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Abstract: At the beginning of the 19th century, in parallel with the beginning of the westernization and the capitalization of the Ottoman Empire, the urban population has started to increase and the structures of cities have started to transform in Turkey. Currently from where we stand, we might comment that the squares, parks, infrastructures, which create the public spaces in our cities, are being shaped in the direction of a marketing policy; cities are becoming artificial, non-living, unsustainable physical spaces without public spaces by starting to lose their livability and publicity. Cities and city centers are the visible points where the pressure of globalization is mostly felt and where the authority, as the “organizer” and the “disciplinarian,” transforms and is transformed rapidly. Competition projects selected with aims for a democratic structure, for presenting various ideas rather than a single pressure and introducing a more participative medium, after the period they are implemented, face difficulties in connecting to daily life and they establish a basis for urban spaces that only seem like public spaces. In this context, “Spaces of per say publicity” which appeared due to the breakpoint in 2000’s, emerge as cases which are not similar to such a doctrine. Spaces of resistance shown at 2013 / Taksim-Gezi Park and 2011 / Madrid Puerto del Sol Square are the best indicators of this discussion.
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INTRODUCTION

In today’s metropolitan areas where globalization can be seen intensively, the rise of the social tension and the rising danger created by social segregations caused the fear against metropolitan areas. Also, as the consequences of developments in mass communication and making people lose the track of time and space by entering in the private life spaces of people; that has brought about the seclusion of people, who have wanted to live in safe places, in their own indoors by getting disconnected from metropolitan areas. Thus, private spaces have begun enlarging and taking public sphere’s place which has a great importance in urban area. As a result, as Sennett suggests, the public sphere fabric - where different economical and social forms get together and meet, where they can see and observe each other closely and where they can interact with each other – has loosen and instead of that, they’ve yielded to the living spaces which mark their places with solid walls and where there are specific social classes grouped together, where there are all kinds of services that reduces the dependency on urban areas; the city centers have become places where people alienated and isolated people pass by instead of being actively used, accommodating every service, homogenous and needed prestigious spheres. However; city centers compose the most important references to history and identity of the cities that they belong and they pave the way to the discovery of the public sphere. In that sense, they are the places whose physical, social and economical structure must be maintained. The spheres, which have been “produced” against the deprivation caused by the lack of public sphere, are made up of the simulations of a restricted public sphere and cannot meet the public sphere’s “open to public access, anonymous, up for grabs and the spheres that the differences become meaningful by sharing” situation.

Within the framework of this article, it is aimed to emphasize the importance of the fact that spaces created by “urban consciousness” are distinguishable by everyone and it is also aimed to discuss the case that
such spaces detach from formal dictates and create their own body/programmatic spaces. In this context, after mentioning the changing policies and planning processes which have become the representations of the politics in Turkey, the process since the Ankara case which the Turkish Republic has received as a result of a competition in parallel with its perception of a “democratic city,” until 2013 / Taksim Gezi Park which has become one of the most important examples of contemporary publicity is examined. In addition, it is also compared to another important example of the new publicity, 2011 / Madrid Puerta del Sol Square which has become an important example of publicity since it was started and which has received one of the European Urban Space awards with specifications such as “functionality,” “coherence with urban memory,” “public participation and acceptance,” “removal of physical and symbolic obstacles,” and urban transformation/development. It is discussed that as a result of globalization and the developments in technology, withdrawn publicities have started to break contemporarily. Currently, cyber-public life style and the substantial publicity in the city have merged to create “a new public life style.” Over the assumption that, the new public life style -regardless of place, memory and form- produces its own space/typology, it is discussed that we need to be the decision mechanisms over our cities.

How people of all age ranges discover publicity, with which interactions this situation can be elicited by the people who need to discover this situation in an early age and what kind of a participation this situation can be transformed into and accordingly the pointer trails of the participation in the sphere are sought.

**Urban Renewal as a Public Sphere**

**Transformed Cities / Designed Public Spaces:** The cities areas are always in motion. One of the most important factors that effect this change and motion is the constant population growth. The changes in city (physical, social demographical) change the structure and lifestyle of the city and play an important role in shaping the social life. Harvey describes the urban area as “Urban areas are formed from the imbricative past styles and daily uses that stand together” [1]; with every change, physical and social structures are rebuilt.

As a result, every change that the city has brings about the change in public spheres, as well. The public spheres as the all the layers of the city and the meeting point of the actors that consist these layers, synchronously are the spheres where the kind of the change in urbanization can be noticed.

