Scholarly endeavors on environmental history and theory should be examined relationally in order to understand how nature positions itself and in what unique ways it is perceived in the surrounding political contexts of institutional and everyday life. Therefore, what is needed here is not an inquiry into the genesis of nature itself, but critical answers to those questions of how and to what extent the idea of nature is effective at institutional level and in everyday life, and more importantly, how nature should be studied through the elements of politics as a field of everyday practices, performances, images, and appearances. For us, nature is an ideological construction, maintains its position in relation to social forces and importantly sustains its political power in space.

This brief article then questions the city of Ankara to problematize such intricate issues on nature and spatial practices as part of Turkey’s modernization project. Attitudes towards nature has long been an important component of institutionalized politics; for the state elite, taming the nature was regarded as part of republican ideology and that ideology must have also been reflected in urbanization, becoming a common ground to frame the norms and standards of public life. For this reason, the new Turkish nation in its early years paid a significant attention to nature under the state’s administrative authority, bringing a tight control over natural and urban environments. By this way, along with those of natural transformations, urbanization was also a part of an ongoing state project with which a new environmental vision in relation to existing establishments firmly positioned itself, materially and visually, through images, displays, and spatial performances. As a result, the republican ideal of spatial transformation, for some, rather became a larger field of power relations through which nature and urbanism mutually constituted each other.

In this context, Turkish Republic’s new capital city of Ankara makes the scope of this article in order to examine intricate power relations in respect to its spatial politics. According to the state elite, Ankara in its early decades was certainly a representation of power and its urban qualities should have been built and practiced accordingly. There, its urban fabric including boulevards, streets and squares, all constructed within Western standards akin to those of European examples (modern, hygienic, and rational) were believed to provide a modern urban environment for empowering Turkey’s modernist everyday life. That was believed to provide a continual tendency away from the political influences of the old regime. The eminent power of Western urbanism here played a pivotal role: for the republican elite, contemporary qualities of Western urbanism and its
social engineering were of significance as surely were the subsequent modern everyday practices. Along with three consecutive planning attempts of the new capital, the overall construction of new state buildings all modernist in style and the cultivation of its vast open landscape for modern practices of recreation further signified the spatial transformation of Ankara for the revolutionary purposes of progress and change. The ordinary people of Ankara could now be invited into those new urban spaces where a distinctly powerful republican identity as a representation of constructed reality was possible. In this representation, the republican identity was a social construct and the city’s urbanism as well as its attitudes towards nature seemed to be the best political means for further constructions.

In this respect, this chapter explores the formation of Turkey’s perceptions towards nature and urban environments around the norms of modernity in respect to Ankara’s urban spaces. It examines how Turkey’s state ideology empowers itself with modernist spatial politics and also examines how different subjectivities on nature utilize such spatial politics as part of their ideological presence and visibility, thereby challenging each other. Ankara, in this respect, provides an urban environment in which the remapping of the city as the loci of new perceptions towards nature beyond the centered domain of the dominant social and spatial orders. At this point, our principal aims are, first, to understand the role and the proponents of ideologies and their spatial politics in making the city as symbols of authority, resistance, and contesting identities; and, second, to reveal the fact that, Ankara’s spatial politics have been shaped by much more complicated net of interactions and conflicting interests.

**Ankara; the Capital of Turkey**

Hereon, the scope should be on how all the above-discussed framework can apply to our case: Ankara’s urban and environmental transformation. Within the canons of “classical Modernist paradigm”, the Kemalist İnkilap was officially introduced in 1923 to separate Ankara from the existing world of traditional and religious display. The state élite was so powerful in this intricate play that by carefully ordering artifacts, events, and even annotating their codes of conduct, the new capital in its first decades was turned easily into a massive “construction site”. The Kemalist İnkilap was an organized project and accordingly, the city had to be re-planned carefully to be able to displace its original spatiality and its local culture. Despite its worldly presence and authority, it was also very important for the élite that the memories of the Ottomans had to disappear, yielding a new iconography within separate political and spatial contexts. Recognizing the fact that urban landscapes were one of the most significant components of creating new memories, the élite’s demands then captured a dramatic shift by which the pre-republican Ankara gradually came to a partial end.

