INTRODUCTION

The Amsterdam Declaration (Congress on the European Architectural Heritage, 1975) and the Granada Convention (Council of Europe, 1985) placed legal and administrative frameworks among the four pillars of integrated conservation, i.e. legal, administrative, financial and technical support. Legal and administrative frameworks are also instrumental in the institutionalisation of urban and architectural conservation for they structure “the invention of new practices” (Healey et al., 2002a, 213).

A number of publications have detailed the evolution of these frameworks, and thus the institutionalisation of urban and architectural conservation field, in a number of European countries, e.g. UK (Pickard, 1994; Jokilehto, 1998; Pickard, 2001a; Pickard, 2001b; Strange and Whitney, 2003). Pickard (2002) comparatively analysed the emergent policies and emergent practices in some European states. No such reference is currently available for Turkey (1).

The main aim of this article is to close this gap by setting the pre-2004 political context of urban and architectural conservation in Turkey, critically analysing the evolution of the legal and administrative frameworks which relate to these areas and evaluating this context in terms of its level of institutionalisation and of its proximity to integrated conservation as outlined in the Amsterdam Declaration (1975).

In addition, this evaluation provides the background to the Government’s attempts to ‘Europeanise’ its conservation policy in the advent of EU accession. Hence, it becomes the basis of our thorough empirical evaluation of these attempts (Kurul and Şahin Güçhan 2009), prior to the ensuing comparison of Turkey’s experiences of conservation with other European states. Moreover, it provides, for the first time, a contextual and overarching evaluation of politics of conservation in Turkey throughout its
Providing this reference now is critical as the ‘Europeanisation’ process resulted in substantial increases in the resources that are allocated to conservation. These increases have in turn increased the foreign investors’ interest in Turkey as a new market for entrepreneurial conservation activities. Within this context, it is important that foreign investors are familiar with the Turkish system. We believe this is an important contribution to knowledge at a time when Turkey has started her accession talks with the European Union (EU) and when she has attracted increased attention of scholars and investors with its bourgeoning economy and its rich cultural and architectural heritage.

Given the above context, our main research questions are:

- To what extent had the field of urban and architectural conservation in Turkey institutionalised until 2004?
- To what extent had the principles of integrated conservation, as outlined in the Amsterdam Declaration, been implemented?

Conceptual Framework

Our conceptual framework is drawn from the ‘new institutionalist’ genre and international decrees which establish the principles of integrated conservation because both fields relate to our research questions. The ‘new institutionalist’ genre acknowledges the “recursive relationship” (Clark, 1998) between structure and agency as the facilitator of the institutionalisation process. ‘New practices’ are invented through this interplay in the urban policy discourse (Healey et al., 2002b). Hence, our conceptual framework is based on this interplay (2), and has three main components:

1. structure,
2. meaning systems, behaviour patterns, rules, norms and regulations, and
3. agency, constituting of actors, their networks and abilities.

This institutionalisation process is heavily influenced by the international decrees that Turkey undersigned for they are the bases of the meaning systems, rules and regulations. Among them, the Amsterdam Declaration (Congress on the European Architectural Heritage, 1975) is singled out for the purposes of our paper as it sets out the principles of integrated conservation. It states that “the conservation of the architectural heritage should become an integral part of urban and regional planning, instead of being treated as a secondary consideration”. It calls for the following factors to put this principle into operation:

- responsibility of local authorities and citizen participation;
- taking social factors into consideration;
- adaptation of legislative and administrative measures;
- provision of appropriate financial resources; and
- promotion of methods and technical skills for restoration and rehabilitation.

Institutionalisation process, and thus a reference for foreign scholars and investors.
In the first section, we describe the structure which refers to the context, in other words, the material conditions which define the range of actions available to actors (McAnulla, 2002) or the framework for action (Gualini, 2002). We argue that meaning systems, behaviour patterns, rules, norms and regulations emanate from this structure, and therefore cannot be considered in isolation. As a result, our analysis of the structure also covers the meaning systems that it yields, with particular reference to the principles of integrated conservation. This analysis provides the background to discussing in the second section the agencies in terms of their ability to interact with the structure and thus to enact the rules, norms and regulations; and thus put the principles of integrated conservation into practice.

urban AND architectural conservation:
structure AND emergent meaning systems

The evolution of the structure of architectural conservation in Turkey, and the emergent meaning systems, can be understood in six distinctive phases according to their scope and focus:

- origins: mid-nineteenth century to the beginnings of the Republic (1920);
- the building of a secular nation: 1920-1951;
- raising the profile: 1951-1973;
- from artefacts to sites: 1973-1983;
- towards localisation: 1983-2003; and
- an era of change: 2003 to the present.

ORIGINS: FROM MID-19TH CENTURY TO THE BEGINNINGS OF THE REPUBLIC (1920)

Conservation of monuments became systematised as a result of both the institutionalisation of the foundation system and the increasing influence of the Imperial Guard of Architects (Öztürk, 1983; Turan, 1963; Madran, 2004) during the Ottoman Era (1299-1920). Attempts to conserving buildings due to their economic and functional values were present alongside developmental approaches which resulted in the destruction of heritage (Madran, 2004). Foundations, which had always kept religiously significant buildings in good condition through interventions that happened to conserve the building character, played a pivotal role in conserving buildings (Akar, 2009).

However, contemporary attempts for institutionalising the conservation and planning fields effectively have their roots in the latter years of the Ottoman Era, namely the Tanzimat period (1839-1876) when extensive political reforms in the state institutions were undertaken (Table 1) (İnal, 1335 (H); Tekeli, 2001a, 2; Madran, 2002). These fields institutionalised concurrently, but in opposition. As a result, conservation came to be regarded as an obstacle to development, which at the time mainly aimed at providing transport infrastructure, leaving the solution of the intensifying problems of rapidly changing cities to be resolved.

