix; “spatial practice” is the process of producing material form of social spatiality. Spatial practice is also called “perceived” and physical (material) space. “Representations of space” refer to the idealistic and subjective way of spatial production. It is also called “conceived” space that refers to the process, in which meanings are constructed. Representational space (spaces of representation) is also called “lived” or “imagined” space, and refers to transformation of physical space by making symbolic use of its object.131

127 Lefebvre states in his footnote that “these terms are borrowed from Noam Chomsky, but this should not be taken as implying any subordination of the theory of space to linguistics.”
128 Henri Lefebvre, The Production of Space (London: Blackwell Publish Ltd, 1991), 33
129 For further discussions, see Henri Lefebvre, The Production of Space (London: Blackwell Publish Ltd, 1991), 29-33.
130 Ibid
131 Berin Gür, “Reconstruction of urban space through the dialectics of global and local: evolution of urban space in Sultanahmet-Istanbul” (Phd diss., Middle East Technical University, 1999), 27
Specifying the social relations of production is political and ideological in representational space.\textsuperscript{132}

What is “lived” and what is “perceived” are identified with what is “conceived”. In other words, representation of space has architectural-spatial and behavioral consequences. Lefebvre claims that these three concepts of space are relational, and there is no priority in between them. Yet representational space has a significant position in this relational matrix.

According to Foucault, space is a production of power. He approaches architecture as a discipline that provides “the institutions for the exercise of power; it institutionalizes power.”\textsuperscript{133} The acts of the dominant political and economic power (eg. the Neo-liberal policies) mediate into the reconstruction and transformation of urban space. According to Foucault, power is productive, and space cannot be considered apart from the exercise of power.

Urban space is, in fact where “the power of spatial representations” (that is the argument by Lefebvre) and “the spatial representations of power” (that is the argument by Foucault) support each other. For the thesis, the unoccupied buildings of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL are the constitutive elements of the urban space, which are discussed also by taking into account these two supporting arguments.

Speaking in reference to Lefebvre, neo-liberal policies after 1980s have architectural-spatial and behavioral consequences. “Representations of space”

\textsuperscript{132} Henri Lefebvre, \textit{The Production of Space} (London: Blackwell Publish Ltd. 1991), 31

\textsuperscript{133} Berin Gür, “Reconstruction of urban space through the dialectics of global and local: evolution of urban space in Sultanahmet-Istanbul” (Phd diss., Middle East Technical University, 1999)
are defined as the ideology of spoken and written words, as the discourse of the systems that produce the social space. Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL buildings are the representations of the policies of the Early Republican Period, which intended to create the modern society through the physical structure that they lived in. These three governmental buildings are “conceived” spaces; in other words they are not only the concrete symbols but also the mental production of the economic policies of the state (i.e. étatist policies). On the contrary, the spatial practice of neo-liberal policies after 1980s, focus more on flexible, adaptable to the market policies, fragmental, short term investments. For example, shopping malls, high rise office blocks and etc. appear as the spatial practice of the neo-liberal policies. Considering the representational space or the space of representations, which overlays the physically “perceived” space and the mentally “conceived” space; the two different approaches can be recognized between the policies before and after 1980. Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL, as the concrete symbols of the modernization project of the Early Republican period and also the missions of their institutions they belonged to, were lived spaces. That is to say that the society practiced and experienced these spaces; most of the people went to the Sümerbank building in order to buy cheap and good quality fabrics or clothes, which were produced by the state. The image of the Sümerbank building for the citizens in Turkey in general and the Sümerbank building in Ulus-Ankara in particular is the store where the domestic fabric of good quality is sold in low price. Emlakbank and also TEKEL had the similar mission before the neo-liberal policies, yet after 1980s these buildings started to become unoccupied one by one. However, these buildings have such a power that whether their functions change or not, they continue to live as Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL buildings with their social images in our collective
memory. Their social images come from their significant role as the material outcome of the ideology of the nation-state policy of the New Turkish Republic.

Speaking in reference to Foucault, every dominant ideology produces its own institutions with its buildings. *Emlakbank, Sümerbank* and *TEKEL* with their buildings were the institutions for the exercise of the nation-state ideology. *Emlakbank, Sümerbank* and *TEKEL* buildings are unoccupied, but they can be re-functioned as a store or a museum. The act of re-functioning institutionalizes a new type of power with new type of use or mission (eg. consumption spaces) that is burdened after 1980s by neo-liberal policies. Consequently, architecture is political in the sense that it both constitutes and also is constituted by the social economic and political transformations.

### 3.2.1. The Building of the “Collective Memory”

According to Maurice Halbhwach, collective memory “exists as long as it is part of the living experience of a group or individual”.\(^{134}\) It is different from the history in the manner that, history fixes past in a uniform manner but collective memory is “a current of continuous thought still moving in the present, still part of a groups [society] active life and these memories are multiple and dispersed, spectacular and ephemeral, not recollected or written down in one unified story. Instead, collective memories are supported by a group [society] framed in space and time.”\(^{135}\)

---


Considering the thesis problem, Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL buildings, have a symbolic meaning in the context of economic, social and political history in Turkey. As it was mentioned before, these buildings are the spaces of their institutions, which were the keystones of the nation state ideology. In that manner, the thesis approaches the concept of the collective memory in two ways: the significance of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL as an institution in the collective memory, and the architectural significance of their buildings in Ulus-Ankara, which are unoccupied today. To repeat, these three institutions have an important role in the development of the country. On the one hand, Sümerbank and TEKEL supported the industrial and agricultural productions in the rural areas; on the other hand Emlakbank supported the planned and sustainable urbanization of the cities. They served for the sake of the public; they included to the daily life of the society. For example, the products of these institutions, which were a type of brands (such as TEKEL beer, Sümerbank fabrics -Sümerbank basmasi-, Emlakbank Housing etc.), were part of the everyday life of the society. (Figure 3-10) In that manner, these memories are, whether multiple or single, shared by the society. Moreover, these institutions provided great capacity for the employment of the society. The employers of the institutions created sub-communities in Turkey, and they are the ones that are resisting the privatization of these institutions, in other words they struggle for their state of belonging and memories. Specifically, the collective life of the employers in the settlements of these institutions generates different memories. Whether they are privatized or liquidated, the society still remembers these institutions, which make their marks on the economic, social and political history of Turkey.

136 The resistance of the TEKEL employers all through the country counter to privatization of TEKEL was taken part in the news. (Appendix F)

Figure 3-11. Gençlik Park (Archive of METU Faculty of Architecture Photo: Baykan Günay)
Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL headquarters located in Ulus are the spatial representations of a group of important institutions in the capital city of Turkey. Ulus was the old city centre, which was planned by Hermann Jansen according to the physical needs of the modern capital city in the 1930’s. There are two axes created by Jansen; the first axis is the railway axis that ends at the main railway station acting as the gate to the city; and the second axis is the north-south axis on which the governmental and social-cultural buildings were located. These two axes intersect at Ulus.

Ulus was the center where the government, society, the services of finance and goods were gathered, interacted, and created a network. Of this network, the headquarter buildings of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL were practically involved in the process of production and distribution of the goods to the public. They were the representations of the public realm of the Republic like other public spaces in Ulus (such as Gençlik Parkı, Gar Gazinosu, Second Assembly Building, and Ankara Citadel). After 1980s, the above-mentioned political, economic and social network with their buildings and spaces in Ulus began to dissolve with the neo-liberal policies. The city center moved to the south of Ankara. The spaces of this coherent network lost their functions, and became singular without the context they belonged to.

The main buildings of the institutions became unoccupied after the privatization or liquidation of the institutions they belonged to. They exist actually but they cannot integrate to the daily life of the society, which is shaped by the neo-liberal policies, since they are unoccupied. The liberal market economies attribute Ulus
an image of the historical city center, which is conserved or renovated with the commodity of the tourism investments. This identity of historical city center assigned to Ulus is different from the identity assigned by the early republican ideology. Speaking in reference to Boyer, the attribution of the new identity to Ulus and its spaces, results in annihilating the “collective memory,” which is the main component of the public realm. In that manner, Emlakbank, Sümerbank, TEKEL buildings and Ulus also, became non-place/non-lieu, which functions only as the commodity space of the tourism instead the spaces of production and distribution of the goods.

As it was mentioned before, the idea of collective memory is “multiple and dispersed, spectacular and ephemeral.” Each imagination, each way of thinking, and each group of a society produces its own collective memory. Considering the thesis problem, the question, how the unoccupied buildings of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL are “conceived,” “lived” and “imagined” by the dominant social and economic policies, becomes crucial to understand the link between the collective memory and the space-power relations. In the imagination of the government today, architectural practices and in turn the buildings of the First National Style constitute the collective memory, and then the

---


architectural practices and buildings of this style are promoted. Related with the First National Style, İnci Aslanoğlu claims that national tendencies affected architecture, became more popular especially after the Second Constitution in 1908, and continued its popularity during the early years of Turkish Republic. Nationalism resulted in the revival of the old elements like Seljukid patterns, and Ottoman Architectural and decorative elements.\textsuperscript{141}

Today, \textit{TEKEL} building as the example of the First National Style is conceived and imagined by the government as the concrete representation of the architecture of the late Ottoman Empire with its façade ornamentations. Therefore, \textit{TEKEL} building will be re-functioned as Turkish Republic Money Museum; as the commodity space by fostering the image of the Ottoman Empire according to the neo-liberal policies. Yet, Sümerbank and Emlakbank are conceived as the representation of the Republican Period so that they are still unoccupied.

3.2.2. Dilemma between İstanbul and Ankara: İstanbul as the Financial Center versus Ankara as the Political Center

There has been a tension between the two important cities of Turkey, namely, İstanbul and Ankara since the Early Republican Period. İstanbul had been the capital city of the Roman-Byzantine and the Ottoman Empires for centuries.\textsuperscript{142} The War of Independence in Anatolia meant the end of İstanbul as the capital of


The common points of the buildings of the First National Style are the symmetry of the mass, the façade ornamentations/decorations in other words, history oriented formalistic attitude.

\textsuperscript{142} İstanbul served as the capital city of the Roman Empire (330–395), the Byzantine Empire (395–1204 and 1261–1453), the Latin Empire (1204-1261), and the Ottoman Empire (1453-1922).
the country. Since it was the last capital city of the Ottoman Empire, a new capital city for the newly established Turkish Republic with the new ideology was decided to be constructed. Instead of re-shaping İstanbul, Ankara became the symbol of the New State by leaving behind the city of İstanbul as the representative of the old Ottoman Empire. The political-governmental centre was moved to Ankara. İstanbul retained its identity only as a trade-commerce and cultural centre of the nation.

From Early Republican Period till 1950s Ankara acted as equipoise for uncontrolled growth and urbanization of İstanbul. After 1950, by the governmental support for liberalization of the economy, the private entrepreneurs preferred İstanbul for their investments. The government also intentionally invested to İstanbul. The city underwent great structural changes; new roads and factories were constructed in the city. Wide modern boulevards, avenues and public squares were built in İstanbul, sometimes at the expense of the demolition of many historical buildings. All these investments were done after the multi party system, and İstanbul once more became the nucleus of the nation’s social, political, economic and cultural life. The city became the base for private industrial enterprises comparing to Ankara or other cities in Anatolia, which were developed with the investments of the state, for example the construction of Sümerbank (and etc.) in the Anatolian cities played a significant role in the development of these cities. Generally speaking, 1950s were crucial in the manner that inequalities between the cities were occurred in the country, although the aim of the Early Republican government was to provide equality

between the cities. İstanbul gained power against Ankara in the control of the finance, and became prior for private entrepreneurship. The gap between İstanbul and Ankara, İstanbul and other Anatolian cities has been increasing since 1960s. Considering the rapid demographic growth of the two cities, to stop the illegal constructions, and to plan healthy infrastructure and qualified physical environment Emlak Kredi Bankası (Estate Loan Bank) started to put its efforts to the construction of the first housing projects in 1950s. Among these projects, Levent(I-IV), Ataköy (I-IV), Koşuyolu, Subayevleri, Atatürk Boulevard were in İstanbul, and Gülveren, Yenimahalle and Subayevleri were in Ankara. Comparing the number of the projects in the cities, the government considered İstanbul more significant than Ankara. When the number of the branches of the Emlakbank that were opened in that period, is considered, İstanbul had the priority, too.

