

INFLUENCE OF INTERNATIONAL PLANNING IDEAS ON ISTANBUL'S URBAN FABRIC

Hatice AYATAÇ, Assistant Professor
Istanbul Technical University, Turkey
ayatachatice@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Diffusion is the process by which economical, political, and cultural experiences are shared amongst countries. The international diffusion of planning ideas is defined as borrowing and imposition at national and local levels. In the case of Turkey, these experiences are viewed within the context of modernization and westernization. The most significant arena of this process took place in Istanbul. The process of adaptation began in the second half of the nineteenth century with the Tanzimat reforms and developed parallel to the degree of influence the United States and Europe had on the changes in the political regime and identity of the country in the wake of the two world wars. The financial support of the United States and World Bank investments sped up this process. A European Union harmonization process is now under way. The objective of this study is to relate the Turkish experience of international diffusion of planning ideas and evaluate the contribution of Istanbul's spatial formation.

DIFFUSION OF PLANNING IDEAS AND TYPOLOGY OF DIFFUSION

Diffusion studies have become a major conceptual tool in assessing the impact of planning on urbanization in the twentieth century. Generally defined as “the sharing of experiences,” discussions of diffusion focus in town planning have been promoted by planning historian Stephen Ward. In a 2000 work titled “*Re-examining the International Diffusion of Planning*,” he defines the process of diffusion of planning ideas as the “*power relationship between the exporting and importing countries.*” This definition aptly summarizes the range of economic, geopolitical, cultural, and technological domination and interdependencies.

Studies of diffusion in planning focus on three fundamental questions (Ward, 2000): *how the diffusion mechanism develops* (key personalities influencing this development, reformists or professional milieus, intergovernmental actions, and so on); *which ideas and practices influence this process*; and *what the fundamental social, economical, political, and cultural ramifications during the diffusion process* are. What the available scholarship suggests is that diffusion needs to be assessed as a highly variable, rather than a single, uniform, process. While there may be similarities in planning experiences between places, the outcomes and resulting products differ. Changes and transformations in developing cities and countries are specifically compared.

Ward breaks down the process of international diffusion of planning ideas, depending on the power relationship between the countries originating and receiving planning models into two types, “*borrowing*” and “*imposition.*”

Borrowing refers to a developing country that is the importer having more of a say in the control and shaping of the diffusion process than the exporting country. The best-known type is “*synthetic borrowing.*” The key point here is the selection and assessment of the foreign model by Professional experts. If the importing country utilizes the rules with no amendments, this is defined as “*selective borrowing.*” On the other hand, multiple imports leads to a multiplicity of planning traditions. If the selection is not conscious, it then falls under “*undiluted borrowing,*” where the application, rather than the concepts, is adopted (Ward, 2000).

Where the exporting country wields greater influence than the importing one, the “*imposition*” process starts. One aspect of this approach is “*negotiated imposition,*” which is the case of countries that are economically dependent. Often foreign aid and investment support figure in these cases. Singapore took the Western, and specifically British, model prior to independence. In countries where democratically elected governments and reformist movements are absent, the “*congested imposition*” process prevails. If the imposition comes from a figure of authority, this becomes “*authoritarian imposition.*” The balance of power between the importer and exporter is one major factor. Additional criteria are the

governance system of countries and the related political processes; official, educational, or holiday trips abroad by those in positions of power such as ambassadors or the elite, as well as official visits by experts; major wars; developments in technology and information exchange, such as the Internet; the translation and publication of major works on planning, architecture, and design; models and implementations of new movements and trends in architecture and planning (such as Garden City, City Beautiful, Modernism, Postmodernism, etc.); and major investors and their works and international investments and institutions such as the World Bank and IMF (Freestone, 2004).

As a developing country, Turkey has been subjected to many influences from without, as well as exercising its own influence on Europe, America, and the Orient. The Ottoman Empire was a major influence on the European, Asian, and North African territories under its sovereignty. This identity was clearly stamped on architecture and public works in these places. The period of decline, where the Empire lagged behind Western development, however, saw a reversal of influences. Valuable works exist on these events in the history of Turkish planning (Çelik, 1986). The main focus of these works is the planning experiences related to becoming more modern, westernized, and up to date. The most recent discourses concentrate on the European Union and the harmonization process (Bozdoğan and Kasaba, 1999). The major manifestation of this expansion is seen in Istanbul, the most populous city in the country. This is why the majority of these studies focus on Istanbul.

In this context, the purpose of this paper is to scrutinize the validity of the typology of the international diffusion of planning ideas process through the development of planning in Turkey as revealed through the case study of Istanbul. It aims to analyze the effects on the urban space of this process and its manifestation on the basis of implementations done in Istanbul.

INFLUENCE OF INTERNATIONAL PLANNING IDEAS ON ISTANBUL'S URBAN FABRIC PARALEL WITH TURKEY PERSPECTIVE..