Extensive re-structuring of local administration was initiated in order to solve these problems. The first step was to establish a municipality in large cities, e.g. a municipality was set up in Istanbul in 1854 (Altunyıldız,
The second step was the establishment of boroughs in cities and municipalities in rural towns during the remainder of the nineteenth century (Ortaylı, 1985, 111-218). These re-structuring efforts could not be coupled with the implementation of development projects due to scarce resources (Madran, 2002, 8). The institutionalisation attempts in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period/Year</th>
<th>Institutionalisation Attempts</th>
<th>Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-1839</td>
<td>Systemising conservation of monuments through: the institutionalisation of the foundation system the increasing influence of the Imperial Guard of Architects.</td>
<td>The economic and functional values of buildings are conserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Old Armoury and Artefacts Collection Museum established</td>
<td>Artefact-focussed conservation activities begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>First Ancient Monument Regulations</td>
<td>Particular focus on archaeological matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Second Ancient Monument Regulations</td>
<td>The term “historic artefact” is defined to cover moveable, and immoveable of disused artefacts of the pre-Ottoman Period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Third Ancient Monument Regulations</td>
<td>Fundamental principles of conservation introduced. The definition of “historic artefact” extended to include all pre-Ottoman moveable, and immoveable artefacts of the pre-Ottoman Period. User rights on artefacts were limited. Export of artefacts banned. Ministry of Education (MoE) emerged as the main agency for implementing regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Fourth Ancient Monument Regulations</td>
<td>The definition of ‘historic artefact’ extended to cover Turkish-Islamic heritage and non-Islamic heritage. MoE resumes responsibility for conserving heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Conservation of Monuments Act</td>
<td>First reference to permissible interventions. Attempt to localise decision-making power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Ancient City Walls and Castles to be left to Municipalities and to Governor's Offices Act (no. 578, 1915)</td>
<td>Delegation of some authority to local institutions. Transfer of the ownership of some monuments to municipalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Ancient Monument Conservation Council established</td>
<td>Heritage artefacts in Istanbul to be included in a register. Interventions to registered buildings and museums to be supervised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Milestones between the mid-19th century and 1917.
conservation field were focused on establishing monument and artefact conservation principles, and the structural framework for conservation activities (6)(Madran, 2002: 188; Akçura, 1987, 115-8, 120-4, 126-33) This was achieved by publishing conservation legislation, i.e. the first (1869), the second (1874), the third (1884) and the fourth (1906) Ancient Monument Regulations (AMR, Asar-ı Atika Nizamnamesi).

The first AMR (1869) only included articles on archaeological excavations and artefacts uncovered (7). The second AMR (1874) brought about some innovation by including the definition of “historic artefacts” and by defining the State as their owner (Akçura, 1987, 115-8). Here ‘the past’ referred to the pre-Ottoman, pre-Islamic, and the Classical Period. Artefacts of the post-Ottoman period were excluded from this definition probably because they still housed important functions of civil life, and thus were still used and maintained by the foundations.

The third AMR (1884) introduced the fundamental principles of conservation, which later became the basis of the Turkish Republic’s legislative framework (Akçura, 1987, 120-4). It expanded the definition of historic artefact to include all pre-Ottoman moveable decorated artefacts and immoveable artefacts, such as palaces, theatres, bridges; and reiterated the State ownership of artefacts. The regulation limited for the first time the owners’ user rights on artefacts, as well as banning their export. While Ministry of Pious Foundations (Nezaret-i Esvaf-I Hümayun) was continuing to institutionalize in the provinces since its foundation in 1826 (İnal, 1335(H)), the Ministry of Education (MoE) became the agency responsible for the implementation of these conservation rules.

The 1906 AMR, which was the last Ottoman regulation, further extended the definition of ‘historic artefact’ to cover Turkish-Islamic heritage and non-Islamic heritage, e.g. churches, monasteries, synagogues (Akçura, 1987, 126-33). It suggested the establishment of a museum commission under the MoE (Önder, 1999; Shaw, 2007, 253-279). The regulation obliged people who discovered immovable and moveables to inform the responsible agency. The Turkish Republic relied on this legislation for conservation matters until 1973, when the first legislative arrangement of the republican era was made.

Although they are the founding blocks of the conservation field, none of the AMRs included decrees on the type of interventions. Conservation of Monuments Act (1912)(8) was the first document that referred to such issues. It was specifically concerned about interventions to castles, bastions and defence walls, which should be based on reports of commissions that would be established under the auspices of local museums. This decision could have been the beginning of the localisation of the decision-making power in the conservation field. However, these commissions could only be established in three cities which had museums at the time. As a result, this Act became detrimental to defence heritage by introducing obligations which could not be adhered to as agencies with adequate capability were not present (Madran, 2002, 73, 1996, 62-3). Some limited localisation of power took place in 1915 by the delegation of some authority to local institutions and transfer of the ownership of some monuments to municipalities (Akçura, 1987, 6, 134-5, 136; Madran: 1996, 61; Madran, 2002, 72-3)(9).

Preparation of a register of heritage artefacts in İstanbul and supervision of activities that related to these buildings and museums started in 1917 with the establishment of the Ancient Monument Conservation Council (10)
As a result of the above evolution, the scope of the 1874 regulation was extended from archaeological heritage to Turkish-Islamic heritage in the 1906 regulation. Like in France, the 1906 Building Regulations gave the MoE the responsibility for conserving heritage, and it defined the roles and responsibilities of local officials (Akçura, 1987, 126-33). We argue that the Turkish Republic inherited a comprehensive legislative framework and some weak institutions from the late-Ottoman period.

While such institutionalisation moves were made, historic quarters were becoming alienated from the emerging new urban structure. Changes in commercial and production practices, which emanated from the rapidly industrialisation of Europe, fundamentally disturbed the socio-economic and political structure in Ottoman cities that had remained largely unchanged between the seventeenth and mid-nineteenth centuries (Aktüre, 1981, 34-102; Denel, 1982). In the case of Istanbul, the city became catastrophic due to problems of being a capital. The population increased more than twice reaching to 873,575 in 1882. In addition to housing problems due to immigration, the frequent fires caused a rapid increase in the number of the houseless. As a result of more than 100 fires happened only in the second half of 19th century created large urban slums; nearly 1/3 of the population started to be sheltered in public buildings (Altınyıldız, 2007, 282-287).

The meaning system of this period developed in these circumstances can be summarised as one which concentrates on the preservation of archaeological artefacts and the resolution of emerging urban problems by developing sanitised, new quarters away from historic centres.

THE BUILDING OF A SECULAR NATION: 1920-1951

The secular Turkish Republic founded in 1923, aimed at establishing a cultural policy based on the principle of ‘creating a nation state from a civilised society’. Transforming all the Ottoman institutions to secular institutions of the new Republic was an integral element of this strategy, which was implemented by legislative changes between 1924 and 1929 (13). These activities strongly associated with the desire to evaluate the Ottoman heritage from a new, secular, independent and scientific perspective.
On the one hand, they delivered ‘progressive’ organisations that could take the revolutions forward, e.g. Turkish History Association, Turkish Linguistic Association. Hence, the earlier searches aiming to define the origins of Ottoman architectural culture started in Tanzimat Period (Ersoy, 2007; Necipoğlu, 2007), continued with the Turcology studies by supporting “especially those foreign scholars close to our [Turkish Republic’s] national thesis” (Redford, 2007, 244, 250). As a reflection of the global ideology dominating at the beginning of the 20th century, this nationalist policy complemented with European modernism and created the so-called New Architecture after 1930 (Bozdoğan, 2007, 202-3; 2008, 122-211).

On the other hand, they abolished the Ottoman organisations that were considered to ‘threaten the secular Republic’. For example, the mature Ottoman pious institution remained largely intact within the Ministry of Religion and Foundation Affairs (Evkaf ve Şeriye Vekaleti) that was founded in 1924. However, it remained dormant until 1935, when it was replaced by the General Directorate of Pious Foundations. Also, some buildings that symbolised the Ottoman state, e.g. palaces, madrasas, tombs, rapidly deteriorated during the institutional transition period between 1924-1935 as a result of being left vacant (Akçura, 1973).