The distinction between İstanbul and Ankara is intentionally developed by the central administration of the state. The dilemma between Ankara and İstanbul was in national scale till 1980s. By the neo-liberal policies and the discourse of the “globalization,” İstanbul becomes the forefront of other cities in Turkey. Since 1980s, the dilemma between the two cities has not been at national scale anymore. This is due to the fact that İstanbul is intended to be a global city, as the center of the international flow of capital in Turkey. After 1980s the competition between Ankara as the political center and İstanbul as the financial center is

---

145 Murat Güvenç and Oğuz Işık, Emlak Bankası 1926-1998 (İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 1999), 136.
146 Murat Güvenç and Oğuz Işık, Emlak Bankası 1926-1998 (İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 1999), 191.
considered in this thesis. The neo-liberal policies diminish the effectiveness of the government by the privatization of the public enterprises and cutbacks in the public sector employment, and by the liberalization of the international trade and flow of capital. These policies put forward the flow of capital instead of the flow of goods and manufactures. Additionally, with the neo-liberal policies, the world is accepted as a unified country, in which every city has a new mission without considering the national borders. The competition between the countries turns into the competition between the cities.\textsuperscript{147} In that manner, the policy of the government in Turkey, which was to establish the balance between the cities and the rural areas, has changed. The authority of the local municipalities gains privilege that causes the reduction of the effectiveness of the central administration on the cities. İstanbul is decided to be the major city that works as the financial center of Turkey, and where the global capital is located.

Then, the headquarters of most of the Bank buildings started to move to İstanbul to attract the global capital. As it was mentioned in the previous chapter, Turkish İş Bank moved to İstanbul in 2001, then Şekerbank, and also the headquarters of privatized sector like Petrol Ofisi moved to İstanbul in order to integrate to and have a place in the global world. The headquarters of Halkbank, Ziraat Bank, Vakıfbank, which are still the State Banks yet will be privatized in the following years, will probably move to İstanbul for the same reasons. The government declared that Turkish Central State Bank (\textit{TC Merkez Bankası}), Banking Regulation and Supervision Agency (\textit{Bankacılık Düzenleme ve Denetleme Kurulu}), and Capital Markets Board of Turkey (\textit{Sermaye Piyasası Kurulu}) will move to İstanbul, too. When the financial sector will totally be moved from

\textsuperscript{147} Çağatay Keskinok, \textit{Kentleşme Siyasaları} (İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 2007), 77.
Ankara with all the State or Private Banks to Istanbul, the control and the administration of the economy will be in Istanbul. However, in the early Republican Period, when Ankara was chosen as the new capital city, the Ottoman Bank and Ziraat Bank moved their headquarters from Istanbul to Ankara, and their central buildings were located in Ulus like the other bank and government buildings.

Figure 3-12. News about İstanbul as “Capital city” (Cumhuriyet Newspaper 04 January 2007)
The reasons behind the transfer of all the governmental institutions that is related to the finance and the State Banks have been discussed for years by the governments, non-governmental organizations and the financial authorities.\textsuperscript{148} The disengagement of nation-state results in the division of the centers into the centers of finance and political administration. For the time being, İstanbul is the financial center and Ankara is the political center.

![Figure 3-13. The heart of Finance (Sabah 11 September 2007)](image)

Considering the thesis problem, the transfer of the headquarters of the privatized State institutions and the bank buildings will cause probably the emergence of even more unoccupied large scale buildings and urban spaces in Ankara. The urban spaces of Ankara become where mainly the governmental buildings are located. These unoccupied buildings help us reading the transformation of

\textsuperscript{148} There are many news sources about the competition of the two major cities, For example; “Ankara mı İstanbul mı?” http://www.internethaber.com/news_detail.php?id=35986&uniq_id=1200665165 (accessed April 24, 2008).
Ankara with different point of view with the emphasis on the privatization of SOEs. On the contrary, the physical structure of İstanbul with investments of the global moving capital is shaped and occupied with newly constructed prestigious skyscrapers. Particularly, the policies of privatization (of the state enterprises and banks), and liberalization, and the discourse of the global city result in the reduction of the effectiveness of the State per se the decrease in the effectiveness of Ankara as the locus of the state. The discourse of globalization and the competition between the cities force the cities to gain new missions in order to endure in the global world. The new strategies for Ankara in order to endure in the global conjectures will be discussed in the following chapter.

3.2.3. Change in the content and meaning of “public interest” and “public service”

The privatization of SOEs, which are not only the basis of national production, but also of the preservation of social balance, seriously contradicts with the definition of “national and public interest” as the most fundamental of the state policies. Public-private, public service and public-common properties of the State such as housing provided for the employees and recreation areas, have social public functions. Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL are the significant examples of SOEs which served for public and fulfilled the public interest. With the privatization or liquidation of these SOEs, their public properties lost their social function. Emlakbank affected the urbanization process of the cities by providing loans or housing to the citizens. Also the contribution of TEKEL in agricultural development of the country and the industrialization experience of Sümerbank had been the keystones of the development of the state and the society since the Early Republican period. Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL are the institutions
for interventions of the state to the economy for public welfare, which was the major mission of the State cited in the Constitution of 1982.\textsuperscript{149} For the Turkish Republic is defined as a “social state”, public services and public interest are the major concepts that the state and its enterprises fulfill. Particularly by the policies of privatization, the content of public interest and public service is changed. In order to better clarify this change with neo-liberal policies, it is crucial to define “public interest” and the “public service”. The concept of “public interest” is defined in the final declaration of 4\textsuperscript{th} National Paper Symposium as follows:

When the concept of public interest is defined “formally” within the Rule of Law, it will possess a spirit with a liberal and social function, and thus will be shaped according to the principles of law and legal guarantee. Such a definition requires abstractness, generalization, continuity, equality, openness, clearness and a normative content.

On the other hand, when the concept of public interest is defined with regard to values, it will be shaped according to the ruling ideology, the tendencies, strength of the political power and the definition of the State they embrace, and thus legal guarantee will not be possible beyond certain aspects. Because, the definition will be interpreted with the idea of “the State of a certain value”, and the evaluation of the concept of public interest will be left to the conception of the social state – social rights and responsibilities of the State (and actually of the political power), which will form a concrete definition. The evaluation of the public interest will present a changing form with the changing interests of the political power, since there will be no abstract, generalized and continuous definition.\textsuperscript{150}

Additionally, public service is defined by Mahmut Duran as “specific activities of the government in the collective needs of the society, and institutions engaged in


\textsuperscript{150} 4\textsuperscript{th} National Paper Symposium was organized by the UCTEA Chamber of Mechanical Engineers with the theme of “The Situation of the Paper Industry in Turkey in the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century” in 20 December 2002. The final declaration of this symposium was published with the title “Evaluation on The Privatization of SEKA within the Context of The Privatization of SOEs”, May, 03, 2008 ,http://www.mmo.org.tr/index.php?Itemid=42&id=1023&option=com_content&task=view.
these activities”. In other words, all government activities, which are socially necessary, are accepted as public service.

The major capital of the neo-liberal period aims for the complete possession of all sources, and demands a complete termination of obstacles against profit. In this respect, concepts and constitutional provisions such as “public interest”, “social goal”, “social public service”, and “social rights” are left aside. However, beginning from the Early Republican period, the main aim of the SOEs is to provide “public service”. Therefore, the aim of the state is not to gain maximum profit from their enterprises, yet to serve to public by using the society’s own sources. In that manner, although each SOE can be evaluated separately, all SOEs should be evaluated within an integral structure. They are the main elements of the integral structure of the state’s production and public services. Hence, it is possible in this integral structure that some of SOEs may have profits and some may not due to the social and economic reasons or the qualities of the services they provide.

As it was mentioned before, the policy of supporting private sector after 1950s resulted in the industrialization of the city of İstanbul in particular which increased the gaps between İstanbul and other cities in Anatolia. However, the main aim of the nation-state policy was to open way for the industrialization of the Anatolian cities by constructing production and living spaces in these cities and by supplying their inhabitants with the spaces for cultural and social activities. In that manner, Sümerbank factories together with their social spaces (recreation, accommodation, sport facilities) are the good examples for the manifestation of

the nation-state ideology by creating “modern” and “contemporary” society in Anatolia with its required physical structure. The industrialization experiences of Sümerbank as the representative of the State in the Anatolian cities and the industrialization experiences of the private entrepreneurs in the big cities like İstanbul are different in terms of their impacts to the social and physical structure of the cities. For example, the energy needs of the factories of the private entrepreneurs are supplied from the sources of the city. On the contrary, the factories of Sümerbank contributed to its neighborhood and the city it was located, by supplying energy to the city from the sources of the factory. This example proves that the aim of the state enterprises (SOEs) is not only producing the goods but also serving for public, on the contrary, private sector aims to gain maximum profits at any cost. The example also disproves the assertion of the government, which claims that private sector fulfills the public service. The quality of the physical environment is also different between the state factories and the factories of private entrepreneurs. Private entrepreneurs establish only factories, production spaces. Yet, the state industrial areas with its social facilities namely, culture, sports, resort, service buildings, serve not only the employees of the factory but also the inhabitants of the city. They are much more planned to provide adequate spaces to socialize.

The mentality of social state is vanished by the neo-liberal policies. In other words, the social and legal “authorization” of the state is weakened by the privatization that accompanies the policy of creating a field and space of action

152 Murat Güvenç and Oğuz Işık, Emlak Bankası 1926–1998 (İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 1999), 175.

153 Çağatay Keskinok, Kentleşme Siyasaları (İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 2007), 149-150.
and power for neo-liberal policies. Replacing the Nation State model with “Company-State” model, a term defined in the final declaration of the 4th National Paper Symposium, neo-liberal policies reduce the state organs to the defender of multi-national (or global) capital and its proponents, and not the defender of its citizens. As Keskinok puts forth, the notion of citizen is replaced by the notion of “customer”. In the “company-state” model, “customers” and basic individual-social rights of these customers have no value and no legal guarantee when compared to the interests of the company.

3.3. Mutual Effect between the Buildings and Its Context

Although the thesis dwells on three unoccupied buildings of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL, and discusses the specific topics in reference to the impacts of the social, economic and political changes after 1980 on these three buildings, the arguments expand to Ulus as the locations of these three buildings and even to Ankara. For these buildings interact with their neighborhood and the city, it is necessary to discuss the effects of the neo-liberal policies on the transformation of Ulus through these buildings. Actually, understanding the transformation processes of Ulus opens up the way to clarify how Ulus is conceived and how it is lived through the history by the social, economic and dominant policies.