With the implementation of new republican ideology in 1923, Ankara became a site of political contestation over its barren land: first the mayor-ship in Western canons, called Şehremaneti, was officially introduced in February 16, 2004; second, the new local government immediately went into a huge expropriation of land, south of railway line for the sole purpose of providing a virgin land for the new city center, called Yenişehir, literally meant the Newtown; third, the newly established institutions such as the Ministry of Development and Housing (Mübadele, İmar ve İskan Vekaleti) framed the primary trajectories of Ankara’s future development – re-organization of the local government, a need for a comprehensive plan for the capital city, providing infrastructure in Western
canons such as irrigation, power supply, water, drainage and sewage as well as other contemporary needs that of housing, transportation, communication, etc.\(^6\)

Following to that, the first cadastral map in 1/4000 was completed in 1924 by the help of Turkish Army’s Corps of Engineer Department, and for many, it was in fact the first engineering attempt to tame Ankara’s untouched landscape into humanly rational order. Then several planning attempts followed each other: in parallel to that of European examples the first comprehensive plan was initiated by the municipality and C. Ch. Lörcher from Germany made two plans in 1925 and 1925 respectively first for the old city center and second for Yenisehir. Herman Jansen also from Germany made the second comprehensive plan for the city in 1928, which was in fact an international competition held in 1927 and continued till 1932. Both plans by Lörcher and then Jansen were of significance not only for the city’s spatiality, but also for its environmental transformation since they became almost turning points in Ankara’s urban history.\(^7\)

According to Cengizkan, Lörcher’s proposal was certainly Ankara’s first modern plan and akin to those of European examples for the issue of zoning as a planning strategy was heavily accepted, the garden-city concept made the city’s underlying structure, and for the urbanized green as a transformative tool was carefully introduced into urban development patterns.\(^8\) Even in the report, the importance of taming the land for the betterment of the new city center was highlighted in many times: for Lörcher, gardened not the untamed nature of Ankara could mark the new capital city’s contemporary feature; the provision of more green into the city center, the implementation of the idea of “beautiful citadel”, and the formation of open public spaces were some of those features envisioned.

What went administratively as well as spatially wrong circa 1920s is still a mystery, and yet, apparently there seemed to be so many reasonable grounds to call for a second comprehensive plan right after Lörcher’s proposal: of many, the unexpected population influx into the new capital city from rural Anatolia, ever-increasing administrative building and housing shortages and those of contemporary needs because of the new state elite’s demands in all domains, and thus sporadic development patterns were some key initiatives for many to organize an international competition, inviting three prominent architects from Europe. Following that Jausseley from France and Brix and Jansen from Germany were nominated as those of carefully selected participants and finally in 1928 Jansen’s proposal received the First Prize. Regarding the Old Citadel as the “crown” of Ankara, Jansen in fact followed the same imprints that of Lörcher and once again, the garden city was in the agenda with its full implications. For some, the proposal was nothing, but a small-scale replica of Europe’s City Beautiful with which the aesthetics of city space was of a main concern.

In fact it was first Lörcher and then Jansen who paid the underlying structure of both old and new Ankara and generated the city’s morphology based upon the premises of a century long European urbanism. According to them, located in the heartland of Anatolian peninsula the city was a bureaucratic town with all the contemporary amenities and a model for Turkey’s new urban strategies – modern, healthy, ordered, and of course, green, all in Western standards. However, Ankara’s growth was unexpectedly oversize since then and the city already exceeded Lörcher and Jansen’s projections even in the mid-1940s. Besides, Turkey underwent serious transformations by the end of the World War II: firstly, the transition into a multi-party system circa 1946 meant an explicit
representation of the growing political contestation between the modernists and the conservatists. Secondly, staunchly effective statist policies, concentrating extensive controls in the state bureaucrats, ceased to exist, and since then new conservative governments gave way to liberalism as the sole successor of all economic formulations. And finally, a massive population influx from the poorer periphery into relatively metropolitan areas, including the capital city, also became a major event that eventually changed Turkey’s demographic maps drastically. In fact, all of these caused serious problems in the capital city such as housing shortages, growing unemployment rates, petty-crime as well as spatial and cultural fragmentation and segregation.

It was in fact in those transitory years that a need for a new plan for Ankara became an important issue among the local and state bureaucrats in order to cope with recent developments. As thus an international competition was held in 1957 and Yücel and Uybadin’s proposal from Turkey received the First Prize. For some, Yücel-Uybadin Plan as the third grand-scale intervention over the city marked a turning point in Ankara’s urban history, even though the proposal was often regarded as modest in content and scale-wise and followed the blueprints of what Löcher and Jansen had already proposed for the city. As a matter of fact, the plan had a very little if any impact because rather than launching larger scale urban operations for the existing city, it almost revised the earlier plans, proposing minor changes in its overall structure and the morphology. And yet, a new corridor towards the western periphery was now in the agenda and Ankara once again began to develop on its barren land accordingly.