Founded in the seventh century BC, Istanbul developed in line with its position of capital city to three empires: the Eastern Roman (AD 324-395), the Byzantine (395-1453), and the Ottoman (1453-1923). Byzantium gave way to Constantinople, which in turn gave way to Istanbul. The city enjoys a noteworthy location as the meeting point between continents and a place of strategic importance. Istanbul is the leading socioeconomic and cultural center of Turkey. Its unique historical heritage bestows a "world city" identity on Istanbul. The most populous city in the country, with a population of 12.782.960 (Turkstat, 2010) Istanbul has traditionally been the first point of contact with, and adaptation of, Western values (Batur, 1998).

Table.1. Dominant External Influences

PERIOD	DOMINANT INFLUENCE	KEY IDEAS AND PRACTICES
Second half of the XIXth Century The Tanzimat Reforms	Great Britain and France	Laws, planning and design principles
The first years of the Turkish Republic and the 1950s	Nationalisation period; French and German experts	Administration and organisation
1950-1980	The USA	Vehicles and road network
Post-1980	Common world values- economic globalisation	Town and architectural styles
XXIst Century	EU harmonisation	Copenhagen criteria; harmonisation conditions

WESTERNIZATION OR BORROWING FROM THE WEST (1839-1923)

Istanbul was the capital of the Ottoman Empire in the nineteenth century. Both as a harbor city and as the domain of the Ottoman dynasty, it was the center of direct imports from the West. The majority of the urban settlement is set inside the city walls on the historical peninsula, with additional settlements outside the city walls and on the Asian shore of the Bosphorus. The first census of 1829 noted the number of inhabitants as 359,000. The urban fabric preserves its traditional and haphazard nature.

The main priority of the time-in-town planning is solving the issue of large areas laid waste by fires and earthquakes that frequently ravaged the city (Denel, 1982).

Town planning rose to prominence in some European countries in the nineteenth century, and the Ottoman Empire also took its share. According to Tekeli, planning activities focused on drawing up maps of the city and making urban scheme recommendations, preparing definitive regulations and creating the organization required to realize the first two items.

Sources assessing the time all agree that the main factor that drove this borrowing from the West was the admiration felt for Western ways by Ottoman envoys who served abroad. Plans outlining the existing structure of the city as well as recommendations for reconstruction were drawn up by foreign experts (Ergin, 1914; Denel, 1982; Kuban, 1996).

The first map of Istanbul based on contemporary and methodical measurements was drawn by engineer Kauffer between 1776 and 1778. The first plan that outlined traditional district layouts was done by the British planner Melling in 1802. The Building Regulation Act that defined the street-building relationships in reconstruction areas following fires was a direct result of studies of similar regulations in Europe. This first layout was deemed too alien to the existing texture. These plans recommend a grid system of roads. Plans drawn up by foreign experts also directed reconstruction work after fires; in 1856, after the Great Aksaray Fire, the Italian engineer Luigi Storari, for example, developed an infrastructure-based plan that regulated circulation as well. Plans developed by Turks who had studied abroad were added to those designed by foreigners. Bekir Pasa, Mustafa Resit Pas, a, and Server Efendi, who were all sent abroad to study, understand and import a planning model, returned to take up influential positions in Istanbul Municipality (Denel, 1982).

Invitations to planners who had never seen Istanbul and whose experience was limited to European work occasionally resulted in recommendations that were led mainly by aesthetic concerns, such as the "Beautiful Istanbul" plan designed by the chief architect of Paris, Joseph Antoine Bouvard, in 1902 (Çelik, 1986). Criticism aimed at these plans focused on their fragmented nature and lack of holistic concern for the entire city (Tekeli, 1994). The largescale applications of European capitalism entered the city through the public transport system in the adoption of new technologies and materials at this time. Priority was given to public areas in Taksim and its environs, where the city met the West and where the majority of Westerners congregated. Moltke drew up the first plans regulating the city's roads in 1839. This plan laid out seven straight and large arteries and three levels of roads according to width. These recommendations soon replaced the traditional Ottoman structure with an entirely new town-planning concept, developed in line with European standards from 1840 onwards (Batur, 1998; Kuban, 1996).

A different planning system was implemented to revitalize areas ravaged by fires. Individual plans were developed according to the scale of the fire, the topography of the area affected, and its position in the city. This era that adopted Western scales in town planning and design is characterized by urban development and expansion, fire codes, and grids concepts. Some of the road and building codes are straight adaptations of European regulations.

The first years of the twentieth century witnessed an accelerated development and expansion in the urban space, stoked by the increase and variation in population, a new lifestyle imported from Europe, a wider choice in public transport, and new building styles. The city was divided into subsections (administrative, commercial, residential, and suburban), while the first examples of that irrepressible pioneer of unplanned expansion, the *gecekondus*, started to make an appearance. The borrowing process in this era developed as a result of observation of, modeling on, and designing plans

based on the Western models by contracting foreign experts. Tekeli (1994) is amongst the writers who believe that the observation process of the time is characterized by "bashfulness" and "shyness." Solutions to problems were developed in line with major European principles, but these solutions remained fragmented.