Although the MoE, with its responsibility for cultural matters (14), and the Ministry of Religion and Foundation Affairs were founded soon after 1920, effective conservation activities could not be undertaken during the War of Independence which dominated the 1920-1923 period. The pious institution, took on the responsibility for the repair of buildings, which belonged to pious foundations (15). The Standing Council for the Historical Real Estate and Monuments in 1951 (Madran, 1996, 64). As a matter of fact, focused on building a nation and its new capital and having limited financial sources, the Republic reluctantly left the architectural heritage of the past in a state of decay. The pioneers of the Ottoman revivalist National Style, who were in charge of conservation of waqf estates, were not able to change the ruined condition of Ottoman building legacy in Istanbul despite their high-ranking authority and responsibility (Altınıldız, 2007, 287-93).

The Republic did not follow many examples in history in its quest to establish a secular state in that it did not demolish or destroy symbols of the Ottoman system (16). Having said this, the abolishment of some Ottoman institutions, resulted in some problems in conserving this heritage during the transition period. All moveable and immovable Royal heritage, was given to the Nation through the transfer of their ownership to different institutions of the new Republic (17). Similarly, madrasahs and their associated land were transferred to the MoE, while schools and their associated land were transferred to Special Provincial Administration with the right of sale (18). As a result, the ownership of both institutions rapidly changed (Madran, 1996, 65).

Changes to the legal framework in order to secularise the state during the first decade of the Republic, the uncertainty that prevailed the structural conditioning period of institutionalisation and sometimes the hasty implementation of projects, resulted in deterioration of heritage. Moreover, the transfer of responsibility for conservation to different institutions,
which did not necessarily have the required expertise lead to incompatible interventions to historic buildings. We argue that this condition was a natural outcome of the secularisation process and it was swiftly attended to. A 1931 report published by a high profile commission that had been established under the auspices of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the founder and the first President of the Turkish Republic, expressed concern, and lead to the establishment of the national Commission for Conservation of Monuments (CCM) in 1933 (Madran, 1996, 66).

In 1933, these activities to institutionalise together with activities that related to the preparation of a register of historic buildings, to documentation and repairs, ended the period of uncertainty during the first decade of the republic. Madran (1996, 71-5) states that 3500 monument registers, buildings at risk registers, and detailed condition reports for monuments and archaeological remains were prepared under the directorship of CCM. Furthermore, information activities to increase public awareness of conservation started during this period.

Table 2. Milestones during the secularisation period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period/Year</th>
<th>Institutionalisation Attempts</th>
<th>Influence on the Conservation Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1924-1935</td>
<td>Legislative changes to transform all the Ottoman institutions to secular institutions of the new Republic; Transfer of Ottoman State buildings to secular institutions</td>
<td>Abolishment of some Ottoman institutions, resulted with problems in conserving heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924-1949</td>
<td>The Standing Council of Ancient Monuments reactivated to become the Culture Department, then the Directorate of Museums in 1933, and then the Council of Historic Artefacts after 1951</td>
<td>The first expert agency with decision-making power on interventions to historic buildings emerged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Organisational structure, and responsibilities of municipalities defined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Commission for Conservation of Monuments (CCM) established; Planning framework defined</td>
<td>National listing - documentation started; Town planning responsibility given to municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>General Directorate of Pious Foundations established</td>
<td>Took on the responsibility for repair of buildings owned by foundations in 1936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second decade of the Republic witnessed a renewed interest in Ottoman buildings, which were taken under the care of the General Directorate of Pious Foundations (Şahin, 1995, 3-4). This interest could be interpreted as the new Turkish Republic’s attempt to “legitimate itself through the creation and propagation of a national heritage” (Phelps et al., 2002) after establishing a nation-state through weakening cultural links with the Empire in its first decade.

However, the General Directorate of Pious Foundations, a significant agency for architectural conservation, was not effective in fulfilling
19. The report also included important suggestions such as the centralisation of the responsibility for conservation of heritage, the listing of monuments, the provision of funding for the implementation of conservation projects, the vacation of historic buildings that were used by the Ministry of Defence, and the preparation of publications by the Ministry of Culture in order to develop public awareness of conservation. As a result of these suggestions, a national Commission for Conservation of Monuments (CCM) was established in 1933. This marked the start of listing, documentation, repair and publication activities in conservation (Madran, 1996, 70).


21. Some departments of the Directorate were renamed with the 1984 Organisation and Responsibilities of the General Directorate of Pious Foundations Decree (no. 227).


26. Building conservation was contextualised with the introduction of conservation area concept in 1973.

its responsibilities (Madran, 1996, 78-9). The transfer of ownership of foundation property to different agencies exacerbated the problem as they prevented the conservation of buildings as an entity. In 1936, the General Directorate was given the responsibility of conserving all property, which belonged to foundations that were established before 1926 (20). Hence, a legal framework for the conservation of these buildings under the authority of a central agency was created (Akçura, 1987, 175-84; Madran, 1996, 78). After numerous revisions of the legal framework, the General Directorate became responsible for conserving property under its ownership in accordance with the register and documentation procedures of the CCM (21). As it had very limited funds in comparison to the number of property which fell under its responsibility, it was given authority to establish a bank in 1954 (22) and to make industrial, commercial and agricultural investment in 1970 in order to raise funds (23).

The legislative and structural framework of planning and development control, which was also a legacy of the Ottoman Empire, remained in force after the foundation of the Turkish Republic (Table 2). They were slightly changed only after the 1930s. The organisational structure and responsibilities of municipalities in Turkey were defined in 1930, and they remained largely unchanged until 2005 (24)(Kurul and Şahin Güçhan, 2009). The municipalities’ conservation responsibilities were limited to approving development plans and repairing historically significant dilapidated civic buildings.

The planning framework was defined in 1933 (25). All municipalities were to commission ‘an expert’ in order to prepare “town plans” in accordance with the procedures. Monuments within the boundaries of these plans were to be “marked” and a ten metre strip of open space was to be designated around them. This designation remained in force until 1984. In practice, it was the only enforced decree about historic buildings until 1973 (26).

This principle, accompanied with opening new avenues and roads which complied with the ‘health’ standards, and with forming building plots of regular geometry were the main design principles (Akçura and Çapar, 1973, 8-10). Based on these principles, the clearance implementations around the monuments and fragmentation and destruction of the historic urban fabrics in the name of improvement were started in the former Capital. Vatan and Millet Avenues, opened by tearing the historic urban tissue of Istanbul, which was left in favour of the new capital, were the precedents of this “development attitude” sparked in 1950’ies (Altnyildiz, 2007, 291, 295-299).