155 Çağatay Keskinok, Kentleşme Siyasaları (İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 2007), 56.
Ulus has been witnessed the Roman and Ottoman periods of Ankara, and also the construction period of Ankara as the capital city of the new Turkish Republic. In that manner, Ulus is multi-layered urban area. It has various layers of social, cultural and political dominations that have to be considered while discussing about Ulus. The railway station that was constructed in the late Ottoman Empire period played a significant role in the decision of the location of the city centre (that is Ulus) of the new capital city, in the Early Republican Period. The Station street (İstasyon street) became the main transportation axis ended with the square, which was called Taşhan Square in the end of 1880s. The name Taşhan came from the building on the corner of the square, which was constructed after the Second Constitutional monarchy, and then destructed in 1937 for the construction of Sümerbank's building. In the early 1920s, this square was called as Hakimiyet-i Milliye (National Sovereignty), and from the early Republican period onwards it is named as Ulus. (Figure 3-14) Considering the fact that Ulus was the only city centre, the change in the names of the square also represents the effects of the social, economic and political transformations. From the square to the Ankara Citadel, through the Karaoğlan Bazaar, there were many stores, patisseries, restaurants and even cinema, which prove that Ulus was a living city centre within its scale. Considering the names before the

156 In the final report of Chamber of Architects Ankara Branch which was presented to the Conservation Council of the Region of Ankara and prepared by Emre Madran, Elvan Altan Ergut and Nimet Özgönül in 10 January 2005. http://www.mimarlarodasiankara.org/?id=1523 (accessed May 13, 2008).


158 In the final report of Chamber of Architects Ankara Branch which was presented to the Conservation Council of the Region of Ankara and prepared by Emre Madran, Elvan Altan Ergut and Nimet Özgönül in 10 January 2005. http://www.mimarlarodasiankara.org/?id=1523 (accessed May 13, 2008)
Republican period, Taşhan represents the fact that this area was conceived as the commercial city centre, and then during the Independence War the square was conceived as the symbol of National Sovereignty, and after the establishment of the Republic it was conceived as the commonwealth.

The first Assembly building of the new Turkish Republic was located on the corner of the Ulus square, and the Second Assembly building was also constructed on the İstasyon street since railway station was the only gate to the city. The first modern hotel of Ankara, Ankara Palas, in which the important guests and the bureaucrats stayed, was also constructed on the İstasyon street.
because of the same reason. The national ceremonies occurred on this street in the early years of the Republic. (Figure 3-15)

![Figure 3-15. İstasyon Street](Arcayürek C., Bir Zamanlar Ankara,Bilgi Yaynevi, Istanbul, 2005)

According the Jansen Plan, the north south axis began with the Ulus square, continued through the Bankalar Street, - Yenişehir- Güvenpark and finished at the President Residence. On this axis, the educational buildings, post office, TEKEL building, bank buildings, Gençlik Park, Opera house, Public house and Ethnographic Museum were constructed as a part and result of the “modernization project” of the Early Republican period. Ulus was constructed as the administrative and commercial center of the modern capital city. As it was explained previously, Ulus was conceived as the hub of the social, political and economic life of the capital city and the country. In other words, Ulus was the
representation of the Republican ideology with its space and spatial practices, with the daily life of the society taking place in Ulus.

By 1950s, the administrational center was moved to Yenişehir and Kızılay but the commercial center was still Ulus. It can be discussed that the liberalization experience in the economy and the rapid urbanization after 1950s resulted in the reallocation of the new administration and commercial center to Kızılay and transformation of Ulus. Ulus lost its function and symbolic image as the city centre of Ankara assigned in the Early Republican period and became commercial centre of the low income groups. In 1950s, the first commercial buildings (such as Ulus İşhanı, Anafartalar Çarşısı) were constructed in order to improve the identity of Ulus as the commercial city center. (Figure 3-16) As a result, the spaces and society in Ulus have started to transform.
As stated and illustrated in the previous pages, throughout the history, Ulus has been transformed due to the dominant social, economic policies. Transformation of Ulus has continued by the neo-liberal policies after 1980s. Generally speaking, the neo-liberal policies approach the cities as commodity, whose spaces can be fragmented into particular sub-spaces. Contrary to the policies, which consider the public benefits a priori, and approach the cities as public realm, the neo-liberal policies more concentrate on the rent value, and take public benefits as secondary. As a result of the architectural-spatial practices of the neo-liberal policies, as an alternative to the city centers, shopping malls with entertainment and recreation facilities, prestigious symbolic high rise office blocks, suburban housing projects, which fulfill the requirements of the popular culture and the new life style, are produced.

To repeat: speaking in reference to Lefebvre’s argument on space, Ulus and its space is the representation of the modernization project of the Early Republican period, and between 1950s and 1980s Ulus is the representation of the commercial life of the low-income group with the first liberalization experience. Together with the neo liberal policies, the nation-state ideology began to dissolve, and the physical environment of Ulus has changed. Today, Ulus being the old city centre of Ankara is conceived as a historical and tourism space, which is to be valued with the investments of tourism. According to Guy Debord, tourism is the consumption of the historical and cultural values.159 The neo liberal policies conceive Ulus as the tourism commodity. Then, individual and the collective memories become the marketing values; and that situation causes the alienation

159 Guy Debord, Gösteri toplumu ve yorumlar (İstanbul: Ayrıntı yayınları, 1996)
of individuals to themselves and to the spaces they live in. For example, Gençlik Park, which was the most popular urban park and actively used by public, becomes unoccupied.

Considering the objects of the thesis, as a result of the neo-liberal policies, Sümerbank, Emlakbank and TEKEL are privatized or liquidated, and these institutions have lost their missions. Their main buildings in Ulus, which were constructed as the (architectural/built) representations of the institutions they belonged to, become unoccupied and isolated. Neo-liberal policies evaluate these spaces as the commodities, in which the interaction between the society and the space is established on the basis of consumption. TEKEL building is going to be the museum of Money; Sümerbank building is used as the store of LC Waikiki; and Emlakbank building or Gençlik Park is still unoccupied. Yet it has to be pointed out that although TEKEL and Sümerbank buildings are re-functioned today they are still unoccupied considering the discussion of the thesis. As the architectural symbols of the Early Republican ideology, these buildings alienate not only to themselves that is to become estranged to their historical, social significance, but also to their neighborhood that is to become estranged to the context; they may not be integrated to the daily life in Ulus that they are once a part of. This proves the existence of a mutual effect between these unoccupied buildings and Ulus.

In conclusion, this chapter has discussed the significant impacts of the neo-liberal policies, specifically on the Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL institutions and their main buildings in Ulus, and also on the capital city, Ankara. Beginning with the brief history of these SOEs and the architectural significances of their buildings, the discussions have been pursued under the specific topics, which are
the buildings of “collective memory”, dilemma between Istanbul and Ankara, the change in the meanings of public interest and public service, and the mutual effect between the building and its context. Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL and their public properties, which are the concrete representations of the nation state policies, have already been privatized or on the process of privatization. Their unoccupied buildings are the concrete results of the neo-liberal policies after 1980s. As they are the elements of the physical structure of the capital city, the change in the social, economic and political approaches has affected the city that can be recognized also through the change in the conditions of buildings in various aspects. The impacts of the neo-liberal policies and the competition between the cities have not completed yet. Ankara, as the capital city of Turkey since the Early Republican period, is the symbolic city of the nation-state policy. Since the neo-liberal policies have resulted in the dissolution of the nation-state ideology, this dissolution affects also the city of Ankara. The transformation processes of Ankara continue. By losing its effectiveness, as a political center, on the economic policy of the state by the neo-liberal policies, the future visions of Ankara in order to compete with other cities, specifically Istanbul, which is the financial center, needs to be discussed. Since the neo-liberal policies approach the cities as the commodities, which can be marketable, the projections of the city of Ankara should be worth studying. The strategies for the city of Ankara today and the future projections for the following years will be studied in detail in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

In this thesis, the unoccupied buildings of *Emlakbank, Sümerbank* and *TEKEL* in *Ulus* in Ankara have been discussed with the emphasis on the impacts of neo-liberal policies after 1980s. These buildings are approached as the concrete representations of their institutions, which were established as the part and result of the ideology of the Early Republican period. As Lefebvre states “space is a social product,” and space and society mutually constructs each other. Then, transformation in the society could not be separated from transformation of the city in physical and social sense. In that manner, the impacts of the social, economic and political changes after 1980s on SOEs, particularly *Emlakbank, Sümerbank* and *TEKEL* are crucial to understand not only the reasons why the main buildings of these institutions in *Ulus* are unoccupied but also the transformation of Ankara as the capital city in the social and physical sense.

For this purpose, initially, the social and economic policies in Turkey have been explained. In order to understand how the year, 1980, becomes a breaking point in the political history of Turkey, the brief historical information has been given. An overview of socio economic policies of Turkey between 1923 and 1980 has been divided into four periods, which are mainly as follows: 1923-1929, early years of the State; 1930-1950, the period of the étatist policies in which the national industry was developed in order to fulfill the public service and domestic needs; 1950-1961, the liberalism period which was experienced with the
beginning of the multi party system; 1962-1979, the nationally planned economic developments with étatist approach. The neo-liberal policies after 1980s have been given briefly.

This study has given priority to the privatization policies of the government, which are initiated to re-structure the economy in Turkey and to decrease the effectiveness of the state on economy, since the objects of the thesis, namely the main buildings of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL in Ulus, are the buildings of the privatized or liquidated SOEs. Therefore, the privatization policies of SOEs in Turkey have been mentioned with the reasons and the objectives behind the executions.

Ankara has been affected directly from the change in the policies of the government. On this account, the reflections of the neo-liberal policies in Ankara have been studied. Two significant periods that played a role in the transformation of the physical and social structure of Ankara have been mentioned. Therefore, the consequences of Early Republican period, during which Ankara was constructed as the capital city, and the consequences of neo-liberal period in Ankara have been briefly explained.

In the second chapter, the discussions on the unoccupied buildings of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL in Ulus have been done in the context of the dominant policies after 1980. Yet prior to the discussions, understanding the specific roles of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL with respect to the reasons for their establishment in the history of Turkish Republic are worth for studying. Therefore, the institutional histories of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL have been mentioned. The buildings of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL in Ulus,
which are unoccupied today, have been introduced as the representations of these institutions and the examples of the architecture of the Early Republican period. These buildings are the part and result of the efforts for the construction of the modern society and physical environment in the capital city of the new Turkish Republic.

The discussions on the main buildings of the Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL have been mainly based on the arguments of Lefebvre on “power of space”, Foucault on “space of power” and Boyer on “collective memory”. The questions that are asked in the beginning of the thesis have been elucidated with reference to these arguments that form a conceptual basis to the thesis. Considering the conceptual basis, the discussions on the unoccupied main buildings of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL can not be separated from the discussions on the social economic and political changes in Turkey. To do so, the discussions have been done under specific topics.