SELECTIVE BORROWING AND PLANNING IN THE CONTEXT OF MODERNIZATION (1923-1950)

The declaration of the Republic in 1923 meant the end of the capital city role, played for hundreds of years, for Istanbul. The new capital was Ankara (Tankut, 1993). These political and economic changes stopped Istanbul's development in its tracks. The dichotomy of the traditional life between the city walls and the Western in Galata and Taksim continued well after the war. The population figures declined; the census taken in 1927 noted it as 699,769. The physical boundaries of the city remained essentially unchanged. That said, summerhouses spread along the coastline and the lands near the new railway (a very republican feature). A number of Western developments such as the increased use of open public areas within the city and variations in transport typify this time (Aru, 1996).

Istanbul began to regain its importance after 1930 with its historical heritage and attractive urban spaces. This was a time when government became even more open in view of scientific progress. Work was undertaken on European municipal management models, planning implementations, and publications on these subjects. The first publications on Istanbul's municipal and urban issues emerged. Foreign experts were consulted. Herman Elgötz was invited from Germany, and Alfred Agache, J. H. Lambert, and Henri Prost were invited from France. A new formation of the Republic's modernity conceptualization for Istanbul began after 1936 with the Prost Plan and was realized (see Figure 1) through the efforts of Lütfi Kırdar, mayor of Istanbul and later governor of the Istanbul Province.

Prost's explanatory notes took their place in building codes while he was still working on the plans. His note defining the town silhouette is still in effect: "The height of buildings to be constructed in areas that are 40 meters or more above sea level is not to exceed 12 meters in height, and that construction on lower levels is not to exceed those heights at the 40 meters level." (Prost, 1948). Many of the Prost plan decisions were in fact implemented, and some remain in force even today. He worked on the functional distribution of the city areas as well as the circulation system and motorized traffic. He based his transport scheme on the topography of Istanbul, recommending the construction of tunnels, bridges, viaducts, and connecting slopes to avoid junctions. These recommendations inspired the post-1980 governments in their transport and highways implementations (Eyice, 2002).



Figure 1: H.Prost Plan , 1936-1937.

Another import from the West at this time was the new building styles and lifestyles. The apartment block, a solution to increased urban populations and limited land availability, became more widely accepted in Istanbul too. According to one municipal study, 1,301 of the 7,377 buildings erected between 1928 and 1934 were apartment blocks. These high-rise buildings were concentrated around Taksim, Maçka, and Cihangir; however, there was opposition.

New residential models, mainly as housing estates, developed in the West after 1945, made their way toward Istanbul too. Kemal Ahmet Aru and Rebiî Gordon planned the largest housing estate not only of Istanbul but also of Turkey in 1947; the Levent District was designed as a garden city between 1947 and 1950 (see Figure 2). Emlak Bankası (Keleş, 1996). The land known as the “Levend Farm” during the empire was purchased from the municipality, its development was plotted in line with town-planning principles, an infrastructure was created, and the Levent District Project came to life with 391 houses of one- or two stories. Encouraged by the popularity of this first development, the 2nd and 3rd district projects were then given the go (Aru and Gorbun, 1952).



Figure 2: The Levent Housing Project

Source: Gorbun Aru, “Levend Neighbourhood,” *Arkitekt* 253-254, no. 20 (1952): 147-48.

MARSHALL AID AND AMERICAN INFLUENCES ON PLANNING, (1950-1980)

The post-Second World War period embodied a number of milestones, increase in foreign aid and debts within the Marshall Plan of the United States, increase in investment in the economy, modernization and mechanization of agriculture, and the move to multiparty democracy. This series of changes clearly had an effect on the demographic, cultural, and spatial makeup of the country. Istanbul became the leader of this process.

In 1950, Istanbul’s population was 975,000; by 1965, it had reached 2,141,000. Natural growth, internal migration, and spatial expansion are the three main features of the time. Experts and publications evaluating this period emphasize that the main issue of the time was the increasing housing demand in line with the population growth (Suher, 1994).

The number of migrants who reached the city between 1950 and 1955 was 270,000. In other words, 74 percent of the population came from outside Istanbul. Rapid mechanization in agriculture and equally rapid population rises in the rural areas have also contributed to the migration.

Technological advances and new construction methods decreased the earlier desirability of whole districts of old wooden houses, old seafront mansions, or huge dwellings set in the middle of private woods. The two convergent factors of the modern city were apartment blocks and motorized vehicles (Erman, 2001; Kiray, 1998).

Other major problems, especially prevalent in the first half of this period, were land speculation and new settlements on both coasts.