Hence, master planning approach of this period, which continued until the 1970s, delivered an urban form which starkly contrasted the existing form. This phenomenon illustrates the gap between planning and conservation which is in stark contrast with the principles of integrated conservation.

Despite this gap, some attempts to conserve the character of cities and towns were present in some development plans. As an example, the Development Plan for Ankara prepared by Jansen designated the Citadel area as a ‘protocol area’ mainly to reflect the monumental and historical character of this area. It is important to note this sensitivity shown by an architect planner at a time when the conservation area concept was present in neither the national nor the international planning discourse.
On the whole, the institutional context of documentation and register of historic buildings, and conservation remained unchanged from the 1950s to the 1970s. During this period, under-resourcing and the resultant financial and staffing problems became acute (Table 3).

Against this background, General Directorate of Historic Artefacts and Museums became localised through the establishment of departments in cities. It became part of the Prime Ministry in 1972 (27), which thus accrued responsibility for cultural affairs until 1989, when the Ministry of Culture was established.

The principal development during the 1950s was the establishment of the High Council for Historic Real Estate and Monuments (28). The High Council (HC) was completely autonomous, and had the sole decision-making power above and beyond all central and local authority. Its establishment is significant for raising the profile of conservation in Turkey. It also helped increasing the level of conservation activity at a time when the country was rapidly urbanising. The primary contribution of the HC to architectural conservation was to initiate discussions on the need to conserve areas, as well as individual buildings. These discussions culminated in the introduction of the concept of conservation area in 1973. The HC also developed the main principles of conservation and identified interventions that are compatible with different categories of listed buildings (29).

Despite these developments, conservation and planning were still considered to be separate entities, and conservation was deemed to inhibit urbanisation and development. This condition is evidenced in the absence of urban planners in the HC (Çeçener, 1982, 263). Given this perspective, it is perhaps not surprising that the HC found itself under immense pressure to narrow down the ten meter strip of open space around monuments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period/Year</th>
<th>Institutionalisation Attempts</th>
<th>Influence on the Conservation Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950s-1970s</td>
<td>The institutional context of documentation, and register of historic buildings, and conservation remained largely unchanged</td>
<td>Under-resourcing and the resultant financial and staff problems, became acute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944-1950</td>
<td>General Directorate of Historic Artefacts and Museums set up departments in cities</td>
<td>Localisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The High Council for the Historical Real Estate and Monuments established</td>
<td>Profile of conservation raised Conservation activity increased at a time of rapid urbanisation Discussions on the need to conserve areas as well as individual buildings started Three listing categories, ‘appropriate’ interventions defined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Milestones from 1951 to 1973.
FROM ARTEFACTS TO SITES: 1973-1983

This period was characterised by the publication of the first act (no.1710), after the 1906 AMR, concerned with conservation of cultural heritage (30). For the first time, the following terms were defined: ‘Site (31), Historic Site, Archaeological Site and Natural Site’. Moreover, the HC’s authority was extended to cover decisions with regards to conservation areas as well as individual buildings. Thus, the most important development during this period was the introduction of the notion of ‘sites’, and hence a holistic approach to architectural conservation to replace one that only valued individual buildings and monuments. This introduction was two years ahead of the 1975 Amsterdam Declaration which instituted the conservation area concept at the international level.

The HC subsequently started designating archaeological sites and conservation areas in existing settlements. The approved development plans for these settlements became invalid once an area was designated. According to this new arrangement, ‘conservation master plans’ for these areas were to be prepared within two years of designation. The High Council was responsible for defining the ‘temporary development conditions’ for these areas. Consequently, planners found themselves in charge of some conservation issues. The concept of ‘Conservation Master Plan’ emerged and for the first time became a subject of discussion among experts.

The 1975 Amsterdam Declaration significantly augmented the emerging Turkish framework. Moreover, its principles lead to the establishment of departments of ‘Documentation and Designation’ and ‘Conservation Planning’ within the General Directorate of Historic Artefacts and Museums and to the commencement of debates on conservation and planning. Hence, the Amsterdam Declaration, an international keystone, and Act no. 1710, a national keystone, became the founding blocks of the transformation of architectural conservation in Turkey.

However, both private and public sectors showed significant resistance against these developments mainly because the society had not yet embraced ‘conservation’ as a necessity. Neither the municipalities nor the planners nor the affected property owners considered to be feasible the conservation-planning models that the High Council and/or conservationists advocated. Despite all the legal requirements, it had taken a long while for the municipalities to prepare conservation master plans as planners in municipalities deemed Act no.1710 to be an obstacle to development. Private owners of historic buildings considered it to be a limitation to their ownership rights (Şahin, 1995). Further analysis of some urban problems would help understanding this period.

Like in many European countries, rapid urbanisation continued to be the main problem in Turkey during the 1960s and 1970s. This problem was eventually solved by increasing property rent, instead of developing policies to open new development areas due to the lack of political will and financial resources. This eventuality dictated a master planning approach which was based

“on building new, wide traffic arteries within the urban macro-form, on increasing the rent in areas flanking these arteries, and on extending the development rights - in effect the building heights- of existing buildings. A natural outcome of this strategy was the emergence of speculative developers with small investment capacity, whose main activity was to

31. The term ‘site’ corresponds to conservation areas in the UK.
replace existing buildings with new, high(er) ones. Their demands and values dominated the urbanisation process in Turkey” (Günay, 1992).

As the populist culture of the middle and upper classes did not consider conservation of historic buildings to be a prestigious or economically feasible activity, existing urban tissue was replaced through higher density building activity during the 1960s and 1970s. A natural outcome of this approach was an increase in the demolition and destruction of historic districts. Wholesale demolition of historic quarters became the norm in many cities.

Meanwhile, the residential requirements and preferences of the middle and upper classes had changed. These groups preferred living in ‘new flats’ which arguably fulfilled their contemporary needs and demands. The ‘modern’ and ‘western’ images were becoming a reality in their new flats, which were considered to be a status symbol. As a result, historic buildings in old quarters of cities were either abandoned or sold. Old quarters became the territory of poor migrants. Their density increased through division of historic buildings to several households, and through building in the courtyards. Such poor quality alterations accelerated the deterioration of historic buildings, and resulted in the loss of many original building features. Irreversible changes to original spatial layouts, structural weakening and replacement of original materials and building techniques were other inevitable consequences of higher density use (Şahin, 1995, 9-10).

Consequently, historic quarters of cities which had become slums turned into ‘transition areas’ for migrants until they were in a position to provide themselves with better living conditions. The main ambition of this social group was to leave these ‘transition areas’ when they had the financial resources to build themselves a squatter in shanty towns in the peripheries of cities (Şahin, 1995, 9-10). As a result, peripheries of all large cities had turned into shanty towns of gecekondu by the 1970s.