All three plans, in short, were quite significant in their historiographical framework and they penetrated deep into the politics of urban developments and of environmental transformations in the Turkish context. In this sense, the primary materials should be studied and such theoretical conceptualizations should be formulated through the help of Turkey’s vast archives and of their yearlong materials on “urban and environmental histories and theories.” To cope with recent developments, in national and international scales, on the other hand, we should encourage radical transitions and prospectus academic proposals, and additional researches.

Searching New Perspectives: A Historical Account

Today, academic environments fall quite short in meeting the nation-wide expectations in this specific field and, in particular, schools of architecture should expose themselves to such inter-disciplinary and comparative fields. Regarding the fact that some institutions have a very strong reputation and scholarly background we believe that our research on urban development and environmental transformation in Turkey have potentials to acquire the necessary material and to establish an intellectual circle for the attainment of scholarly works on both urban and environmental histories and theories. We also believe that our research can be utilized as an experimental domain to further academic researches on cities and nature in regard to social and ecological problems. It is also important to note that the project is initiatory in the fields of architecture and of social and political history and theory because it will mediate comparatively through the spheres of cities in Turkey, Anatolian landscapes and such ideological mappings. It is believed that it will surely open up a new intellectual stream in the conception of Turkey’s alternative architecture, urban design, and planning traditions.

The studies on urban transformations in relation to nature have long been under critical coercion for it is now believed that such idiosyncratic multi-faceted relations between
city and nature should solely be questioned neither in pure modes of spatial analyses nor in the reductionist perspective of ecologies. Rather, the effective intrusion of urban into nature, or vice versa, needs a broader perspective with questions as that of how nature is produced in parallel with the processes of space production. Therefore, one needs to question how and under what circumstances the production of nature is exercised; and how nature production is in tune with the modes and means of space production and the reproduction of social relations of space production. Leaving culturalist interpretations or morphology analyses aside as secondary agents, therefore, this research questions critically what production of nature and space meant and how its was operationalized in Turkey’s capital city of Ankara in history.

Today, with full enforcement of neo-liberal policies since the 1980s not only has *laissez-faire* become the governing mode of political-economy; but the overall effect of liberalism has drastically altered many of the orthodoxies from welfare states to culture of modernity that had long been established throughout the 20th century. The new era, in fact, has been regarded as the final accord of Turkish capitalism through which the role of central agencies were minimized if not eradicated; social projects for collective well-being were crippled; and the modernity project with its full implications specifically in urbanism and architecture gave ways into fragmented “isms”.

Within the spatial terms the last 20 years have witnessed a relentless restructuring process in all scales: Ankara’s spaces in tune with the neo-liberalism’s homogenizing nature were redefined; the city was enforced to take part and play hard in the sustenance of them; and its architecture became one of the most important agents of all political maneuvers of fixing capital spatially. Along with the side-effects of this new spatiality such as the time-space compression among geographies and the generic programs in architecture the city suffered the most. Ankara enjoyed a great turnover for it enhanced its position as the spaces of accumulation and distribution *vis-à-vis* landed and finance capital; it also nurtured a great deal of social inequalities – experiencing full of paradoxes – wealth and poverty, glamorous corporate buildings and eradicated city centers, luxurious suburbs and slums, all went hand in hand. Today we have a city of dualities, which is antagonistic in nature and reflected spatially.

In this respect the research not only questions Ankara’s final stage of becoming an uneven city in respect to its capacities for the production of nature and space, but also traces the blueprints of its environmental transformations in both natural and spatial terms, specifically till the 1950s.

Under the intensifying burden of urban and environmental problems like spatial decadence, social and political upheavals, industrial pollution, global-warming, earthquakes and floods, or exploitation of nature, contemporary architecture is now providing ample room in its curricula to set up a new rationale and thus to enhance architects’ position. Architecture today is more eager to incorporate the socially and politically creative dialectic between built and natural environments into its fields of inquiry. In the company of new conceptual tools, scholars are also encouraged to offer critical and challenging viewpoints to emphasize the significance of social and political histories and theories as principal fields in the betterment of both urban and natural environments.