The first topic is the buildings of the “collective memory”. As it was mentioned previously, these buildings served for three important institutions of the State, which were the keystones of the national economy. In that manner, the concept of collective memory has been dealt in two ways. Firstly, the impacts of the Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL as an institution, and then the impacts of their main buildings in Ulus on collective memory, have been mentioned. Moreover, the productions of these institutions have been emphasized because their productions have a brand value in the collective memory such as, TEKEL beer or cigarette, Sümerbank fabrics and Emlakbank housing.
The second topic of the discussions is the dilemma between İstanbul and Ankara: İstanbul as the financial center versus Ankara as the political center. The thesis accepts that the dilemma between these two cities has been started since the Early Republican Period, in which Ankara was constructed as the new capital city of the New Turkish Republic as opposed to İstanbul, which had been not only the capital city of the old Ottoman Empire but also Roman- Byzantine Empire for centuries. It has been argued that, Ankara became a symbol of the new Turkish Republic; as a result, the investments done by the government have focused on Ankara in order to develop the city and foster its symbolic image until the end of the 1950s, the period of the first liberalization experience. On the one side, the political, governmental and economic centre of the nation-state was Ankara, and on the other, the trade, commercial and cultural center was İstanbul. By the neo-liberal policies of the today's world, the dissolution of the nation-state, and the discourse of the globalization, the attention of the government is directed to İstanbul. The economy is not based on the industrialization anymore; in general sense, the flow of capital and the flow of information and technology dissolve the boundaries of the countries; the competition between the countries becomes the competition between the cities. In that sense, İstanbul is decided to be the competitive city of Turkey, with its historical, geopolitical and administrative background. The headquarters of all private and national banks either have already moved to İstanbul or have been planning to move, in order to attract the global capital. Even the autonomous institutions, like Turkish Central State Bank (TC Merkez Bankası), Banking Regulation and Supervision Agency (Bankacılık Düzenleme ve Denetleme Kurulu), and Capital Markets Board of Turkey (Sermaye Piyasası Kurulu), which control the economy, are planned to be moved to İstanbul. In that sense, this study discusses that Ankara as the capital city of
the state loses its function of controlling the economy against İstanbul. Therefore, Ankara sustains its function as a political center and transfers its authority on economy to İstanbul. The thesis approaches the dilemma between İstanbul and Ankara as a process in the manner that, as the headquarters of such institutions will move from Ankara to İstanbul, the transformation of Ankara functionally and physically are inevitable, just as the possible increasing number of unoccupied buildings.

The third topic considered in the thesis is the change in the content and meaning of the concepts of public interest and public service. Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL, which are privatized or liquidated according to the neo-liberal policies of today, were crucial SOEs whose aim was fulfilling the “national and public interest”. The thesis defines the concepts of the public service and public interest in order to clarify the impacts of the privatization. Although the government claims that public services can be given by private sector, this statement is questionable considering the definitions of the public service and public interest. The priority of private sector is to gain maximum profit, and that priority contradicts with the priority of the public interest and public service. On the one hand, there are SOEs, which aim to serve for public at any cost; on the other hand, there are private entrepreneurs, which aim to extinct all the obstacles against profit. By privatization of the SOEs, it has been argued in the thesis that the state behaves like a “company”, so that the citizens become the “customers”\(^{160}\), who can not protect their social rights and public benefits due to the change in the mentality of the state.

\(^{160}\) Çağatay Keskinok, *Kentleşme Siyasaları* (İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 2007), 56.
Ulus has a symbolic meaning as the city centre of the Early Republican period; thereof the transformation process of Ulus has been mentioned in order to clarify how Ulus is conceived and how it is lived throughout the history by the social, economic and dominant policies. Generally speaking, since the type of spaces and the institutions of neo-liberal policies have changed due to the criteria of the global economy, the focus of spatial practices of neo liberal policies has been shifted to the shopping malls, luxury housing projects, high rise office buildings and the urban projects, which are all conceived in their rent value. Taking these policies into account, the unoccupied buildings of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL in Ulus, which have lost their missions due to the privatization or liquidation of the institutions they belonged to, can not be integrated to the social, economic and political life in Ulus even in the case that they are re-functioned. Although these buildings are physically present, their non-presence absence in terms of function and/or in the symbolic space they used to occupy in the collective memory can be considered to be creating voids in Ulus. Therefore, it is argued that these buildings are not only alienated to their historical and social significance, but also to their neighborhood, to Ulus.

In the light of the discussions on three buildings and Ulus, the future investments on Ankara by the government should be mentioned in order to understand how Ankara is conceived by neo liberal policies. In the Early Republican period, Ankara was planned and constructed as the capital city. The discourse of the early republican period constructed Ankara as a part of the modernization project

and the spatial representation of the modern society and life. It was accepted also as a model for the other Anatolian cities as the designed and constructed image of the new Republic.

On the other hand, the discourse of the global city today and the competition between the cities in order to attract the international capital result in seeking for a new identity for Ankara, which is quite different from being a political center. That is why in the 2023 master plan of Ankara, which is prepared by the
Metropolitan Municipality, Ankara is conceived as the city of science, culture and services. The further spatial and social development of Ankara is planned according to this vision. The aims of the 2023 master plan are stated as: to analyze and orient the structure of Ankara in the system of global and regional relations and in the sectors of economic activity and social life; and to provide social, economic and cultural progress in a way which allows optimum benefit from the natural and human resources. The identity of a constructed capital city with its coherent agricultural and industrial production has been shifted to an identity of a creative, inventory and innovative scientific center. The targets of the Municipality are declared in the metropolitan strategic plan for the following ten years of Ankara in a way that Ankara is to be the second biggest industrial city; the biggest commercial city; the biggest city for conventional tourism, the biggest city for health-thermal tourism; the biggest city of university education; and the biggest city in terms of technological developments of the country.

All these targets create their own spatial practices, which result in the transformation of Ankara. To exemplify, according to the master plan of 2023 Ankara, the governmental buildings will move away from the city centre, and their buildings will be re-functioned by taking their neighborhoods into account. For

---

162 The Metropolitan Municipality is authorized on the cities in place of the central government with the neoliberal policies.


example, **TEKEL** will be a museum due to the fact that **Ulus** is conceived as the cultural and historical city centre. Also, **Atatürk Orman Çiftliği (AOÇ)**, which is the unique example in Turkey for agricultural and also industrial investments in the capital city, will be a ground for the spaces of expositions. In other words, the neo liberal policies are seeking to produce a way to market the cultural, social and historical values of Ankara. In doing so, the conceived spaces of the neo liberal policies create a new type of relationships between the individual and the city, which are based mainly on consumption. Here, it is clear that the basic services that have to be provided to the individuals as citizens are understood as services to the client; that is to say that the concept of citizen is replaced by client.\(^{165}\)

The constructed capital city of the early Republic and its spaces represent the ideology of the Republic. In the 2023 master plan of the capital city, the decentralization of the governmental buildings and embassies, the approach to the renovation and rehabilitation of **Ulus**, **AOÇ**, and **Gençlik Park**, and an intention to construct the informatics valley are among the examples that represent the spatial practices of the neo-liberal policies.

To understand how Ankara will be transformed step by step, it is crucial to mention the planning decisions of the 2023 master plan of the city of Ankara. In the master plan, the main governmental buildings, which are located in the city

165 We can see an example where the neo-liberal ideology openly states such an understanding: the definition of the target of the fire department of the Metropolitan Municipality of Ankara in the Strategic plan of 2007–2011 for European Union is as follows:

"With the end of the year 2009, new fire taskforce units will be set up by a coordinated work so that there will be no fire stations lacking anything, and no complains will remain in terms of customer satisfaction (Italics mine) [Müşteri memnuniyeti için sonuçlanmayaacak şikayet kalmayacak şekilde yeni İtfaiye binimleri kurarak koordineli çalışma sonucunda; İl dahilinde 2009 yılı sonuna kadar eksik İtfaiye binası kalmayacaktır.] http://www.ankara.bel.tr/AbbSayfalari/ABB_Nazim_Planlari/ABB_nazim_plani.aspx (accessed May 15, 2008)"
centre, will be moved to the outwards of the city, to the new prestigious governmental buildings on the axis of Eskişehir Road. Similarly, the embassies which are located on the Atatürk Boulevard are encouraged to move to the Or-an diplomatic district. The spaces of both government and the embassies in the city centre will be transformed and re-functioned according to the properties of the neighborhood.

In the 2023 master plan, it is mentioned that, Ankara is expected to be the biggest city as being the center for the informatics and technology research and development in Turkey, which will consist of 77% of the total research in the country.¹⁶⁶ There are still six technology development centers in Ankara, which are ODTÜ Teknokent, ANKARA Teknoloji Geliştirme Bölgesi (Bilkent), Hacettepe Üniversitesi Teknoloji Geliştirme Bölgesi, Ankara Üniversitesi Gölbaşı Teknoparkı, Gazi Üniversitesi Teknoparkı, while in Istanbul there are three technology development centers.¹⁶⁷ Additionally, Ankara is expected to be the biggest city for conventional tourism and health and thermal tourism. To do so, it is planned to construct new convention centers; one convention center in the north of Ankara, one in Hacı Bayram Ulus, two in Söğütözü.¹⁶⁸ Additionally, for the health and thermal tourism, private hospital constructions will be encouraged in Ankara. The restoration and conservation of Ulus as the historical tourism centre, and the renovation of AOÇ and Gençlik Park as the recreation and fair area are intended. Moreover, the urban transformation projects like Kuzey


Ankara Girişi (North Gate to Ankara), Dikmen Vadisi 3, 4, 5 (Dikmen Valley 3, 4, 5) are the examples for the rehabilitation of the gecekondu areas.\textsuperscript{169}

These details are given in order to clarify what kind of projects will be put into practice as representing the spatial practices of the neo liberal policies, which give emphasis to rent value rather than public value. In the same manner, the meanings of concepts of public space and public realm, the way of giving public service and also the type of the relationships between the individual and the city have been changed.

Therefore, the future conditions of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL buildings are to be examined with respect to the above-mentioned future projections for Ankara suggested by the 2023 master plan. As the unoccupied buildings of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL are located in Ulus; they may be re-functioned according to the future projections suggested for Ulus, which is planned as the cultural and historical city centre for tourism investments in the 2023 plan. Furthermore, these buildings are the significant examples of the Early Republican architecture, and their institutions are the basis for the development of the Republican ideology. In other words, they are the symbolic images of the history of the Turkish Republic in architectural and social-political sense.

Speaking in architectural terms, the architecture of both the Emlakbank and Sümerbank buildings differs from the architecture of the TEKEL building (i.e. the First National Style). As it was mentioned before, considering the dominant policies of today's government, the architecture of the early 1920s of Ankara, which is the First National Style as the revival of the Seljukid pattern and

\textsuperscript{169} Büyükşehir Ankara Dergisi, no: 175 (2008): 4-13
architectural and decorative elements of the Ottoman Empire, is consciously selected to be taken into consideration in the process of re-functioning. That reminds us the discussions of the collective memory, which binds the group of people with common background, and it is in that sense that the question whose memory is to be conserved and represented becomes crucial. That is why TEKEL building is on restoration process to be the Turkish Republic Money Museum of the Turkish Central Bank, which will become a consumption space. On the contrary, the buildings of Emlakbank and Sümerbank, with its much simpler facades having no historical references to the Ottoman and Seljukid architecture, are conceived by the today's government as the representative of the westernization project of the newly established Turkish Republic, and are still unoccupied. Although the store of Sümerbank has been rented to a private firm, this is a short term project, and re-assessment of the building in the long run might not be put into practice.

Coming to the question, what the after effects of the condition of being unoccupied in urban scale are, that is asked at the beginning of the thesis, concerning the Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL main buildings in Ulus, their conditions of being unoccupied have affected their milieu and also the city of Ankara. They have the power of transforming their neighborhood considering their scale and their functions in the city. The condition of being unoccupied can be mentioned in two ways. Firstly, as these buildings physically exist, their non-presence in terms of function creates voids in Ankara. When the dimensions of the area that these buildings occupy are considered, the scale of the voids in the city centre causes the large urban spaces that can not be actively integrated to the everyday life of the city as it has been illustrated in the introduction of this
thesis. Secondly, Ulus, in which the large scale urban voids start to come up (e.g. Gençlik Park), turns into the nonfunctional historical city centre, which may only serve for tourism. That shows the fact that the conditions of being functional, being used or being unoccupied, being nonfunctional affect the status and the characteristics of the urban spaces.