TOWARDS LOCALISATION: 1983-2003

Despite all the protests and reactions which we detailed in the previous section, the High Council continued to be the only institution which had the decision making power between 1973 and 1983. Even if it was not under direct pressure from any political perspective as an autonomous entity (32), it was portrayed as a practical obstacle to development by those who wished to remain outside its autonomy. This portrayal resulted in friction between the Council and the public.

Even so, the 1980s were marked by listing and documentation activities and implementation of some conservation projects within the bounds of limited resources. The General Directorate of Cities Bank, municipalities and Land Registry Offices in cities were informed of conservation area designations and listings so that this information could be used in preparing development plans. However, the planning and conservation mechanisms for conservation areas had not yet been developed even if this concept was introduced in 1973. Likewise, the first terms of contract for the preparation of ‘Conservation Development Plans’ were issued in the 1990s. Therefore, development plans did not pay regard to conservation areas or listed buildings until the 1990s.

The HC was replaced with Regional Councils for Conservation of Cultural and Natural Heritage (33), and the High Council for Conservation of

33. Regional councils from hereon.
The High Council from hereon stands for the High Council for Conservation of Cultural and Natural Heritage.

1983 Cultural and Natural Heritage Conservation Act (no: 2863).

The changes that were made in 2005 by the Act 5366, propose increasing the number of regional councils by establishing new councils for each renewal area. Number of new Conservation Regional Councils still continues to increase. Currently there are thirty three councils. For latest information and for the list of the councils visit: http://www.kulturvarliklari.gov.tr/Genel/ BelgeGoster.aspx?f6e10f8892433cff03077cA1048A18343C1A5398CDEBDCC8 or http://www.kulturvarliklari.gov.tr/

Unfortunately, the majority of the academic and non-academic members of the regional councils are not specialised in conservation. Neither do they have the required knowledge of the law or implementation issues. Two main reasons lead to this condition. First, the number of experts with appropriate knowledge and skills is very limited. Second, the procedure for the selection of council members dictates that academic members are appointed by the Higher Education Council while the Ministry of Culture appoints non-academic members which are in the majority. Thus, many council members were discharged in the past because of political reasons which resulted from changes to the Government.

Cultural and Natural Heritage (34) in 1983 (35). The HC had the decision making power and it was to act as an adjudicator for resolving disputes between the regional councils (RCs) and applicants. The RCs provided opportunities for delegating some of the decision making power to local agencies, and for the representation of municipalities in the conservation process.

Although it is desirable in the conservation context, delegation of decision making power to the regions exposed the regional councils to local pressure. Today there are about 33 conservation councils (36). However, the number of experts who could become members is very limited. Existing experts prefer not to be involved due to the limited opportunities to implement the decisions taken by the councils, to the absence of local institutions which would direct, control and make conservation a reality and to the susceptibility of councils to local pressure against conservation. Consequently, these councils have not yet started to function properly despite the fact that they offer practical advantages and empower the regions. This condition mainly emanates from the inappropriateness of the elected members (37), and results in inconsistent decision making between different regions, despite the HC’s decision-making principles established to ensure consistency of decisions made by different councils. The malfunctioning of the councils may also stem from the vertical “scalar expansion” which may result in a “loss in coherence and efficacy of policies and governance” (Herrschel and Newman, 2002, 22).

Despite the absence of policies which would encourage the public to embrace conservation, both the municipalities and the public have come to internalise- involuntarily in some cases- the significance of conservation between 1983 and 2003. Because of the very limited financial resources, it was very difficult to implement the key decisions although there was a comprehensive legal structure, as described above. Thus, exemplary conservation/regeneration projects remained very limited.

One such example is the Citadel Area in Antalya. Extensive conservation/regeneration projects are yet to be implemented in areas such as the Historic Peninsula in Istanbul and the Citadel Area in Ankara, even if these districts have long been designated conservation areas.

Specifically after the 1980s the legal framework of conservation has evolved, in tandem with contemporary discourse. As a result, a structure which defined the agencies responsible for conservation of cultural heritage emerged. These developments were despite contradictions and deficiencies in terms of implementation that we discussed above. The General Directorate of Historic Artefacts and Museums, which was under the Prime Ministry between 1972 and 1989, was replaced by the general directorates of Scheduled Monuments and Museums, and Cultural and Natural Artefacts under the Ministry of Culture, established in 1989 (Figure 1).

Henceforth, the Ministry became the principal agency with conservation responsibility. It worked in collaboration with city directorates of Culture under the Governor’s Offices and (if present) with city directorates of Museums. It also accrued, through the Regional Councils, the decision making responsibility for cultural property under the ownership of public bodies (Figure 1). All conservation master plans for conservation areas and all projects for interventions to cultural heritage had to comply with relevant regulations published by the Ministry of Culture. These plans and projects were also subject to approval by the Regional Conservation Councils (please refer to Figure 1 for such procedures). Within this context,
Figure 1. The organization of architectural conservation (before 16/04/2003, redrawn after Sahin, 1995, 286).
municipalities were responsible for procuring “Conservation Master Plans” if they resided over a conservation area, for getting these plans approved by the Regional Council, and for implementing them. This structural framework and the emergent procedures (Figure 1) remained valid until 2003 when fundamental changes were made.

AN ERA OF CHANGE: 2003 TO THE PRESENT

Post-2003 legislative arrangements fundamentally changed the institution of architectural conservation by introducing new vehicles for implementing conservation projects. We discuss these changes in detail in another article (Kurul and Şahin Güçhan, 2009), for which this article forms the background. Here we will suffice by giving a brief overview.

One of the fundamental changes was that the municipalities were given important conservation responsibility. In addition, tools for implementation were introduced and more importantly new resources for conservation were created. Municipalities have begun to support and engage in conservation as they have realised the role of historic values in enriching the cityscape. Despite this, conservation remains to be the concern and interest of intellectuals and the middle class.

2004 was truly an important turning point for Turkey, which had adopted the EU perspective and hence started making the institutional changes that were necessary to become a member. Extensive changes were made in conservation legislation and its institutional framework after 2004. These changes can be categorised under three main groups (38):

• Changes that relate to the re-structuring of public administration (39),
• Changes that indirectly relate to architectural conservation, and
• Changes to the structural and legislative framework of architectural conservation.

The re-structuring of public administration

The fundamental aim of these changes is to align the Turkish administrative structure with the governance principles of the European Union (EU). The fundamental conservation related change was to give the municipalities responsibilities ‘for the conservation and repair of cultural and natural heritage’, for ‘defining the scope of urban regeneration and development projects, for the provision of development land and housing, for the conservation of urban history and cultural heritage’, and for the utilisation of ‘special planning tools’ in these areas. Municipalities of settlements with populations above 50,000 and/or their special provincial administration (SPA) were authorised (40) to designate ‘deteriorating conservation areas which began to lose their character’ as ‘renewal areas’. Procedures for the procurement of plans for these areas and their implementation; and for organisation, management, control, participation and use within their boundaries have also been defined. These procedures will be instrumental in implementing conservation plans which have so far remained to be ‘academic’ due to issues associated with ownership (Kurul and Şahin Güçhan, 2009).