Akin to their international counterparts, scholarly endeavors in Turkish architecture should also be in search of similar theoretical and historiographical frameworks to
discover solutions to urban and environmental problems. In this respect, the primary objective of this research is thereupon to explore the possibilities of an academically flexible, holistic and coherent milieu in architecture that is to comprehend the above-mentioned problematique. The project has a two-fold aim: A comparative research specifically about Turkey’s modernization project circa 1900-1950 with respect to its urban development processes and subsequent environmental transformations.

**Themes on Urban Development and Environmental Transformation**

Anatolian cities and their landscapes have their underlying spatial problems; and in this sense, any scholarly investigation should examine social, political, cultural, and economic contours of such animosities as well as ideological mappings onto urbanites and nature. Such excursions to understand Turkey’s urban development processes and its environmental transformations, however, need inter-disciplinary and comparative analyses of similar cities and of natural peculiarities. Schools of architecture in Turkey now realize the significance of such inter-disciplinary programs and comparative studies on urban developments and their intricate relations to environmental transformations. Albeit recent premises, nevertheless, Turkish intelligentsia today seems to fall quite short in fulfilling this particular field; and apparently, there is now an increasing gap in the domains of urban and environmental issues in all means: contemporary theoretical frameworks are still needed and comparative studies must be in today’s architectural agenda.

Regarding the fact that our project needs broader theoretical constructions and their implications through case studies, we should trace the roots of similar problems and such theoretical formulations back to their original source. In light of contemporary literary mode, it is suggested that there are conceptual idiosyncrasies in how urban and environmental studies conceive important meta-discourses so as to inquire nations’ relation to their natural environments. Urban studies are skeptical about the emancipatory realm of environmental transformations for they believe that the present social order has always been predestined under the consequences of capitalist disorder. Building their narrative onto distinctive qualities of nature, environmentalists, on the other hand, are constructing rather deductive and reductionist discourses with limited if any emphasis on social and political theories. Notwithstanding, it is now believed that there is ample room to explore how societies imagine nature and utilize it as a political apparatus in the process of constructing social and cultural identities in their urban environments or vice versa. Yet, such excursions need further explanations that would have the use of both urban and environmental histories and theories.

The fields of urban and of environmental histories and theories are both relatively new yet originally independent sub-fields in architecture. For some, their histories extended much earlier: urban history and theory became an important sub-field since the 1980s, on the other hand, environmental history and theory is primarily a product of recent years: yet, “both (sub)fields were largely outgrowths of the events and turmoil of their own times rather than evolving from the independent study of the past.” Appeared to be largely concerned with closely interrelated spheres of space, on the other hand, both urban and environmental history and theory, examine such areas as:

- Social, cultural, and political histories and theories in understanding contemporary cities;
- Social, cultural, and political processes and systems in production, consumption and re-production of urban spaces; and their spatial representations; and,
- Natural qualities, ideological and conceptual manifestations onto nature
- Social, cultural, and political spheres of environmental transformations and their histories and theories;
- Forms and proponents of "urban rural confrontations."\(^{20}\)

As clearly manifested in many of the *avant-garde* programs as originally established elsewhere, in short, urban history and theory is to examine cities under recent theoretical and historiographical problematique whereas environmental history and theory is about the role and the proponents of nature in social, political, and cultural praxes of contemporary societies. Because it is now understood that it would be difficult to study urban developments without considering environmental transformations there seem to be expanding academic projectiles to bring these two independent domains under one scholarly roof.\(^{21}\) These programs are built upon the fact that cities have always placed demands on their hinterlands, and in these processes they altered urban ecosystems for their own purposes. Thus urbanites both replaced the natural environments and created urban locales with contesting social, cultural, and political climates.\(^{22}\)

Now re-formulated as urban and environmental history and theory, this specific field has recently identified five primary themes: "the study of the impact of the built environment and human activities in cities on the natural environment; study of societal responses to these impacts and efforts to alleviate environmental problems; exploration of the effect of the natural environment on city life; analysis of the relationship between cities and an ever widening hinterland; and the investigation of gender, class, and race in regard to environmental issues."\(^{23}\) For many schools of architecture, further academic investigations are yet to come. The role of nature in the political economy of urban spaces, environmental imagining in nation making processes, the role of ideologies in natural conceptualization and transformation are some significant issues in need of further exploration.