The unoccupied buildings of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL were the parts and results of the social, economic and political life in the Early Republican period, and used until the privatization or liquidation of their institutions. Therefore, the non-presence in terms of function affects not only the building itself but also the nearby environment. As they are not used, the maintenance of these buildings has not been done. The deterioration of these buildings results in the deterioration of their neighborhood. It can be said that this is a mutual deterioration whose effects can be observed in the decay in the everyday life and in the social and economic conditions of the nearby environment. Although these buildings are isolated from their neighborhood, their neighborhood can not be isolated from the impacts of the unoccupied buildings of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL. The impacts of these buildings can be illustrated as the decreasing value of stores or the decay in commercial life and in turn in economic life of the neighborhood. In addition, these buildings may cause security and even health problems for the neighborhood. Considering their locations and scale that they are mostly at the city center, so their effects on urban scale and urban life can be recognizable.

The social, economic and political transformation of Ankara from the capital city of Early Republican policies to the city of neo-liberal policies can be recognized through the transformation of the symbolic spaces of the Early Republican period.
The unoccupied buildings of Emlakbank, Sümerbank and TEKEL in Ulus are examples of such transformation process. The spaces of the Early Republican period of which these buildings are examples, are today conceived as commodities, and the city is also seen as a commodity to be marketed with a new identity to compete with other cities in global scale. Here, it should be stated that, even in the case that these buildings are re-functioned and are not unoccupied anymore, that will be realized with the practices of the dominant policies of neo-liberalism rather than an idea of continuity of their identity and historical importance. Therefore, these buildings will continue to be unoccupied within the collective memory.
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A.1 COMPLETELY PRIVATIZED COMPANIES BETWEEN 1985 AND 2007 (www.oib.gov.tr)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPANIES</th>
<th>% of Shares sold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Adıyaman Çimento Sanayii T.A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Anadolubank A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Aşkale Çimento Sanayii T.A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) ÇELBOR Ç.Çekme Boru San. ve Tic.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Türkiye Gemi Sanayii A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Denizbank A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Denizli Çimento Sanayii T.A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Ergani Çimento Sanayii T.A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Eti Gümüş A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Filyos Ateş Tuğlası Sanayii T.A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Eti Krom A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Eti Elektrometalurgy</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Eti Aliminium</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) İskenderun Çimento Sanayii T.A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) İskenderun Demir ve Çelik</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Karabük Demir Çelik Fabrikası</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Kars Çimento Sanayii ve Tic. T.A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) Ladik Çimento Sanayii T. A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) Lalapaşa Çimento Sanayii T.A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) Ordu Soya Sanayii A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) Siyas Çimento Sanayii T.A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) SÜMERBANK A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) Şanlıurfa Çimento Sanayii T.A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24) TAKSAN</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25) Trabzon Çimento Sanayii T.A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26) USAŞ Uçak Servisi A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27) Van Çimento Sanayii T.A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28) BOZÜYÜK Seramik San. ve Tic. A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29) YEMSAN Yem Sanayii A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30) Türkiye Süt Ürünleri A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31) Kurtalan Çimento Sanayii ve Tic. A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32) Etibank Bankacılık A.O.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPANIES</td>
<td>% of Shares sold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33) HAVAŞ</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34) Konya Krom Manyezıt Tuğla San. Tic.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35) Yanımcı Porselen San. Tic.A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36) ÇITOSAN T.Çimento ve Topr. San.A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37) ORÜS orman Ürünleri A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38) Petrol Ofisi A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39) Turban Turizm A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40) TUMOSAN T. Motor San.Tic.A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41) Türkiye Zırai Dinatım A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42) ESGAZ</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43) BURSAGAZ</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44) DİV-HAN</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45) ETİ Bakır A.Ş.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46) ETAĞ Etimesgut Ağaç San. Tic.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47) T. Selüloz ve KAğıt Fab. (SEKA)</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48) T. Gübre Sanayi (TÜGSAŞ)</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49) TÜPRAŞ</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50) Deniz nakliyatı T.A.Ş.</td>
<td>99.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51) YASATAŞ Turistik Tesisleri A.Ş.</td>
<td>99.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52) Sivas Demir Çelik İşletmeleri A.Ş.</td>
<td>99.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53) Gerkonsan</td>
<td>99.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54) PETLAS Lastik Sanayi A.Ş.</td>
<td>99.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55) Güven Sigorta T. A.Ş.</td>
<td>99.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56) Trakya(Pınarhisar) Çimento San. A.Ş.</td>
<td>99.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57) Elazığ Çimento Sanayii A.Ş.</td>
<td>99.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58) Çorum Çimento Sanayii A.Ş.</td>
<td>99.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59) KÖYTEKS Yatırım Holding</td>
<td>99.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60) Niğde Çimento Sanayii T.A.Ş.</td>
<td>99.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61) Bartın Çimento Sanayii T.A.Ş.</td>
<td>99.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62) KUMAŞ Kütahya Manyezıt İşl. A.Ş.</td>
<td>99.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63) Gaziantep Çimento Sanayii T.A.Ş.</td>
<td>99.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64) TESTAŞ T. Elektronik San.Tic.A.Ş.</td>
<td>99.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65) Söke Çimento Sanayii T.A.Ş.</td>
<td>99.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66) Afyon Çimento Sanayii T.A.Ş.</td>
<td>99.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67) Aksaray Azmi Milli T.A.Ş.</td>
<td>99.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68) Ankara Çimento Sanayii T.A.Ş.</td>
<td>99.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69) GİMA Gıda ve İhtiyaç Mad. T.A.Ş.</td>
<td>98.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70) ÇİNKUR Çinko Kurşun Metal San. A.Ş.</td>
<td>98.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71) Balıkesir Çimento Sanayii T.A.Ş.</td>
<td>98.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72) Asil Çelik San. ve Tic A.Ş.</td>
<td>96.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73) MEYSU A.Ş.</td>
<td>96.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74) Gümüşhane Çimento Sanayii T.A.Ş.</td>
<td>95.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75) Adapazarı Şeker Fabrikası</td>
<td>94.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77) TOE-Türk Otomotiv Endüstrileri A.Ş.</td>
<td>91.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78) ANSAN Ankara Meşrubat Sanayii A.Ş.</td>
<td>88.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79) KOYTAŞ Köy Tarım Makinaları A.Ş.</td>
<td>85.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80) Ankara Anonim Türk Sigorta Şirketi</td>
<td>84.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Company Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>GÜNEYSU A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Tüstaş Sinai Tesisleri A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Adana Kağıt Torba Sanayii T.A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Ataköy Turizm Tesisleri ve Tic.A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Başak Sigorta A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Ataköy Otelcililik A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Baha Esat Kütahya Şeker Fab.A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>ERDEMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Bursa Soğuk Depoculuk Ltd. Şti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>İpragaz A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>DİTAŞ Deniz İşlet. ve Tankerciliği A.Ş</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Cyprus Turkish Airlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Türkiye-Libya Ortak Tarım ve Hay.A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Ray Sigorta A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>ÇEMAŞ Döküm Sanayi A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Ünye Çimento Sanayi A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Çaybank A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>NETAŞ Northern Elektrik Telekom A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>BİNAŞ Bingöl Yem Sanayii A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Adana Çimento Sanayii T.A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Mardin Çimento Sanayii A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Çayeli Bakır İşletmeleri A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Eskişehir Yem Fabrikası A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Trakmak Traktör ve Ziraat Mak. A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>PAN Tohum Islah ve Üretme A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Konya Çimento Sanayii A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Kepez Elektrik A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>TELETAŞ Telekom. End. ve Tic. A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Migros Türk T.A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Başak Emeklilik AS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Biga Yem Fabrikası A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>İstanbul Demir Çelik Sanayi A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Aksaray Yem Fabrikası A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>SUNTEK Ağır Isı Sanayi A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>AEG Eti Elektrik A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Türkşablo A.O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Kars Yem Fabrikası A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Bolu Çimento Sanayii A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Türk Traktör ve Ziraat Makinaları A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>ÇİMHOL Çimento Y. Mam. San. Hold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Polinas Plastik Sanayi T.A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Güneş Sigorta A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Çorum Yem Fabrikası A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>ALTEK Elekt. Sant. Tes. İşlt. ve Tic. A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Çelik Halat ve Tel Sanayii A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>MEKTA Ticaret A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Çamsan Ağaç Sanayi T.A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Çukurova Elektrik A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companies</td>
<td>% of Shares sold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129) ÇANTAŞ Çankırı Tuz Üre. ve Değ.</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130) Toros Ziraı İlaç ve Pazarlama A.Ş.</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131) SAMAŞ Sanayi Madenleri A.Ş.</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132) Bandırma Yem Fabrikası Ltd. Şti.</td>
<td>24.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133) Konya Şeker Fabrikası A.Ș.</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134) TOFAŞ Türk Otomobil Fabrikaları A.Ş.</td>
<td>23.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135) TOFAŞ Oto Ticaret A.Ş.</td>
<td>21.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136) YEMTA A.Ş.</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137) KÖY-TÜR Ana Dam. Tavuk San. Tic. A.Ş.</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138) ETÜDAŞ- Erzincan Tarım Ürün. Üre. A.Ş.</td>
<td>18.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139) Metal Kapak Sanayi A.Ş.</td>
<td>18.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140) Tat Konserve Sanayii A.Ş.</td>
<td>17.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141) ÖBİTAŞ İnşaat ve Tic. A.Ş.</td>
<td>16.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142) Arçelik A.Ş.</td>
<td>16.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143) Pancar Motor Sanayii A.Ş.</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144) Yeni Çeltek Kömür ve Madencilik</td>
<td>15.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145) Fruko Tamek Meyve Suları San. A.Ş.</td>
<td>15.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146) Ataköy Marina ve Yat İşletmeleri</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147) Manisa Yem Fabrikası A.Ş.</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148) Isparta Yem Fabrikası A.Ş.</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149) Tunğar Tunceli Gıda Sanayi A.Ş.</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150) Olgun Çelik San. ve Tic. A.Ş.</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151) Amasya Şeker Fabrikası</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152) DİTAŞ Doğan Yedek Parça İmalat A.Ş.</td>
<td>14.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153) Toros Gübre ve Kimya Endüstrisi A.Ş.</td>
<td>14.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154) ABANA Elektromekanik San. A.Ş.</td>
<td>13.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155) Şeker Sigorta A.Ş.</td>
<td>13.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156) Kayseri Yem Fabrikası A.Ş.</td>
<td>13.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157) Aymar Yağ Sanayi A.Ş.</td>
<td>11.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158) Şekerbank T.A.Ş.</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159) Pancar Ekicileri Birliği A.Ş.</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160) Kömür İşletmeleri A.Ş.</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162) Türkiye Sinai Kalkınma Bankası A.Ş.</td>
<td>8.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163) Ege Et ve Mamulleri Yem San. ve Tic A.Ş.</td>
<td>7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164) Çanakkale Seramik Fabrikaları A.Ş.</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165) Pınar Entegre Et ve Yem San. A.Ş.</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166) Tamek Gıda Sanayii A.Ş.</td>
<td>5.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167) Hektaş Ticaret T.A.Ş.</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168) Layne Bowler Dik Türbın Pomp. A.Ş.</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169) Ankara Halk Ekmek ve Un Fab. A.Ş.</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170) Sivas Yem Fabrikası A.Ş.</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171) Hascan Gıda Endüstrisi A.Ş.</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172) Mars Ticaret ve Sanayi A.Ş.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173) MAKSAN Malatya Makina Sanayi A.Ş.</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174) ÇESTAŞ Çukurova Elektrik San. A.Ş.</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175) Balikesir Pamuklu Dokuma San.</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176) İMSA İstanbul Meşrubat Sanayi A.Ş.</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMPANIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shares sold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>177) Liman İşletmeleri ve Nak. san. Tic.A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178) Ülfet Gıda ve Sabun San. A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179) MAN Kamyon ve Otobüs San. A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180) OYTAŞ İç ve Dış Ticaret A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181) Ceyhan Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182) Dosan Konserve San. ve Ticaret A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183) Aydın Tekstil İşletmesi A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184) Karadeniz Çimento Kireç ve Ürün. San.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185) T. Elektromekanik San. A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186) T. Kalkınma Bankası A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.2 PRIVATIZATION IMPLIMENTATIONS BY YEARS