Changes that indirectly relate to architectural conservation

Further comprehensive changes were made in the field of tourism (41). They influence conservation areas in a number of ways. First, they introduced concepts such as Culture and Tourism Conservation and

---

38. Full texts of all acts to which we refer in this article can be accessed at the Official Gazette’s web-site at: http://regal.basbakanlik.gov.tr/. Act numbers are required.


40. Act no: 5366.

41. Act on Changes to Tourism Promotion Act (no: 4957), which was published in 2003 (OGN: 25186, OGD: 1st August 2003).
Development Areas, Culture and Tourism Conservation and Development Sub-Areas, and Tourism Centres. Mixed-use including cultural, educational, entertainment, commercial and residential uses, is envisaged in these areas. Second, transfer of rights of access, including leasehold on property within Conservation and Development Areas (42), to Turkish or foreign individual or corporate investors have now become possible (Kurul and Şahin Güçhan, 2009). The proposed model is similar to the ‘build, operate, transfer’ model which was proposed during the 1980s.

Changes to the institutional and legislative framework of architectural conservation

A number of legislative changes have been made in this field (43). One of the main changes is the re-structuring of the ministry with conservation portfolio. The ministries of Culture and Tourism have been amalgamated to form the Ministry of Culture and Tourism (MoCT) (44). Other important developments to note are the changes to the principal conservation act (no: 2863) (45). Important innovations in terms of conservation planning and implementation of conservation projects are made. For example, novel concepts such as Conservation Development Plan (CDP), Management Plan, Nexus Point and Participatory Area Management, are introduced. The new structure, which was defined by the introduction of these concepts, inaugurated a new approach to conservation. It is regarded as a ‘process’ together with implementation. Thus, the preceding attitude that was mainly confined to the preparation of unimplemented master plans is replaced (Kurul and Şahin Güçhan, 2009).

The agencies which could invent new practices within this structure are also introduced. For example, municipalities and local governor’s offices could set up ‘conservation, implementation and control offices’, while the Special Provincial Administrations (SPAs) could set up ‘project offices’ and ‘training offices’. We interpret these changes as a step towards closing the gap between planning and conservation.

Agencies would not be in a position to take action and thus invent new practices without allocated resources. Fortunately, recent changes made resources available, for example, by allocating 10% of the property tax for expenditure on cultural property. Cumulatively such allocations increase the financial resources that were available by 200-fold. The arrangements for the exchange of privately owned cultural property (46) has potential to further augment the resources and thus to contribute to solving the acute resource problems which have continued during the Republican Era.

These changes strengthened the organisational structure of architectural conservation, aligned the Turkish conservation legislation with international norms, created specific resources for conservation of cultural heritage, and introduced new concepts and organisational models for implementation and for speeding up the decision-making process.

CONTEMPORARY AGENCIES: AGENTS AND ABILITIES

We have so far discussed the evolution of the structure of architectural conservation, and the emergent meaning systems. We will now turn to the agencies which operate within the constraints that have emerged from this structure, and their responsibilities. The Ministry of Culture and Tourism (MoCT) is the main body responsible for organising the conservation field. Ministries of Public Works and Housing, Environment and Forestry, and
Defence, General Directorate of Pious Foundations, General Directorate of Highways, and Department of National Palaces (Grand National Assembly of Turkey); local governments, i.e. municipalities and governors also have important functions (Figure 1).

MINISTRY OF CULTURE AND TOURISM

The Ministry of Culture, which was founded in 1989 (47), became the MoCT in 2003 (48). Main conservation duties of the Ministry are

“... to nurture, develop, disseminate, introduce, evaluate, cultural values, to lead the public institutions and organisations in the cultural arena and to collaborate with these institutions, to protect historic and cultural heritage from destruction and extinction”. Two general directorates, which operated at central and local levels, fulfilled these responsibilities until 2003 (49).

It has been acknowledged by the Ministry officials and extensively published by experts that the MoCT cannot appropriately fulfil its responsibilities due to its structure and organisation; that there are significant problems in implementation and enforcement due to lack of coordination between agencies and to limited financial and human resources that are at this Ministry’s disposal (Şahin Güçhan, 2003; Şahin Güçhan et al., 2001). The following data provides some insight to the fundamental cause of these problems:

This Ministry is trying to fulfil the above defined responsibilities in collaboration with Culture and Museum directorates in each city, through

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type:</th>
<th>March 1995</th>
<th>December 1999</th>
<th>August 2005 (*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Buildings</td>
<td>30084</td>
<td>35464</td>
<td>26914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Buildings</td>
<td>5009</td>
<td>5796</td>
<td>5667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Buildings</td>
<td>4754</td>
<td>5774</td>
<td>5569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Buildings</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>1438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Buildings</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial and Commercial</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>1790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martyrium</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monuments</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural objects</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>2352</td>
<td>2911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruins</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets to be preserved</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44921</td>
<td>56376</td>
<td>48519 (**)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Number of registered immovable objects in Istanbul | 19512 |
| Number of designated SITES in TURKEY |
| Archaeological Sites | 2768 | 4273 | 6019 |
| Natural Sites | 310 | 717 | 942 |
| Urban Sites | 116 | 164 | 204 |
| Historical Sites | 51 | 118 | 128 |
| Others | 147 | 334 | 399 |
| Total: | 3392 | 5606 | 7692 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type:</th>
<th>March 1995</th>
<th>December 1999</th>
<th>August 2005 (*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Buildings</td>
<td>30084</td>
<td>35464</td>
<td>26914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Buildings</td>
<td>5009</td>
<td>5796</td>
<td>5667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Buildings</td>
<td>4754</td>
<td>5774</td>
<td>5569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Buildings</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>1438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Buildings</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial and Commercial</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>1790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martyrium</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monuments</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural objects</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>2352</td>
<td>2911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruins</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets to be preserved</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44921</td>
<td>56376</td>
<td>48519 (**)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Number of registered immovable objects in Turkey | 19512 |

Table 4. Number of registered immovable objects and designated Sites in Turkey.

* These figures are taken from the following web-site:

** This total does not include the number of listed buildings in Istanbul because the Ministry of Culture and Tourism started a new listing process for Istanbul after the 1999 earthquake, and thus providing separate information for Istanbul. The total cited on the Ministry’s web-site is incorrect.