As a direction for future projects, the study of cities and their relationship to nature, as broadly manifested in Cronon’s pioneering work of *Nature’s Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West*, for instance, seem to be extremely important for several reasons.\(^{24}\) It is a new scholarly ground that addresses the historical and the contemporary urban and environmental problems from different perspectives. It is also a vehicle for interdisciplinary research through which scholars in the fields of environmental history and theory and of urban history and theory can now find a common ground. In this respect, the theme of urban and environmental history and theory has clearly established itself as a leading intellectual field and it will certainly grow in the future.\(^{25}\) It has a well-defined and formulated yet flexible curriculums, attained by different areas, such as architecture, environmental design and planning, urban sociology, geography, anthropology as well as environmental engineering, natural and urban ecologies, etc., and they all lead to interdisciplinary and comparative perspectives.\(^{26}\)

In summary, any investigation on urban developments and environmental transformations should utilize the best of each sub-field and such emancipatory meta-language(s) (with contemporary social theories and historiographies). It should also foster urban and
environmental history and theory not as a separate milieu but as an inter-disciplinary field that should be integral to architectural discourses and practices.

A Theoretical Framework: First and Second Nature

Here the basic premise is how all the above-mentioned expectations should be theorized. In his seminal book *Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape*, for instance, Cosgrove suggests that “Landscape is a way of seeing that has its own history, but a history that can be understood only as a part of wider history of economy and society.” Unlike Cosgrove’s emphasis on cultural perceptions as constructed historically Zukin not only questions the role of culture in understanding the very transformative phases of urban landscapes but also emphasizes representations as tools of power relations, involving all scales of institutions, class, and social productions. Here, productive forces, labor, and market relations are of significance too. Mitchell, on the other hand, suggests that landscapes should be regarded as pure metaphors with which social relations among contesting social agents are in need of further investigations.

Perhaps the best analytical survey is of Cronon’s *Nature’s Metropolis*. Completely leaning towards Marxian construal of first and second nature he discusses both the first nature as original, pre-human, etc. and the second nature as the constructed one that needs an ongoing process for the production of social relations, and finally argues that it is never just first or second nature, but rather a complex layering of the two. The Marxian dialectic between the first and the second nature is of significance and yet far beyond the scope of this introductory essay; therefore, what seems to be more important here is the fact that from the view of urban history the modern urban environments are the milieu of that complex layering through which the first nature continuously atop the second nature. Here it is accepted that the city was an increasingly autonomous centre of capitalist accumulation and market, organizing the life of the very first nature.

As forecasted by the original Marxian narration, in interacting with nature social agents not only transform their close vicinity and mold a different and yet self-possessed system of material reference, but also open up new possibilities for chancing the social order. Through this process of interaction, in other words, we also change ourselves and this dialectic is fundamental to understanding both the history of social agents’ relation to nature and the political instruments necessary for transforming the natural environments. According to Marx, the changing convictions in this complex process of transformation can be defined, as social construction of nature and it should be examined through the language of “political economy”. Accordingly the operation of orthodox investigation eventually emphasizes a unique practice of a system of power in this process of social construction. Apart from the level of social and power relations within society, the same investigation also suggests the importance of such significant institutions, social groups, and marginal social actors involved in the general process of constructing (the) nature. Such understanding is partly a by-product of a deep belief in the significance of dominant social structures as well as the underlying class conflicts. Along with a precise location in historical contexts with respect to class issues, and the strict analysis on mode of productions in the process of environmental transformation, however, a new Marxian version that would refer to purely instrumental relation of culture and nature is needed. In extending Marx’s metaphor, for instance, Harvey anticipates that “as we have collectively produced space and wrought a second nature out of first nature, so we have collectively produced ourselves.” For him, the outcome of
this formula suggests a strong emphasis on the dialectic of man and nature of which the mysterious sphere of second nature hence also stands for the cultural domain of man’s social consciousness and his willful exercise over nature.\textsuperscript{34} Considering the long history of human intervention in nature, the spatial and temporal co-existence of man with his environment nevertheless formulates a gainful yet quite hermetic framework of which nature and cultural can now find their representations in the hidden particularities of daily life. In this picture, nature and thus the second nature, reflect differing perceptions and ideologies. Hence, the Marxist circle saw that as the reification of nature.\textsuperscript{35} Here then the investigation relies on both production of nature and space, as first and second nature, and the term production should be captivated within the theories of Marxist economy politics.