Table A.2-1. Privatization Implementations by Years (www.oib.gov.tr)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yöntemi</th>
<th>1986-2006 ($)</th>
<th>2007 ($)</th>
<th>2008 ($)</th>
<th>Toplam ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blok Satış</td>
<td>18.158.793.478</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18.158.793.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesis/Varlık Satış</td>
<td>2.525.240.737</td>
<td>2.295.982.839</td>
<td>20.016.305</td>
<td>4.841.239.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İşve Arz</td>
<td>1.261.053.768</td>
<td>1.838.642.981</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.180.202.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOPLAM</td>
<td>25.782.742.474</td>
<td>4.258.629.659</td>
<td>105.254.070</td>
<td>30.146.626.363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure A.2-1. Privatization Implementations by Years (Özelleştirme İdaresi Başkanlığı, www.oib.gov.tr, accessed 21 May 2008)

### A.3 COMPANIES IN THE PRIVATIZATION PORTFOLIO

Table A.3-1. Companies in the Privatization Portfolio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF THE COMPANY</th>
<th>INDUSTRY</th>
<th>Share of PA (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Sümer Holding A.Ş. (1)(2)</td>
<td>Textile, leather, ceramics, carpet</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Sümer Halı A.Ş.</td>
<td>Carpet</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) T. Denizcilik İşletmeleri (1)</td>
<td>Maritime</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Tobacco, Tobacco Products, Salt and Alcohol Enterprises Inc. (TEKEL)</td>
<td>Tobacco Products, Salt</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Turkish Electricity Distribution Inc (TEDAS)</td>
<td>Electricity Distribution</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Ankara Doğal Elektrik Üretim ve Ticaret A.Ş.</td>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Türkiye Şeker Fabrikaları A.Ş.</td>
<td>Sugar processing</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) KBL-Karadeniz Bakır İşlet. (1)</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>99.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) T.Halk Bankası A.Ş.</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>99.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) PETKİM Petrokimya Hold. A.Ş. (1)</td>
<td>Petrochemicals</td>
<td>61.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Doğusan Boru Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş.</td>
<td>Pipe Production</td>
<td>56.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) THY-Türk Hava Yolları A.Ş. (1)</td>
<td>Airline</td>
<td>49.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Türk Arap Pazarlama A.Ş.</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Kayseri Şeker Fabrikası A.Ş.</td>
<td>Sugar processing</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) T.İş Bankası</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>0.000001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1): Some of the shares of these companies have been privatized
2) 15 Participation Shares have been transferred to Sumer Holding on March 12. 2001

### A.4 ENTITIES IN THE PRIVATIZATION PORTFOLIO

Table A.4-1. Motorways and Bridges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOLL MOTORWAYS</th>
<th>BOSPORUS BRIDGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pozanti-Tarsus-Mersin</td>
<td>1. Boğaziçi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Edirne-İstanbul-Ankara</td>
<td>2. Fatih Sultan Mehmet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tarsus-Adana-Gaziantep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Toprakkale-İskenderun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. İzmir-Çeşme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. İzmir-Aydın</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Gaziantep-Şanlıurfa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. İzmir ve Ankara Çevre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A.4-2. Other Entities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PORTS</th>
<th>OTHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. State Railway’s Bandırma Port</td>
<td>1. Foça Holiday Resort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. State Railway’s İzmir Port</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. State Railway’s Samsun Port</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. State Railway’s Derince Port</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. İzmir-Çeşme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

NEWSPAPER EXTRACTS ABOUT PRIVATIZATION IMPLEMENTATIONS IN TURKEY

B.1 18 MARCH 2007 – BİRGÜN NEWSPAPER
Suat Yıldız

AKP, ne varsa satmaya hazırlanıyor. Elektrik dağıtım ve üretim şirketleri, köprüler, otoyollar, şeker fabrikaları, limanlar, hatta üniversiteler bile sırada.

**Enflasyon hesabı şaşırttı**

AKP, ne varsa satmaya hazırlanıyor. Elektrik dağıtım ve üretim şirketleri, köprüler, otoyollar, şeker fabrikaları, limanlar, hatta üniversiteler bile sırada.

**2008-2010 DÖNEMİNDE, ÖZELEŞTİRME RÜZGARİ HIZLI ESECeker**

Önümüzdeki 2 yılda önemli elektrik dağıtım ve elektrik üretim şirketleri özeleştirecekler, köprü, otoyollar, şeker fabrikaları, Bandırma, Samsun ve Iksınderun limanları da sırada.

**Cari açık 39.2 milyar dolar**

AKP, ne varsa satmaya hazırlanıyor. Elektrik dağıtım ve üretim şirketleri, köprüler, otoyollar, şeker fabrikaları, limanlar, hatta üniversiteler bile sırada.

**KÖPİŞ VE OTYOYOLLAR**

Gücü birlikte, köprüler, otoyollar, şeker fabrikaları, Bandırma, Samsun ve Iksınderun limanları da sırada.
Göz göre göre zarar!

Köy Hizmetleri’ni tosfiye etmek adına kurumun bölge altyapısına hizmet üreten fabrikası çürümeye terk edildi

Mehmet Aşamoğlu

Köy Hizmetleri ve Kalkınma, köylerimizdeki hizmetlerin alınmadan mahrum bırakılması nedeniyle, köylülerimizin sosyal ve ekonomik durumlarımıza hizmet etmeyi, köy halkına hizmet etmeyi, isteklerini yerine getirmeyi, köylülerin tedirginliğini azaltmayı amaç eden 30 Ekim 2006 tarihli ve 2006/51 sayılı Köy Hizmetleri呤iklikle Kurumunun evrensel yaklaşımına ve köylü hizmetlerinin en doğru şekilde görüldüğü için, köy halkına hizmet ve hizmet verilmesi için gerekli önceliklerin alınması gerektiğini savunuyoruz.

İhtiyac var

Köy halkının hayatlarını ve işlerini etkileyen durumlar köylü olmakla kalmamak, köylülerin hizmetlerini alıp almaması, hizmetlerin kirlenmesi, hizmetlerin hafiflememesi, hizmetlerin hizmetvericilerin sosyal politika, ekonomik politika, sosyal hizmet politikalarının etkisiyle birlikte hizmetlerin alınıp alınamaması, hizmetlerin hizmet verilmesi için gerekli önceliklerin alınması gerektiğini savunuyoruz.

Kurumun işlevi

Köy Hizmetleri Genel Müdürlüğü, Avustralya tripinin ilk aşamasındakolon başı, “kurumun köylü hizmeti ve kurumun köylü hizmet vermesi” konusunu şu şekillerde açıklıyor:

- Köy halkının hizmetlerini alıp almaması, hizmetlerin hafiflememesi, hizmetlerin hizmet verilmesi için gerekli önceliklerin alınması gerektiğini savunuyoruz.
- Köy halkının hizmetlerini alıp almaması, hizmetlerin hafiflememesi, hizmetlerin hizmet verilmesi için gerekli önceliklerin alınması gerektiğini savunuyoruz.

Ayrıca genelde köylülerin hizmetlerini alıp almaması, hizmetlerin hafiflememesi, hizmetlerin hizmet verilmesi için gerekli önceliklerin alınması gerektiğini savunuyoruz.

Kurumun işlevi

Köy Hizmetleri Genel Müdürlüğü, Avustralya tripinin ilk aşamasındakolon başı, “kurumun köylü hizmeti ve kurumun köylü hizmet vermesi” konusunu şu şekillerde açıklıyor:

- Köy halkının hizmetlerini alıp almaması, hizmetlerin hafiflememesi, hizmetlerin hizmet verilmesi için gerekli önceliklerin alınması gerektiğini savunuyoruz.
- Köy halkının hizmetlerini alıp almaması, hizmetlerin hafiflememesi, hizmetlerin hizmet verilmesi için gerekli önceliklerin alınması gerektiğini savunuyoruz.

Evet, köylü hizmetlerini alıp almaması, hizmetlerin hafiflememesi, hizmetlerin hizmet verilmesi için gerekli önceliklerin alınması gerektiğini savunuyoruz.

Ayrıca genelde köylülerin hizmetlerini alıp almaması, hizmetlerin hafiflememesi, hizmetlerin hizmet verilmesi için gerekli önceliklerin alınması gerektiğini savunuyoruz.

Kurumun işlevi

Köy Hizmetleri Genel Müdürlüğü, Avustralya tripinin ilk aşamasındakolon başı, “kurumun köylü hizmeti ve kurumun köylü hizmet vermesi” konusunu şu şekillerde açıklıyor:

- Köy halkının hizmetlerini alıp almaması, hizmetlerin hafiflememesi, hizmetlerin hizmet verilmesi için gerekli önceliklerin alınması gerektiğini savunuyoruz.
- Köy halkının hizmetlerini alıp almaması, hizmetlerin hafiflememesi, hizmetlerin hizmet verilmesi için gerekli önceliklerin alınması gerektiğini savunuyoruz.

Evet, köylü hizmetlerini alıp almaması, hizmetlerin hafiflememesi, hizmetlerin hizmet verilmesi için gerekli önceliklerin alınması gerektiğini savunuyoruz.

Ayrıca genelde köylülerin hizmetlerini alıp almaması, hizmetlerin hafiflememesi, hizmetlerin hizmet verilmesi için gerekli önceliklerin alınması gerektiğini savunuyoruz.

Kurumun işlevi

Köy Hizmetleri Genel Müdürlüğü, Avustralya tripinin ilk aşamasındakolon başı, “kurumun köylü hizmeti ve kurumun köylü hizmet vermesi” konusunu şu şekillerde açıklıyor:

- Köy halkının hizmetlerini alıp almaması, hizmetlerin hafiflememesi, hizmetlerin hizmet verilmesi için gerekli önceliklerin alınması gerektiğini savunuyoruz.
- Köy halkının hizmetlerini alıp almaması, hizmetlerin hafiflememesi, hizmetlerin hizmet verilmesi için gerekli önceliklerin alınması gerektiğini savunuyoruz.

Evet, köylü hizmetlerini alıp almaması, hizmetlerin hafiflememesi, hizmetlerin hizmet verilmesi için gerekli önceliklerin alınması gerektiğini savunuyoruz.