Settlement preferences according to geography are interesting; in 1950, 79.5 percent of the population was on the European side, with 20.5 percent on the Asian. By 1965, these figures changed to 77.5 and 22.5 percent, respectively. The southern shores of the city were the most popular choice (Arkitekt Journal, 1961). The third issue is the demands of the growing industrial areas. The fourth issue is the chaotic nature of traffic, caused partly by the increase in private vehicle ownership and the number of dolmus, etc (Tekeli and Okyay, 1981). The Beyazıt Square project (1960) is an execution in Istanbul of pedestrianization projects as implemented in Europe and America.

The main players in forming the shape of Istanbul city during this period were the personal desires of the politicians, their projects, the recommendations of foreign planning experts, and the objectives of the planned eras. The plans devised by Prof. Henri Prost were loyally followed between 1936 and 1950. Following his departure, a temporary commission was formed with members selected from

eminent academicians and professionals. This commission evaluated 143 plans and wrote their reports. While the Prost plans were found wanting, they were praised all the same as containing regulation recommendations that were appropriate (The Plan Reports of Istanbul,, 2007). The commission found the plans lacking in technical, scientific, planning principles and objective factors, and in attention to local conditions; the view of the commission was that Prost was driven in the main by aesthetic concerns (Sayar, 1956; Suher, 1994).

Power was then handed over to the Municipality at the end of the temporary commission's term. The Istanbul Municipality continued to seek counsel from foreign consultants from time to time, notably Prof. Högg between 1957 and 1960 and Prof. L. Piccinato between 1960 and 1967.

1956 marks a turning point in the political development of the country as well as Istanbul. Adnan Menderes, prime minister, his plan's two main objectives are clear: to solve the traffic problems and to beautify the city (see Figure, 3). The model was the Champs-Élysées of nineteenth century Paris. He explained his vision of a contemporary city: "Essential to the needs of the residents, the roads and avenues are vitally important. This is why major junctions and squares, carrying the majority of the traffic, need to be redefined and reconstructed. We must plan and build large, handsome squares and open up wide avenues. We must greet the visitors arriving by air or land with first-class roads and decorate the city with statues reflecting its heritage." (The 75th Anniversary of the Republic, 1956).

An effort to devise solutions to the country's socioeconomical problems within a planned framework is what formed the State Planning Institute (SPI) in 1960. Charged with preparing five-year development plans, the SPI's first five-year plan covered the years 1963 through 1967. This plan sought to solve Istanbul's economical and social problems and determine new settlement centers to alleviate the burden of speedy growth and over urbanization.

Another action of this period was legal regulations. Taking the right to property as a base, various rules and regulations legalized a grid system of roads, so alien to Istanbul's topography (Keleş, 1996). While Europe was prioritizing local solutions and forming town spaces in line with an urban design guide, Istanbul was led by sui generis (unique to that place) rules. This naturally led to smaller plots, overbuilding, lack of open areas, and a stereotyped apartment block style. Once more and definitively the economic capital of the country, Istanbul now is in search of new spatial preferences.



Figure 3. Adnan Menderes operation to solve the city traffic, Kenddy Avenue and Vatan Boulevar

The city started growing northwards, and the European and Asian sides were connected by the first bridge over the Bosphorus in the mid-1970s. The population balance between the two sides of the Bosphorus has now shifted; in 1970, 22 percent of Istanbul's population resided on the Asian side; this ratio rose to 28 percent in 1975 and 32 percent in 1980, reaching 36 percent in 1990. Policies

favoring roads have always been a factor in the increase in private car ownership (Arkitekt Journal, 1975).

Post-1980: Urban Planning for a Mass Consumer Society (1980-1999)

Globalization is the flavor of the world at this time. Istanbul now takes its place as a “world city.” Local government was made much more independent of the central with the Act numbered 3030, and greater town councils were given much more generous funding. Bedrettin Dalan, mayor of Istanbul between 1984 and 1989, leveraged these new freedoms to start up a number of “mega projects.” Just like Menderes, Dalan also razed down huge areas, opened up wide avenues and green areas, and developed and implemented highway projects supporting land transport. One of the most important of these projects is the revitalization of the Haliç (or “Golden Horn”), financed by the World Bank. This project had the admirable objectives of decentralizing industry, creating an infrastructure to clean the waters of the Golden Horn, and creating wide expanses of green areas; however, it also irrevocably ruined very important examples of historic buildings and streets. Another mega project of the time was the Tarlabası Boulevard, based on a German model from Essen. This project was finished in 1988, having demolished 368 buildings, 167 of which were listed; needless to say, it attracted scathing criticism. Yet another megaproject was the suspended road on the Bosphorus, in front of the historic waterside mansions.



Figure 4: New architectural and life model; Ataköy, Galleria Shopping Center and Gated Communities

Sources: www.mimdap.org

The second bridge over the Bosphorus and its connecting roadwork led to the development of the forest areas north of the city. The city was formed by the implementation of the Reconstruction Law numbered 3194 and the administration. The Tourism Incentive Act of 1982, attracting international investment, resulted in the construction of nearly forty projects in the city between 1984 and 1993, such as hotels and business centers (Gürsel, 1998; Keyder, 2000).