**Urban Development and Environmental Transformation in Anatolia**

Following the premises of the above mentioned issues, the pioneering projects to investigate how the modes and proponents of urban developments and their natural surroundings affect each other, and what forms of historiographical and theoretical tools are imperative to understand this uncanny relation, now determine the boundaries of the scholarly world. Along with some scientific excursions and pure ecological discoveries, schools of architecture now give ways to social and political dimensions of urban-nature dichotomies and compare alternating cities and natural environments in different periods and geographies. From an inter-disciplinary perspective, at the center of their theoretical debates, however, are the legacies of the Enlightenment project, the industrial revolution, and the new social structures. For these studies, the new cities and the overall transformation of natural surroundings under the premises of these developments are of significance and the construction of new “urban-nature dichotomy” should be regarded as one of the most important models of a universally defined modernization process.\textsuperscript{36} In light of these notions, one still finds ample “discursive formations” about the profound complexities that underlay this unique social and spatial metamorphosis and modern nations’ changing conception(s) towards nature.\textsuperscript{37} While dwelling on such discursive formations and ideological positions, studies draw attention to a still largely neglected area: *the environmental histories of Modernization processes and such nation-building meta-narratives in relation to urban development and environmental transformation*.\textsuperscript{38}

Understanding Turkey’s desire for urbanization and environmental transformation as parts of its Modernization Project also needs similar historiographical perspectives, historical categorizations, and theoretical formulations.\textsuperscript{39} In parallel to those works as clearly manifested in contemporary capitals, architecture should play a pivotal role in drawing the contours of urban development processes and forms as well as the modes of environmental transformations, material or imaginary. Along similar lines, and inherent to an exclusively republican ideology of Turkey, it is also believed that only through the introduction of the elements of natural transformation, either in material sense or simply in terms of public perception, could there be a progression.\textsuperscript{40} In light of such theoretical conceptions, projects then should be designed to investigate specifically such areas as:

a. the imagined quality of the new natural surroundings and such modernist images in the early years of the Turkish cities that became significant in urban and environmental transformations;

b. ideological mappings upon nature and their representations as the dominant constituent elements as surely were the subsequent architecture;
c. the significance of such transformation phases as urban constructions or dams, irrigation canals, railroads, and the cultivation of the vast open landscape for modern settlements, agriculture, and recreation;

d. State-originated programs and projects that further signified the material transformation of nature for the revolutionary purposes of progress and change.

Epilogue…

The impact of the built environments and social and spatial activities on natural environments; the state’s responses to these impacts and efforts to construct such environmental transformations; the effects of natural environments on urban life; and the relationship between cities and their ever widening hinterland should be investigated in similar projects. Environmental imagining in nation making processes, the role of ideologies in natural conceptualization and in environmental transformation should also be some other significant issues in need of further exploration. The republican sentiments for urban development and subsequent environmental transformations in this specific era are significantly undiscovered and they need comparative investigations to conceive Turkey’s urban and environmental histories simultaneously. As such specific questions remain unknown, undefined, and not yet scholarly explored; and therefore, our inquiry should aim to unfold such possible, alternative histories of “urban developments” in regard to “Anatolia’s geographical and environmental transformations.”

The primary significance of our project then should be:

a. to explore the dialectic between urban and natural environments under the constraints of Modernism;

b. to develop inter-disciplinary historiographies and theories to understand the forms of urban developments and environmental transformations in the comparative contexts; and,

c. To question “environmental history of the Early Republican period” in reference to social and political theories.

To sum up so far, the recent studies suggest that environmental transformations can be traced as powerful social metaphors, relegating the landscape to be cultivated for the purpose of an independent, national power. Similarly, the new nation’s history in the Turkish context should be considered as a tabula rasa; and in this respect, our thesis should be re-formulated as: societal values and the new social/political/cultural codes required a politically symbolic harmonization through which the mythic spirit of the Anatolian prairie/bozkır would have met with the unchallenged prowess of civilization and Enlightenment. In light of this formulation politics on urban development processes and such environmental transformations is of significance and makes the whole problematique more complex and multi-dimensional.41
Figure 1. Lörcher Plan of Ankara in 1924.\(^{42}\)

Figure 2. Lörcher Plan of Ankara in 1924-25.\(^{43}\)
Figure 3. Jansen Plan of Ankara in 1928

Figure 4. Jansen Plan of Ankara in 1932
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