Ayrıca genelde köylül
APPENDIX C

THE STATISTICS EXTRACTS OF INDUSTRIALIZATION AND THE ECONOMY OF THE CITY OF ANKARA

C.1. STATISTICS OF THE CHAMBER OF INDUSTRIES IN TURKEY


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANAYİ ODALARI</th>
<th>Ürün verdikten satışlar net (YTL)</th>
<th>Satış Hasılatı (YTL)</th>
<th>Brut Katma Değer (YTL)</th>
<th>Öz Sermaye (YTL)</th>
<th>Net Aktifler (YTL)</th>
<th>Dönem Karı (YTL)</th>
<th>İhracat (1,000 $)</th>
<th>Ücretle Çalışan Ortalaması (₺)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADANA</td>
<td>1,50 1,40</td>
<td>0,54</td>
<td>2,13</td>
<td>1,82</td>
<td>2,04</td>
<td>1,58</td>
<td>1,97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANKARA</td>
<td>6,09 4,80</td>
<td>5,55</td>
<td>13,04</td>
<td>11,26</td>
<td>12,18</td>
<td>4,44</td>
<td>8,72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALKIÇERİ</td>
<td>0,83 0,65</td>
<td>0,32</td>
<td>0,69</td>
<td>0,63</td>
<td>0,33</td>
<td>0,18</td>
<td>1,30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENİZLİ</td>
<td>1,80 1,42</td>
<td>0,75</td>
<td>1,10</td>
<td>1,37</td>
<td>1,03</td>
<td>1,10</td>
<td>2,10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGE BÖLGESİ</td>
<td>5,77 4,57</td>
<td>4,51</td>
<td>7,05</td>
<td>6,92</td>
<td>4,48</td>
<td>6,36</td>
<td>7,91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESKİŞEHİR</td>
<td>0,81 0,71</td>
<td>0,58</td>
<td>1,18</td>
<td>0,96</td>
<td>1,16</td>
<td>1,04</td>
<td>2,27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAZIANTEP</td>
<td>1,75 1,51</td>
<td>0,48</td>
<td>3,58</td>
<td>1,32</td>
<td>0,41</td>
<td>1,54</td>
<td>4,52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İSTANBUL</td>
<td>60,24 65,00</td>
<td>58,35</td>
<td>57,22</td>
<td>61,76</td>
<td>61,71</td>
<td>68,40</td>
<td>59,81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAYSERİ</td>
<td>2,11 1,75</td>
<td>1,16</td>
<td>1,98</td>
<td>2,34</td>
<td>2,15</td>
<td>1,18</td>
<td>4,75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOCAELİ</td>
<td>18,09 17,38</td>
<td>26,84</td>
<td>9,79</td>
<td>9,79</td>
<td>12,38</td>
<td>12,80</td>
<td>4,90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KONYA</td>
<td>1,01 0,81</td>
<td>0,90</td>
<td>2,25</td>
<td>1,82</td>
<td>2,14</td>
<td>0,38</td>
<td>1,28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOPLAM</td>
<td>100,00 100,00</td>
<td>100,00</td>
<td>100,00</td>
<td>100,00</td>
<td>100,00</td>
<td>100,00</td>
<td>100,00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table C.1-2. The List of Ankara Firms which are Top 500 Firms of Turkey


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sıra No 2006</th>
<th>Sıra No 2005</th>
<th>Bağlı Bulundu Oda/KT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Firma ve Müesseseler</strong></td>
<td><strong>Kamu /Özel Firma Sıra No</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C-2. The List of Ankara Firms which are Top 500 Firms of Turkey (Ankara Sanayi Odası, http://www.aso.org.tr, accessed 21 May 2008) (Continued)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>BAŞTAŞ BAŞKENT ÇİMENTO SANAYİ VE TİCARET A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>ŞAHİNLER METAL SANAYİ VE TİCARET A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>YAKUPOĞLU TEKSTİL VE DERİ SAN. TİC. A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>ERKUNT SANAYİ A.Ş</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>MESA MESKEN SANAYİİ A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>ANKARA UN SANAYİİ A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>NUH'UN ANKARA MAKARNASI SANAYİ VE TİCARET A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>ŞÀ-RA ENERJİ İNŞAAT TİC.VE SAN.A.Ş</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>EMEK BORU MAKİNA SAN. VE TİC.A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>BAŞTAŞ HAZIR BETON SANAYİ VE TİCARET A.Ş.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ÖZET DEĞERLENDİRME:

- 2006 yılında, 6'sı kamu - 26'sı özel sektör firma olmak üzere toplam 32 firma Türkiye'nin en büyük 500 firması içinde yer aldı.
- 2005 yıl sıralamada Ankara Sanayi Odası üyesi 8'i kamu firması olmak üzere, 37 firma yer almıştır.
- 2005 yıl sıralamada yer alan 6 firma;
  - Baymina Enerji A.Ş.
  - Birlik Pazarlama Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş.
  - Et ve Balık Ürünleri A.Ş. Genel Müd.
  - Isparta mensucat sanayi ve ticaret A.Ş.
  - Makina ve Kimya Endüstrisi Kurumu Genel Müdürlüğü
  - Nabay Tekstil Sanayi ve Tic. A.Ş.
- Üretimden satışlara göre 500 büyük firma içinde aso üyelerinin payı; 2005 yılında % 8,6 iken, 2006 yılında % 10 olmuştur.
- 500 büyük firma içinde;
  - Birinci sırayı Tüpraş-Türkiye Petrol Rafinerileri A.Ş almıştır.
  - İkinci Ford Otomotiv Sanayi A.Ş'dir.

**C.2. TOP 100 URBAN AGGLOMERATION GDP (Gross Domestic Products) RANKINGS IN 2005 AND ILLUSTRATIVE PROJECTIONS TO 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Cities ranked by estimated 2005 GDP at PPPs</th>
<th>Est. GDP in 2005 (bn at PPPs)</th>
<th>Cities ranked by projected 2020 GDP at PPPs</th>
<th>Est. GDP in 2020 (bn at 2000 PPPs)</th>
<th>Real GDP growth rate (% pa) 2006-20</th>
<th>GDP growth ranking (out of 151)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>1191</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Osaka/Kobe</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>Mexico City</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mexico City</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>Osaka/Kobe</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Washington DC</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Washington DC</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>Buenos Aires</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dallas/Fort Worth</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Buenos Aires</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>Sao Paulo</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>San Francisco/Oakland</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>Dallas/Fort Worth</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>Seoul</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sao Paulo</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>San Francisco/Oakland</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Seoul</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Mumbai (Bombay)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Beijing</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Rio de Janeiro</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Metro Manila</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Rio de Janeiro</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Shenyang</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Jakarta</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Zihl</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Doha</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Pheonix</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Guangzhou</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Mumbai (Bombay)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Kolkata (Calcutta)</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Montpellier</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Milan</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Cario</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Metro Manilla</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>St Louis</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Beijing</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Jakarta</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Bangalore</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Tampa/St Petersburg</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Pusan</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Millan</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Kolkata (Calcutta)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Tehran</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Riyadh</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure C.3-1. Distribution of Working Areas of Ankara in 2023 Master Plan (Ankara Büyükşehir Belediyesi, www.ankara.bel.tr , accessed 21 May 2008)
APPENDIX D

NEWSPAPER EXTRACTS ABOUT ANKARA

D.1. 19 MARCH 2007- HURRIYET ANKARA NEWSPAPER

Ankara 42 milyar dolarla dünyada ilk 100‘ün içinde

Savunma sanayi ve yazılım sektörlerinde bir numarayız

Yetkili den seçer

Pançarı açıklanmıştır

Türkiye İşaretler Arasında

Hakan Aktürk, DHA

Yetkili den seçer

Pançarı açıklanmıştır

Türkiye İşaretler Arasında

Hakan Aktürk, DHA

Pançarı açıklanmıştır

Türkiye İşaretler Arasında

Hakan Aktürk, DHA
“Ankara turizm kenti olabilir”

Turizm Geleceğine Vakfı Başkanı Ayça Adalılar, Ankara’da turizme yönlenince önem vermevedini belirttikler, kentin sağlık ve kongre mekezine dönüşünün bebeğine söyledi.

TÜRKIYENİN de şehirleri, kültür eserleri ve organik güzelliğini dikkat çeken bir şehirdir. Bu nedenle, Ankara’da turizme yönleniyorsa, kentin sağlık ve kongre mekezine dönüşünün bebeğine söyledi.


SAĞLIK KENTI OLALI


“Vatkal Ankara Baskanı, sektördeki düzenlenmiş sağlık ve kongre mekezine dönüşünün bebeğine söyledi.”

FLASTİK YASAKLANMALI

Bakan, otellerdeki özenin önemini vurguladı. “Onlardan sonra Türkiye’deki önemin Önemi Resmi olarak belirtildi.”

Daha sonraki toplantıda, vakıfların önemin önemi belirtti. Vatkal Ankara Baskanı, sektördeki düzenlenmiş sağlık ve kongre mekezine dönüşünün bebeğine söyledi.

“Vatkal Ankara Baskanı, sektördeki düzenlenmiş sağlık ve kongre mekezine dönüşünün bebeğine söyledi.”

Sorpu ÜYSUN

D.2. 26 SEPTEMBER 2007 - SABAH ANKARA NEWSPAPER

142
KENTTE RANT ÜRETİMİ

"..."
Günay, Atatürk'ün sonraki devlet adamı olarak Ankara için sadece özen gösterilmediğini ve kentin geleceği hayal edilerek planlama yapılmadığını söyledi.


Ankaralıların 2. adresi Design Plaza

D.5 05 JANUARY 2007- CUMHURİYET ANKARA NEWSPAPER

Projeler başka bahara kaldı!

Andrzej Badoży, Bayburt Gölü'nden, 2011 yılında yıktığını ilan ettiği manzarayı 6 tane keşif 2066 ceset senin az 12000 saatlik bir süreci sürdürdü. Yani,poszisyon olmayan metin projeler, 2005'te bir anda toprağın altına batmıştır.

Kuşağı inşaat bıktırch

Ankara halkı karaklik

Cenlikö Parkı hanabeye döndü

AOÇ'ye yakın sözü planda kabul edildi

D.6 10 MARCH 2007- HÜRRİYET ANKARA NEWSPAPER

Ankara'da satış değerini yüzde 32 düştü

BÜLÜM DESTEKLERİ


Satış verimliliği son derece düşüş gösterdi.

Bölge bazında anaaz apologize

Ankara'da "toplum satış" değerlendirmesi amacıyla hazırlanan bir açıklama ile satışa konut satışları değerlendirildi ve satış verimliliği son derece düşüş gösterildi.

Ankara'da satış değerini yüzde 32 düştü

Tıp ve Kültür Genel Müdürü Gefühl, 2016 yılı sonuna kadar dönemdeki özellikle konut satışları değerlendirildi ve satış verimliliği son derece düşüş gösterildi.
APPENDIX E

NEWSPAPER EXRACTS ABOUT SÜMERBANK

E.1. 29 AUGUST 2003 - TUMGAZETELER NEWS PORTAL

Sümerbank tarihe karışıyor


2006-10-04 19:20:05 NTV-MSNBC
Sümerbank`ı tarihten sileceğiz


2005-07-28 14:18:01 HO Terdilmiş
Sümerbankın 17 yıldır sata sata bitiremedik


2004-08-31 21:00:00 Milliyet
Hızlınlı bir kapamış

Sümerbank'a saygın duruşu

İmparatorluğın fabrika münasebeti kâdederşaten ve özel şefi, Sümerbank'ta "Uğurlar olsun kurultuk" sözlerini ettiği, geleneklerle hızlı bir şekilde vermek gerekmektedir.

Fak. (0112) 427 20 64


Eski bir zincirin hürdaya girmisini kadınIPv4


Sümerbank, alisveris merkezi bankacıdır, ama onun sahip olduğu tesislerin temelleri, ziyaretçilere kapı açmıştır. Çarşamba gününde genel plan möhteldir bugünkü. 1999 yılında Osmanlı İmparatorluğu sahasının son kullanımlarında olduğu, ama yapışkan ve ormanının sahasında için sanayi çalıştırılmaktadır. Ailelerin istahına karşı, imkanları bugünkü Türkiye'nin yönetiminde gölgedir. 1999 yılında Osmanlı İmparatorluğu sahasının son kullanıma tarih saatinde ise, sanayiyi da ve sanayiye elverişli olmaya devam edilecektir.

Türkiye'yi İrak edecek mohteldir bugünkü ile

Ordu'nun damadı için kurşun ve fası yanak işine, demir kunduzları için Bıyık ve akrabaları için Milyon sanayinin galasyonunun genişi bir şekilde panasonik fabrikalar ile Türkiye'deki birinci türünü yapmış olduğu ve birlikte Batı Avrupadaki gibi sanayiye bugünkü, gene jüri ile sanayiyle daha da güçlenmiş, Türkiye'ye ve Türkiye'nin sanayinin de şu anda birtakım,** onur ve hüzünle** teşvik edilmektedir. Ordu için kullanılan mevcut iş ve sanayideki birlik ve hüzünle de kıyaslanır.