Characterized mainly by political calculations and changes in the law, this period saw Istanbul’s population increase from 4,531,000 in 1980 to 7,300,000 in 1990. Internal migration continues unabated, albeit for different reasons, forming new settlements, subcultures, and identities. Consumption, communication, and globalization typify the day. The Galleria Shopping Centre (1987) is the first example of mass consumption in Istanbul. This the new model of shopping was soon followed by gross- and hyper-markets. This consumption model became a distinct lifestyle (See Figure 4) (Bozdoğan, 1999; Keyder, 2000). (see Table 1).

The expansion at the boundaries continued, with increasing pressure coming from the shantytowns. Acts of Parliament regulating gecekondu imbue a degree of legitimacy to these illegal buildings that are no longer confined to a single-story ramshackle building; most are now multistory apartment blocks. A new subculture has emerged in these outposts independent of Istanbul; a “threatening other” concept has entered the vernacular (Erman, 2001).

The Housing Development Act of 1981 (revised in 1984) extended the availability of high-standard, high-rise estates with their own social facilities, creating “satellite

towns” and estates. At the same time, compounds (Gülümser, 2004) (walled/gated communities) such as Kemer Country, Alkent, Atasehir, and Crown Plaza took a hold, following global architectural trends and offering a protected lifestyle. These developments in housing are obviously relevant to the formation of the current outline of the city (Hacısalıhoğlu, 2000). The city is now expanding northwards, with the slogan of the day being “a comfortable lifestyle in a green setting far from the madding city.”

City planning had followed some semblance of system previously under the auspices of foreign experts until the 1980s; afterwards it all became a good deal more piecemeal. The key planning activities of the 1990s included the preparation of the Istanbul Metropolitan Area Master Plan, which advocated the decentralization of industry located in the central business district and conservation areas and emphasized the need to invest in public transport (Kocabaş, 2006).

The Great Marmara Earthquake of 1999 shook more than the ground, making Istanbul’s planners appreciate the need for earthquake-proofing and emergency action plans. Foreign experts on earthquakes, such as the Japanese and some EU members, were consulted on models in addition to foreign aid flowing in at this time. The Earthquake Master Plan and debates on urban transformation concepts have been the key targets of World Bank investments.

THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION’S AUTHORITARIAN IMPOSITION AND COPENHAGEN CRITERIA (2000-2010)

The country greeted the new century with an economic crisis. The Turkish lira devalued considerably and the IMF Stabilization Package brought along essential reforms. One of the mainstays of this package has been the reduction of public spending and support of private investment. This political and administrative modernization opened the doors to negotiations with the European Union for accession at the Helsinki Summit of 1999 (Table 1). The country has now entered a new era of economical, political and legal reforms. As it has demonstrated throughout its history, what the country does is first and most evidently illustrated in Istanbul. The consultative approach has been adopted. The prime minister of the time, Bülent Ecevit, and mayors of Istanbul Recep Tayyip Erdogan, Ali Talip Özdemir, and Kadir Topbas, have all targeted a reduction in the growth rate of the city during the harmonization process and better preparation for future earthquakes. They all support utilizing advanced information technology and investment. The new Earthquake Master Plan of 2004, the result of collaboration between four universities and led by the Japan International Cooperation Agency, aiming to improve survival rates in high-risk areas, identifying seismic areas, developing risk management systems, and determining the location of safe residential areas, was illustrative of their approach to town planning (Bayrak, 1999) Sustainable urban transformation principles will also be developed under these guidelines. The European Commission recommends not only transport and security but also spatial transformation in the development of economical, social and cultural areas. Pilot projects are already being implemented in Zeytinburnu, Galata, Fener, and Balat. These projects are supported by the World Bank and UNESCO (Zeren Gülersoy and The others, 2008).

The core problem of urban transport in Istanbul results from a lack of integration between different municipal departments dealing with transport, planning and housing. With initially each department promoting their own proposals and not communicating with the others, the Istanbul Metropolitan



*Figure 5: Major urban design competitions such as the Kartal- Pendik Regeneration Masterplan that was won by Zaha Hadid Architects in 2006
Source: www.arkitera.com*

Planning and Urban Design Centre IMP (Urban Age, 2009) recently founded in 2005, is now aiming to introduce a more integrated planning strategy. IMP is a privately-funded, public-functioning enterprise which works on preparing masterplans, development plans and site analyses for conservation, redevelopment purposes. They bring different practices of urban development and planning, such as transport, housing, design together under one roof and are trying to become the official body of the municipality in producing the visual and supplementary documents.

The IMP calculate a sustainable number for Istanbul's population to be 16 Million by 2023, however they estimate 22 Million given the current growth (Istanbul Strategic Plan Report, 2008). By then, it is most likely that a new third bridge will be built over the Bosphorus, a project which receives special attention by Turkey's Prime Minister. The rail network will be extended across the city, and new urban centres such as Kartal-Pendik (1.5 Million), Silivri (2 Million) (Istanbul Strategic Plan Report, 2008) should establish a more polycentric Istanbul.