49. Here we only present the departments which were part of the Ministry of Culture and which had conservation related functions until 2003. Departments of the Ministry which have responsibilities in the ‘cultural’ context have been excluded. These two directorates were unified in 2003 under Act no: 4848 to become the General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums. One of these directorates was the General Directorate of Cultural and Natural Artefacts. It incorporated the regional conservation councils. Its main responsibilities were: to undertake all listing related activities in collaboration with its local units, to ensure that all decisions that relate to the definition and conservation of sites, to the preparation of conservation development plans and to the conservation of listed buildings were appropriately made and that these were dutifully implemented. Despite its clear responsibility, this Directorate was not in a position to spare adequate levels of funding, or specialised human resources for preparing conservation development plans or conservation projects. The second directorate was the General Directorate of Scheduled Monuments and Museums. Its main responsibilities were: to enable the conservation and management of museums and natural heritage, to follow all procedures that relate to archaeological excavations and to provide funding for excavations, to establish and sustain local museums and cultural centres, and to collaborate with the other directorate in conservation related matters. This directorate faced similar problems, e.g. scarcity of funding, difficulties faced in inspection and supervision of archaeological excavations. Appropriate preservation and exhibition of artefacts in museums has been another challenge, which is accentuated by the lack of resources.
the 33 regional conservation councils. It had a total of 449 positions, including short-term contract staff, as of August 1999. Only 290 positions were full in 1999 (Şahin Güçhan et. al., 2001). A comparison of this data to the amount of architectural heritage in Turkey; Table 4 clearly demonstrates that the Ministry of Culture and Tourism cannot possibly fulfil its responsibilities with its existing staffing levels.

We discussed elsewhere (Kurul and Şahin Güçhan, 2009) the amalgamation of ministries of Culture and Tourism, and the allocation of new positions for specialised personnel have resulted in a slight increase in the staffing levels. Moreover, the transfer of some of the Ministry’s responsibilities to the municipalities, and the establishment of new units within the municipalities are expected to result in an increase in the number of personnel working in conservation.

It is also envisaged that the recent legal changes and promotions will result in an increase in the proportion of the conservation budget. In 2003 the Ministry of Culture’s budget had reached its lowest level as a percentage of the National Budget (only 0.23%). Hence, the Ministry could only afford to cover its staff costs and compulsory expenses.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT: MUNICIPALITIES AND SPECIAL PROVINCIAL ADMINISTRATION

Origin of local government in Turkey dates back to the final years of the Ottoman Empire (50). Its institutionalisation started during the early years of the Republic (51). These acts envisaged that local public services would be provided by the local government. Municipalities and Special Provincial Administration (SPAs) in each city form the local government with the responsibility for providing local services. These agencies are located within and supervised by the General Directorate of Provincial Administrations (52) under the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

SPAs (53)

Public Assemblies which were founded in 1913, sustained during the Republican Era. They were renamed as SPAs in 1987 (54), and undertook the provision of public services in rural areas. This responsibility was transferred to some ministries and central administrative bodies in due course (55). Today, SPAs support central administration in the delivery of public services.

Specifically after the 1987 Act, SPAs started to take part in the preparation of projects for conservation of cultural and natural heritage which fell under the responsibility of local governors. Over the last ten years, they have also been involved in the implementation of such projects. However, serious problems emerge during the implementation of such projects as the SPAs do not have specialist units that could undertake these activities. We argued that such problems could be avoided in the future if SPAs establish ‘project offices’ as envisaged the recent legal changes (Kurul and Şahin Güçhan, 2009).

MUNICIPALITIES

The Turkish administrative structure gives the municipality significant power to intervene in the natural and built environment. It can therefore be argued that municipalities are the second most important actors in the conservation field after the MoCT (Şahin Güçhan, 2002a, 57-9; Şahin

---

50. Act no: 971. Publication year: 1913 (Hicri 13/03/1329 in Lunar Calendar); Ottoman OGD: 15/03/1321; Ottoman OGD: 1414, source: http://www.icisleri.gov.tr/
51. Villages Act (no: 442, publ. year: 1924); Municipalities Act (no: 1580, publ. year: 1930).
52. General Directorate of Provincial Administrations was established in 1930 by The Structure and Responsibilities of the Ministry of Internal Affairs Act (no: 1624, date: 24.5.1930). Its current structure and responsibilities were defined by the Structure and Responsibilities of the Ministry of Internal Affairs Act (no: 3152, date: 23.2.1985).
54. Special Provincial Administration Act (no: 3360).
Güçhan, 2002b, 55-63). Despite their significant role in shaping the built environment, municipalities have not shown the necessary competence in using their powers in order to deliver economically and socially buoyant places. Such incompetence was revealed, once again, during the aftermath of the 1999 earthquake and subsequent natural disasters. Administrative bodies and academicians argued that the majority of these problems emanated from the municipal legal framework (Şengül, 2001, 95-114; Tekeli, 2001b, 101-22; TBD, 1993). Legal and structural changes, specifically after 1980, reformed the role of municipalities which were originally defined in 1930 (56). Transfer of some decision making power and some functions from the central administration to the municipalities can be argued to be the most important change after the 1980s.

Municipalities had very limited conservation responsibility until 2004. Hence, they did not directly or actively concern themselves with conservation. Despite this, they had some conservation functions because of their role in planning. These functions included: the production, authorisation and implementation of conservation development plans in accordance with the regional conservation councils’ decisions; implementation of the temporary development regulations in conservation areas; enabling the conservation of listed buildings in collaboration with museums and RCs; authorising the implementation of planning and/or listed building consents given by the regional councils; authorising occupancy/use on completion; and representation at regional conservation council.

The main repercussion of these functions was observed in the context of conservation areas. Once an area was designated as a conservation area, the municipality had to prepare or procure a conservation development plan within a year. Until this plan was prepared, all decision making power regarding development within such areas, was transferred to RCs which had to define the temporary development conditions for such areas. Municipalities were responsible for enforcing these conditions through their development control function. They were also represented at the RCs and they had a vote. As a result, they had the decision making and implementation power. The common problem that emerged during this stage was that municipalities were responsible for the implementation of some decisions in favour of conservation which they did not necessarily support (Figure 1). Another problem was that municipalities were responsible for implementing and controlling conservation projects but they did not have specialist staff. Municipalities were not obliged to employ such staff until 2004. Therefore, experts such as (conservation) architects, planners, civil engineers, were not present in municipalities.

**OTHER AGENTS**

Ministries of Public Works and Settlement (MoPWS), of Environment and Forestry, and of Defence indirectly accrue conservation responsibility through their duty of care for all buildings, including listed buildings, under their ownership. The MoPWS is responsible for preparing and implementing projects in order to solve problems related to planning and infrastructure investment that are brought to their attention by the local governors. Despite such a responsibility, it does not have a department which specialises on conservation. It incorporates the General Directorate of Cities Bank (57), which finances municipalities to procure development plans.

---


57. This institution is mainly responsible for financing the developmental activities of municipalities. Please refer to: [http://www.ilbank.gov.tr/](http://www.ilbank.gov.tr/) for further information.
General Directorate of Pious Foundations was founded in 1935 with the remit of conserving religious and public buildings that date back to the Seljuk and Ottoman eras. Turkey Bank of Pious Foundations was established in 1954 in order to provide funding to the Directorate. Even if it is one of the oldest agents with conservation remit, the Directorate has not yet established an infrastructure that will enable the conservation of its buildings. It sub-contracts projects. The majority of its repairs are not compatible with contemporary conservation principles and they damage listed buildings (58).