Sümerbank'ın verileri, değerli değerlerle de olmamak isteyenler için sadece en iyi fikirlerde, sanayiye bugünkü, ordu ve sanayideki birlik ve hüzünle de kıyaslanır.

Imparatorluğun fabrika münasebeti kadınIPv4, "Uğurlar olsun kurultuk" sözlerini ettiği, geleneklerle hızlı bir şekilde vermek gerekmektedir.

Bazı bu için, genel sanayiye bugünkü, geleneklerle hızlı bir şekilde vermek gerekmektedir.
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Tarihi TEKEL binası restore ediliyor

ANKARA’nın Cumhuriyet dönemi yapılarından tarihi tekel başını tutan bu binanın restore ediliyor. 1 Ekim 2007 tarihinde yeniden hale getirildi.


15 Mayıs 2007 tarihinde ihale edilen ve 26 Kasım’a kadar tamamlanması öngörülen binanın restore edilmesi için 4 milyon TL’ye harsandığı belirtildi.

Statik Yapı Değiştiriliyor

İski tekel başını tutan bu binanın restore edilmesi için statik yapı deformasyonları için de 4 milyon TL’ye harsandığı belirtildi. Restorasyon çalışmalarında statik ve dinamik deformasyonlar gözlemli edilecekti.

Restorasyon çalışmalarında statik yapının deformasyonları gözlemli edilecekti. Statik ve dinamik deformasyonlar gözlemli edilecekti. Restorasyon çalışmalarında statik yapının deformasyonları gözlemli edilecekti.
"Tekel Özelleştirmesi Yüz Binlerce İnsanı Olumsuz Etkileyecek"

Tek Gıda-İş Genel Sekreter Yardımcısı Özerman, Tekel özelleşmesinin sosyal maliyetinin getirisinden çok daha büyük olduğunu vurguladı. Tütün-Sen "Tütüncülük bitiyor" dedi.

Türkiye Tütün Müskirat Gıda ve Yardımcı İşçileri Sendikası (Tek Gıda-İş) Genel Sekreter Yardımcısı Tülay Özerman, "Tekel özelleşmesi alıcı firmaların önemli bir kâr sahasını ele geçirme çabalarını yansıttığını, Tekel'in yüzde 30'lar civarında pazar payı var. Bu çok önemli bir gelir kaynağı" diyerek konuştu.

"Sigara her zaman kârlı bir sektördür. Tekel'in birtakım verimlilik ve kârlılık sorunları varsa bu kötü yönetiliyor olmasındandır. Tekel yönetimini kastetmiyorum. Tekel'in yatırım kararlarını zamanında ve yerinde almasına izin verilmiyor."

Tekel'in sigara bölümünün özelleşirilmesiyle ilgili ihaleye 18 Şubat'ta dört grup teklif verdi.

“Çalışanlar işsiz kalacak”

Varlık satışı yoluya gerçekleştirilecek özelleştirmeyle Tekel’e ait altı fabrikanın arazileri (arazisi Milli Emlak’a ait olan İstanbul’daki hariç), makineleri, hammadde stokları ve toplamda 10 bin tonu bulan tütün stoklarıyla birlikte satılacağına dikkat çeken Özerman, bunun bu fabrikalarda çalışan 3 bine yakın işçi için işsizlik anlamına geleceği vurguladı.

“Yaprak tütün işletmelerini de sayarsak özelleşirilmesinden etkilenen işçi sayısı 13-14 bin civarında olacaktır. Bu işletmeler alınan tütnünü üretime yönlendiren üreticilerin fiyatı pazarlık etme sıçraması kalmayacak. İki yıl içinde onlar da kapatılacak."

“Tütün üreticisi dibe vuracak”

Özerman, özelleştirilenin tütün üreticilerine etkisiyle ilgili sorumuzu ise şöyle yanıtladı:

- En çok tütün ihrac eden Ege’de bunun çarşısı sonuçları olacaktır. Doğu ve Güneydoğu daha da kötü etkilenecek. Bu bölgelerde üretilen tütünün tamamina
yakınıını Tekel alıyor. Tekel devreden çıkınca 110 bin üretici aile, yani tütünden geçen yakın yaklaşı 650 bin insan aç kalır.


**Tütün-Sen: Tütüncülüğe son darbe**

Tütün Üreticileri Sendikası (Tütün-Sen) ise bir basın açıklamasıyla tarım ve gıda sektöründeki hükümet politikalarının çiftçilerin değil çokuluslu şirketlerin çıkarlarını kolladığını ileri sürdü, Tekel özelleştirmesinin durdurulmasını istedi.

Hükümetin daha önce Tekel’in alkol bölümünü özelleştirerek üzüm üreticilerini açlığa mahkum ettiği savunan sendika, sigara bölümünün özelleştirilmesiyle tütüncülüğe de son darbenin vurulduğu iddia etti. (KM/EÜ)

**BİA Haber Merkezi - İstanbul**

20 Şubat 2008, Çarşamba

Kerem MORGÜL
Tekel, Özelleştirmeye Hazır

Tekel'e Ait Sigara Fabrikalarının 'Bloq Satış' Yoluyla Özelleştirilmesine Dönük Teknik Hazırlıklar Tamamlanmıştır.

Tekel'e ait sigara fabrikalarının "bloq satış" yoluyla özelleştirilmesine dönük teknik hazırlıklar tamamlanmıştır.

Edinilen bilgiye göre, Özelleştirme İdaresi Başkanlığı tarafından yürütülen çalışmalar sonunda, Tekel'e ait sigara fabrikaları bir bütün olarak satılacak.

Buna ilişkin şartnameye son şekli verilirken, yetkililer, siyasi otoritenin karar vermesi halinde sigara fabrikalarının özelleştirme ihalelerine 15 gün içinde çıkılabileceği belirttiler.

Ancak, genel seçimler nedeniyle Tekel'in özelleştirilmesinin seçim sonrasına kaldıgına da işaret eden yetkililer, şu değerlendirmede bulundular:

"Biz 6 sigara fabrikasının özelleştirilmesine yönelik bütün teknik çalışmaları tamamladık. Şartnamemiz de hazır. Sadece son değerlendirme rötuşları olabilir.

Halen ikisi yabancı yatırım fonu, biri hem fon hem yatırımcı, ikisi de Türkiye'de yerli ortaklarla farklı alanlarda faaliyette bulunan toplam 5 yatırımci, Tekel'in özelleştirilmesi ile yakından ilgileniyor.

Söz konusu özelleştirmeyle ilgilenen yabancı yatırımcıların fazla olduğu da, daha yüksek bir fiyat beklenmesi yolunu tutuyor.""

Bu arada, Tekel'e ait gayrimenkuller, sigara işletmelerinden ayrı olarak satılıyorka.

Söz konusu gayrimenkullerin satışını gerçekleştirecek olan Özelleştirme İdaresi, bu gayrimenkuller için de, İstanbul Zincirlikuyu'daki Karayolları arazisi ile İETT'nin Levent'teki arazi satışındaki yöntemi izleyecek.

Gayrimenkullerin satış için yürütülen çalışmalarla, bu taşınmazlardan daha yüksek ranta edilemesi için Belediyeler nezdinde girişimde bulunularak, imar planı tahlilatına gidiyor.

İdare, Tekel'e ait gayrimenkullerden en yüksek geliri, Kartal Cevizli'deki işletme sahasından bekliyor.

Hazırlanan Satış Programına göre, özelleştirme sonrası Tekel'i alan firmaya, Cevizli'deki makina ve ekipmanı taşımı için intifa süresi verilecek.

Daha sonra burası, turizm ve ticaret merkezi alanı olarak satışa sunulacak. Satış geliri de Hazine'ye irat kaydedilecek.
Beykoz’da Mey’in boşalttığı Paşabahçe İçki Fabrikası’nın alanı da, intihar süresinin dolmasının ardından turizm tesi olarak satışa çıkarılacak. Yetkililer, boşaza nazır bu alanın butik otel şeklinde değerlendirilebileceğini belirtiyorlar.

İzmir’de yaprak tütün ve içki fabrikasına ait Alsancak’taki 2 gayrimenkulün de yine imar planı değişikliği yapılarak ihaleye çıkarılması planlanıyor.

Ankara İncek’teki arazi için de proje geliştirilmesi çalışmaları devam ediyor.

Özelleştirme İdaresi yetkilileri, gayrimenkullerin satışına ilişkin proje çalışmalarının 2 ay içinde tamamlanmasını ve daha sonra ihaleye çıkılmasını beklendiğini ifade ettiler.

Haber Yayın Tarihi: 29 Nisan 2007 Pazar Saat 11:12
Yazdırılan Sayfa: http://www.haberler.com/tekel-ozellestirmeye-hazir-haberi/

(C) 2006 Haberler.Com
Yeni Medya Elektronik Yayıncılık Ltd Şti.
Adana İşçiler Üretmek İçin Direniyor


250'sinin kocası çalışmıyor

Biraz önce dışarıdaydık. Çocuk Hakları ve Haberciliği eğitimine katılan yerel medya temsilcileriyle birlikte Adana'nın İstanbul'un baharını andırır şartında, fabrikanın bahçesindeydi. Önce sloganlarla karşılandı işçiler bizi; sonra Ertuğrul Kürkçü kursuyle çıktı, işçilerle konuştu, yeni liberalizmin basın emekçilerinin de üzerine geldiğini söyledi.


"Kâr eden fabrikayı kapattılar" 

"Ama devlet 4 buçuk milyonluk Marlboro’dan da Maltepe’den de aynı özel tüketim vergisini alıyor. 1 milyon 200 bin lira."Sen bu askeriye, polise giden yardımların parası nereden geliriyor sanıyorsun? Hep Tekel'in gelirleri bunlar."

"Çocukları uyurken görüyoruz"


* Fotoğraflar: Ahmet Şık
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Tolga KORKUT
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BAT: Tekel’i 1932’de düşündük 76 yıl sonra aldık

Merve ERDİL / ANKARA

TEKEL sigaranın özelleştirme ihalesini 1 milyar 720 milyon dolar ile kazanan British American Tobacco’nun (BAT) Yönetim Kurulu Başkanı Jan de Plessis, firmanın Tekel’i almaya 1930’lu yıllarda karar verdiğini söyledi.


1930’lara dayanıyor

“Sabır ve uzun vadeli hedeflerden bahsederken, arşivlerimizden çıkan 1932 yılında yapılan bir Yönetim Kurulu tartışmasını bilmek isteyeceğinizı düşündüm. Burada BAT’ın yaptığı bir teklifi, tartışma tutanaklarından tırmak içinde aktarıyorum, ’Yıllık gideri 10 bin pound olan Türk Tütün Monopolisinin idaresini üstlenmeliyiz.’ O tarihte bunun tabi edici bir anlaşma olacağını düşündülüyordu. Bence yaptığımız modern anlaşma daha iyi ve her ne kadar bazı şeyler daha pahalı olsa bile, kesinlikle 76 yıl beklemeye değer...”

Payı 5’e katlanacak

Plessis, Tekel’i 860 milyon İngiliz pound’uyla satın aldıklarını ve bunun, Türkiye sigara pazarındaki paylarını beşе katlayacağını belirtti. Plessis, Türkiye’deki yatırımlarının uluslararası markalarını genişletmek için daha güçlü bir platform oluşturacağını da bildirdi.