The planning and implementation of a series of mega-projects called "urban transformation projects," a term first coined in the early 2000s, has also come in this period (See Figure 5). Some of the urban transformation projects of the mid-2000s involve inviting world-renowned architects like Zaha Hadid and Ken Yeang to design projects for entire districts. Zaha Hadid's project for Kartal, an industrial district on the Asian side, involves relocating industries to the outskirts of the city and designing office buildings that will accommodate service industries, five-star hotels targeted towards international visitors, and a marina catering to cruise tourism (Urban Age, 2009).

The Galataport and Haydarpaşa projects are two other highly publicized and controversial mega-projects in the making. The former refers to the construction of a cruise ship marina surrounded by shopping centers, hotels and recreational spaces on an area of 100,000 square meters along the Marmara Sea coast on the European side. The Haydarpaşa project involves the transformation of 1,000,000 square meters, including the major historical train station on the Asian side, into a seven-star hotel surrounded by a marina, a yacht club, a cruise ship port, office buildings, and shopping centers. TCDD operates the train station and the Port of Haydarpaşa. Since 2003, speculations over the future of the area have gained velocity. Towards the end of 2004, newspapers started publishing articles about development of a "new Manhattan" in Haydarpaşa with construction of several skyscrapers with the area transformed into a new central business district.

These projects are highly controversial in that they foresee the destruction of the historic fabric of the city in order to specifically cater to the interests of high-income groups, severely limiting public access to these areas. Moreover, both projects have provoked serious legal disputes (Urban Age, 2009).

INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS

This paper set out to analyze the dominant external influences on the development of town planning in Istanbul based on the conceptual model of international diffusion of planning ideas defined by Ward and to evaluate its manifestation on the process of the spatial shaping. In this context, this theory has adequately explained the influences on our country and defined the criteria. The periods defined in the article have been assessed on the basis of political, economic, cultural, and social change.

Evaluations of the mechanism of the diffusion process in each period and the dominant ideas and fundamental reasons affecting change have been made. The town-planning process in Turkey has been significantly influenced by Western planning, culture, and experiences as noted in Table 1.

Istanbul, thanks to its geographical position between two continents and its nature as a gateway to Europe, as well as its historical legacy, has been the city most evidently influenced.

The experience of Turkey shows similarities with other developing countries, certainly on the economical dependency platform, while differences, mainly due to social and political formations, also abound. Ward's definition of exporting and importing identities overlaps the basis of dominance on the world's power stage. This is why, during the ascendancy of the Ottoman Empire, Turkey's influence on the territories it controlled was significant. However, once it lagged behind the rapid change that overtook Europe, this identity was replaced by that of a borrower. England, France, and later Germany, with close political relations, were the main influences on Turkey's elite. Reports following observations led the Tanzimat reforms, and town planning moved from the traditional system to a process defined by codes. The leading role the values borrowed during the reforms played on town planning accelerated, triggered by national and urban conditions. While the fabric of towns was destroyed by fires and natural disasters such as earthquakes, lasting solutions were sought in Western implementation models. The results of visits abroad and models investigated were imported and borrowed, interpreted on urban criteria. During this period a certain degree of selection was applied to determining the principles that would direct town planning.

The First World War changed the balance of power in Europe; in Turkey, its effect was to shake the country into a transformation with the War of Independence. The fountainhead of this movement was Atatürk, who observed the West but assessed and interpreted its values as applicable to Turkey. The modernization he anticipated in every field was shaped under the aegis of a new system of governance. His borrowing was not based on imitation but was, on the contrary, assimilatory. Foreign experts were consulted on basic planning principles within the context of economic and administrative self-sufficiency and self-government rules adopted by Atatürk. Town planning projects undertaken during this period, while influenced by European Garden City movements, still preserved an indigenous quality. Politicians who followed Atatürk were enticed by the economic support offered by America to Europe known as the Marshall Plan. Political ideas and personalities took centre stage with the onset of the multiparty system. Kongar divides these political identities into two main categories:

“Statist-Selectionary” and “Traditionalist-Liberal.” (Kongar, 2004).

The fundamental difference between the two groups emerged in their consciousness and following of the West. The periods when Menderes, Demirel, and Özal were prime ministers and the mayors of Istanbul were Lütfi Kırdar and Bedrettin Dalan have left definitive marks on not only Turkish political history but also on economic, social, and cultural life as well as the shaping of cities.

The common trait in these political personalities is their constant admiration of the West and, specifically, the dominant power of the time, the United States. They have been instrumental in transporting these values and criteria they admired to the country and specifically to Istanbul without, sometimes, so much as a local elimination process. The destructive applications utilized in Europe in the postwar period, often causing reactions due to their lack of concern for urban conservation, were defined as new models to be adopted in the country. Wide boulevards were opened up in Istanbul, and the development of road transport was deemed to be a major modernization policy. While foreign experts were commissioned to draw up plans, the execution lagged behind the political direction.