Department of National Palaces, which is part of the Grand National Assembly, is responsible for the conservation of artefacts and properties that belonged to the Ottoman Sultans (59). Dolmabahçe, Beylerbeyi Palaces are examples of the buildings under its responsibility.

Turkish History Research Association is another agency which has some role in the conservation field. It was one of the agencies that the young Republic founded in order to create a nation-state. It was established in 1931 and was renamed as Turkish History Association in 1935 (60). The Association particularly conducted research on and undertook documentation of archaeological sites after 1935 under the auspices of President Mustafa Kemal Atatürk. It also pioneered the determination of conservation principles for these sites. Nevertheless, Madran (1996, 75-6) states that the Association’s conservation activities were limited to “publication of introductory pieces of monography on history of art and architecture; and providing limited funds to Turkish archaeological excavation teams” after the 1940s.

**NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS (NGOs)**

In addition to the agents that we introduced above, there are private or semi-public organizations and NGOs which are active in the field of conservation. The number of such organisations were limited until the Republican Era. It could be argued that the Assembly of the Ottoman Engineers and Architects, which was established in 1908 (Tekeli and İlkin, 1993, 100) and the Assembly of Istanbul Advocates (Madran, 1997, 84) were among the first conservation related NGOs.

A comparison with countries such as the UK, France and the Netherlands reveals that the establishment of NGOs was much delayed in Turkey. Since the 1990s, their number has quickly and significantly increased (61).

In addition to NGOs, some organizations that were originally established to provide educational services have since the 1980s become involved in conservation. These include the Yehbi Koç Foundation (1969) and the Sabancı Foundation (VAKSA, 1974). Also, a number of associations and societies which aimed at promoting local character and culture, and their conservation were established in the recent years. The number of similar organisations has rapidly increased since the 1990s (62).

**DISCUSSION, AND CONCLUSIONS**

Our analysis has shown that there is a well developed structure which is based on an extensive legal framework. Despite some shortcomings, conservation legislation has developed in tandem with the international conservation principles. Legislation on certain conservation issues was published earlier in Turkey than it was in developed European countries.
Therefore, we argue that the structure of the conservation field, as a framework for action, is soundly built.

However, the field is yet to be institutionalised as appropriate agencies and meaning systems that would enable the emergence of appropriate ‘new practices’ are yet to be developed. One of the reasons behind this condition is that conservation phenomena had been regarded as a central government imposed set of prohibitions and obstacles to development until the 1990s. The second reason was the lack of political will to use the extensive legislative powers, of adequate levels of funds, and of expert staff in agencies with conservation responsibility. As a result, only one of the principles of integrated conservation, i.e. adaptation of legislative and administrative measures, had been implemented in Turkey by the early 1990s, whilst the remaining four principles had not. This was mainly due to lack of resources which inhibited the interplay between the structure and the agencies with conservation responsibility.

From the 1990s, some promising developments have augmented the likelihood of the conservation field to become institutionalised because more opportunities for the “recursive relationship” (Clark, 1998) to be established emerged. For example, the public perception of ‘old’ and ‘historic’ has started changing. Personal initiatives that were taken by municipal leaders who believe in conservation, the spill-over effects of projects that they undertook in collaboration with an increasing number of NGOs and the media’s indirect contribution to publicising conservation, contributed to this change. The 1990s also witnessed a change in the way tourism is perceived. It is no longer regarded as a sector that can be assessed only by accommodation capacity. It has recognised its reliance on local character that emanates from built and natural heritage. This transformation has also contributed to the positive change in the public and political perception of conservation.

The legal changes since the early 2000s, specifically those brought in 2004, resulted in significant structural changes in the conservation field. As we argue elsewhere (reference withheld not to reveal identity), new tools, institutionalisation arrangements and significant resource increases of the post-2004 re-structuring period will result in an increase in conservation activities in the near future, enabling the emergence of new practices. However, these recent arrangements could also lead to further damage to cultural heritage due to the limited number of experts and to low quality service provided by contractors. We argue that the post-2004 period offers both risks and opportunities. Henceforth, the biggest challenge is to ensure that the new institutional framework will be fully developed into one that would safeguard heritage. Numerous layers of culture and history in Turkey and their significance for the global culture, transforms this challenge into a critical one.
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**TÜRKİYE’DE KORUMA ÖLÇÜTLERİNİN TARIHİ GELİŞİMİ: 19. YÜZYIL SONUNDAN 2004’E**

Bu makale, Avrupa Birliği’ne uyum sürecinde kapsamlı yasal ve yapısal dönüşümlere sahne olan Türkiye’de, özellikle 2004 yılındaki değişimlerin eşliğinde, Osmanlı’nın son döneminde gündeme gelen ve 2004 yılına kadarki süreçte evrilen bir mimari ve kentsel koruma alanının yasal ve idari kurumlaşma çerçevesinin gelişimini tanımlamak ve mevcut duruma ilişkin bir ön değerlendirme yapmayı amaçlar.


Bu çerçevede makalenin ilk bölümü Türkiye’de yasalar, normlar ve bunların dayandığı anlamlar sisteminden oluşmuş örgütlenme yapısının ortaya çıkışına odaklanır. Bu yapısı, tarihi örgütlenme köşet kronolojik bir çerçeve içinde, altı dönem olarak tanımlanmıştır. Bunlar, Başlangıç:

- Kamunun yeniden yapılandırılmasını öngören vasal değişiklikler,
- Koruma alanının dolaylı olarak etkileyen vasal değişiklikler,
- Koruma alanının doğrudan etkileyen vasal değişiklikler.

Henüz pratiğe yeterince yansıması olmayıp 2004 yılından itibaren yoğun şekilde artan mevzuat değişikliklerinin olumlu nitelikleri yanı sıra pek çok tehdit de içermektedir.


Çalışmanın sonuc bölümünde, Türkiye’de koruma alanının örgütlenmesinin özellikle mevzuat ve kaynak üretimi anlamında batı Avrupa’daki koruma değerleri ile örtüşmek, gerekli olarak gelişkin yapıya kavuştuğu değerlendirilmesi yapılmıştır. Ancak bu güçlü ve gelişmiş koruma mevzuatı ve oluşturulunun kaynaklar; siyasi irade eksikliği ya da koruma alanındaki tarafların uzmanlıklarına ilişkin eksiklikler nedeni ile başarılı koruma uygulamalarının gerçekleştirilmesini, dolaysıyla erişilen vasal ve idari çerçeveye rağmen, bu eksikliklere bağlı sorunlar, Türkiye’de mimari ve kültürel mirasın korunmasını sağlamak konusunda başarılı, ‘bütünlesik uygulamaların’ gerçekleştirilmesini engellemektedir.