American economic aid and directing policies started an unavoidable global dependency process. American values, not only in social and cultural life, but also in town planning, crossed the Atlantic and reached Turkey. The post-1980 period, explained as the leap into a new era and modernization, witnessed technological advances, opening up to the world in every field, and the entry of foreign investment into the country, all of which altered the nature of the diffusion process. Istanbul's urban borders spilled over geographical boundaries, and its population increased by the day. Efforts were made to meet the demands of the increasing population with new housing estates and developing transport networks. The laws became forgiving instead of problem solving. The latest position in the twenty-first century is the point where the European Union becomes the counterweight to the might of the United States on the global stage.

As an effective authoritarian power, the European Union imposes its own criteria. The country is currently making an effort to reform and codify town planning, amongst other areas, in a bid to meet these criteria. So while the main aim is to develop a model that will preserve original values, the current urban transformation phenomena demonstrate the problems related to the application of these ideas.

The processes that developed under the "Westernized, Modern, and Contemporary Turkey" definitions actually describe imitation and borrowing. A more selective approach dominated until the 1950s, and the contribution of foreign experts and planners was more definitive. Starting with specifically the second half of the 1950s, modeling and exact implementations became the order of the day. The planning executions that focused on Istanbul during this time have been criticized for the harm they have wreaked upon the topographical, spatial, and cultural aspects despite their ostensible objective of beautifying Istanbul. In addition, a holistic planning culture failed to take hold. All planning projects concentrated on selected areas of the city. The preference for the views of foreign planners over those of local planners and architects was taken to be a prestigious choice. It is possible to interpret this situation as a direct result of the imposition on space of values admired by politicians. Conspicuous here are internal imposition as well as external model borrowing. The European Union accession process aims to harmonize all countries, which, in turn, brings the country into an external imposition process.

REFERENCES

- Arkitekt Journal, 1961 "1935-1980 Arası Marmara Bölgesinde Nüfus, Arkitekt 30.
- Arkitekt Journal, 1975 "Boğaziçi Köprüsü," Arkitekt 44, no. 357
- Aru K.A.,and Gorbon, R., 1952 "Levend Mahallesi 1. Kısım İnşaatı" Arkitekt 20, no. 253-254 (1952): 174-81.
- Aru,K.A., 1996 Türk Şehircilik Tarihi, Cumhuriyet Döneminde Şehir Planlama [History of Turkish Urbanization, City Planning in Republican Period] (İstanbul:I.T.Ü. Mimarlık Fakültesi, Şehir ve Bölge Planlaması Lisans Seçme Dersi Notları, 1996);
- Batur, A.,1998 "1925-1950 Döneminde Türkiye Mimarlığı (Turkish Architecture in the Period of 1925-1950), in 75 Yılda Değişen Kent ve Mimarlık İstanbul: TC İs, Bankası ve Tarih Vakfı ortak yayını, 1998
- Bayrak, 1999., "İstanbul Valileri ve Belediye Başkanları,". İstanbul Tarihi (Ankara, Turkey:İnkilap Kitabevi, 1999), 196-97
- Bozdoğan, S.,1999 Türk Mimari Kültüründe Modernizm (İstanbul: Türk Tarih Vakfı, 1999)
- Bozdoğan S., and Kasaba, R., 1999 "Giris, (Introduction)," in S. Bozdogan and R. Kasaba, eds.,Türkiye'de Modernleşme ve Ulusal Kimlik (Modernization and National Identity in Turkey), 2nd ed. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999),
- Burhan, A., 1931 "İstanbul'un İmarı Hakkında Notlar," Mimar 5 (1931): 149-53;
- Çelik, Z., (1986) The Remaking of Istanbul (Berkeley: University of California Press

- Denel, S., 1982 “Batılilasma Sürecinde İstanbul’da Tasarım ve Dış Mekanlarda Değişim ve Nedenleri” (PhD thesis, I.T.Ü. Mimarlık Fakültesi, O.D.T.Ü. Mimarlık Fakültesi Basım İş birliği, Ankara, Turkey,
- Ergin, O.N., 1914 Mecelle-i Umur-u Belediye (Istanbul:Istanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür İşleri Daire Başkanlığı Yayınları, 1914), no. 21, Cilt 4
- Erman, T., 2001 “The Politics of Squatter (Gecekondu) Studies in Turkey: The Changing Representations of Rural Migrants in the Academic Discourse,” *Urban Studies* 38, no. 7
- Eyice, S., 2002 .İstanbul’un İmar Planı Raporları,” *Istanbul Dergisi* 43 (2002): 20-24
- Freestone, R., 2004 “The Americanization of Australian Planning,” *Journal of Planning History* 3, no. 3 (2004): 187-214;
- Gülümser, A., 2004 “A New Trend in Urbanization: Gated Communities in İstanbul” master’s thesis, ITU, Institute of Science and Technology, İstanbul.
- Gürsel, S., 1998 “1980’li Yıllar ve Sonrası,” in Cumhuriyetin 75 Yılı, .1923-1953, Cilt 3 (Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Kültür Yayınları, 1998), 804-807;
- Hacısalıhoğlu, Y., 2000 Küreselleşme, Mekansal Etkileri ve İstanbul (Globalisation, Its Spatial Effects and İstanbul) İstanbul: Akademik Düzey Yayınları
- Keleş, R., 1996 Kentleşme Politikası [Urbanization Policy] [Ankara, Turkey: İmge Kitabevi Yayınları, 1996]
- Keyder, Ç., 2000 .İstanbul Global ve Yerel Arasında (Istanbul between Global and Local) (Istanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2000);
- Kıray, M., 1998 “Azgelmis, Ülkelerde Metropolitanleşme Süreci,” in 75 Yılda Değişen Kent ve Mimarlık (Istanbul: TC İş Bankası ve Tarih Vakfı ortak yayını, 1998), 99-106;
- Kocabaş, A. (2006), 'Urban Conservation in İstanbul: Evaluation and Re-conceptualization', *Habitat International, A Journal of the Study of Human Settlements*, Elsevier, 2006.
- Kongar, E., 2004 21.Yüzyılda Türkiye, 2000’li Yıllarda Türkiyenin Toplumsal Yapısı (Istanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, Otuzbeşinci Basım, 2004)
- Kuban, D., 1996 İstanbul an Urban History;Byzantine, Constantinapolis. İstanbul The Economic and Social History Foundation of Turkey Publishing, 1996
- Lafi, N., 2003 “From Europe to Tripoli in Barbary, via İstanbul: Municipal Reforms in an Outpost of the Ottoman Empire around 1870,” in J. Nasr and M. Volait, eds., *Urbanism: Imported or Exported? Native Aspirations and Foreign Plans* (Chichester, UK: Wiley-Academy, 2003), 187-205.
- Lewis , B.,1961 The Emergence of Modern Turkey, London: Oxford University Press, 1961
- Prost, H., 1948 “İstanbul” (Z. Feran,trans.), *Arkitekt* 17 (1948): 197-98
- National Report and Action Plan for Turkey, 1996 United Nation Human Settlements Conference, Habitat II Report, İstanbul, 1996.
- Sayar,Z., 1956 “İstanbul’un İmarı Münasebetiyle,” *Arkitekt* 25, no. 284.
- Suher, 1994 “Planlama,”İstanbul Ansiklopedisi 6. cilt (1994): 265-74.
- The Beautification of İstanbul, 1943 İstanbul Belediyesi Brosürü (Istanbul: İstanbul Belediyesi Yayını, 1943
- The 75th Anniversary of the Republic, 1956. Cumhuriyetin 75 Yılı.1923-1953 [The 75th Anniversary of the Republic], “ İstanbul’da Deprem Gibi İmar–1956,” vol. 2, 408-9.
- The Plan Reports of İstanbul, 1934-1995, (Şener Özler ed), Architecture Foundation of İstanbul publication, 2007.
- Tankut, G., 1993 Bir Bas kentın İmarı Ankara: 1929-1939, Ankara, Turkey: Anahtar Kitaplar, 1993
- Tekeli and Okyay,1981 “Dolmuş’un Öyküsü” [The Story of Dolmuses] (Ankara, Turkey: Çevre ve Mimarlık Bilimleri Derneği, 1981).

Tekeli, 1994 The Development of the Istanbul Metropolitan Area: Urban Administration and Planning .Istanbul: Kent Basimevi,

Turkstat, 2010 , <http://www.turkstat.gov.tr/>

Uçarol, 1985 Siyasi Tarih (Istanbul: Filiz Kitabevi, 1985)

Urban Age İstanbul Brifing Report, 2009. www.citymaking.com/wp-content/uploads/2009/02/istanbul-briefing.pdf

Wagner, 1936 “Istanbul Havalisinin Planı,” Arkitekt 6, no. 10-11 (1936): 301-06.

Ward, S., (2000) “Re-examining the International Diffusion of Planning,” in R. Freestone, ed., Urban Planning in a Changing World (New York: E & FN SPON, 2000), 40-55;

Zeren Gülersoy, N., Tezer, A., Yiğiter, G.R., Koramaz, K., Günay Z., 2008 İstanbul Project, İstanbul Historic Peninsula Conservation Study, Vol, 1-4.

İstanbul Strategic Plan Report 1/ 100.000

http://www.planlama.org/new/images/stories/Dokuman/istanbul_cdp_pdf

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This paper has been developed from the article titled The International Diffusion of Planning Ideas: The Case of Istanbul, Turkey which was published in JPH in the year of 2007, volume 6 and number 2 .