Public spheres are the spheres which consist the heart of the community life and which enable people to communicate with each other [2]. Sennett explains public sphere as the significant places where people have the opportunities to establish social relationship. Habermas defines this encounter as; “a common sphere which is formed by the public opinion [3]”.

Public sphere’s characteristic that the differences become meaningful by sharing them, has been longstanding. The publicity, which found its meaning in 18th century’s European cities, lost its significance in time and left its place to “private life”, public life has begun to be important in ratio that private life requires. Sennett stated that industrial capitalism had a great effect on organizing and supervising the social life and puts emphasis on 19th and early 20th century’s public life which gradually took form around more passiveness, muteness and spectatorship imageries [4]. Now, the necessities have changed with the effect of the stock and become consumption objects; this situation is shaping the daily life, as well.

In 20th century, the individuals became alienated to the production and began to be consumption-focused subjects inside “globalization” and “consumption” order that globalization carries with. That way, the most important urban program binding people closely became consumption and the urban/public spheres, which enabled the social and cultural transfer in historical process, gave its place to consumption spheres. [5] In the new world that has been created, the public sphere simulations took their places which cannot be related with the city by proliferating as a result of becoming an attraction center which considers the consumers’ every need of comfort. These “new centers” designed take part as places which are introverted as a whole, externalizing the city life and “sole buildings” that contains everything within itself. Although it is claimed that there is public life in these spheres, these spheres, which cannot be reached by everyone, appear only as trading, entertainment and leisure time activities places which are restricted “public life simulations.”

As another life simulation sphere “cyber/public spheres” enabled individuals be nationalized in his/her own private sphere. Thanks to the mass communication, the individual can get the information, can communicate
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2Simulation: It is defined as artificially reproducing a tool, a machine, a system or phenomena in order to analyze, show or define mechanism style via model or a computer program
and can perform every act that he/she can in public sphere without being in urban area just in his/her private sphere, it doesn’t matter where he/she is. In that sense, the obligation of living in cities vanished, public sphere is now everywhere [6]. However, in this case the boundary between public sphere and private sphere becomes indistinct and private sphere and the public sphere changes their places. The public sphere as a performance sphere is removed and a mass culture is being created and popularized with mass communication. In that sense, that there is limited publicity is being talked about.

Well, do all these changes raise awareness in individuals? We come across with the questions like while the city is under so much transformation, is it possible to protect the identity of city, to present the local, redefining the subject-object connection and to build public spheres/city centers which is specific for the region and with which the local people can relate to? [7] Because the urbanite does not take place in the mechanism that makes decisions for the city that he/she lives in and even though he/she has every right, he/she doesn’t or couldn’t ask for it. This problem will be discussed in the next section with the questions how the urbanite can be added to urbanization rate with a conscious participation and what kind of a response that situation gets in Turkish urbanization history.

The Urbanization Story of Turkey: Urbanization, which is described as the population growth process in cities of the society, is the indicator of problems as it is mentioned with value judgment adjectives like “rapid urbanization”, “irregular urbanization” and “over-urbanization”. Urbanizing is a new term which emerged with the urbanization and it means that the urbanite starts to show required labor force as a consequence of that, migrations with which the local people can relate to? [7] Because the urbanite does not take place in the mechanism that makes decisions for the city that he/she lives in and even though he/she has every right, he/she doesn’t or couldn’t ask for it. This problem will be discussed in the next section with the questions how the urbanite can be added to urbanization rate with a conscious participation and what kind of a response that situation gets in Turkish urbanization history.

Urbanizing contains a social organization within itself and dissuadable migration, it was an era that the decisions were made in nationwide or on regional basis, that the relationship patterns that the city life requires. On the other hand, it makes people exist with the civic productions by increasing the dependency to city life [8]. Sociologically, it means adopting a lifestyle under the thumb of behaviors and value judgments peculiar to that city.

When we consider the urbanized individual’s asserting his rights in terms of civil rights, it can be said that they go through three phases. The first phase is the fundamental rights and freedoms that started and probed with French Revolution; in the second phase, the social rights stepped in with the 1917 socialist revolution and still today it is developing and diversifying. Today, environmental rights, social and cultural self-determination and taking advantage of humanities common existence etc. forming the third phase rights that can be said to be the solidarity rights and we can evaluate the urbanized individual’s right among them.

In this case, the only condition to have a healthy city structure is the development of urbanite awareness and informing each individual about his and the other individuals’ rights that form the city. The existence of this order by itself can be achieved only with the public sphere’s existence. In this case, public sphere must be available to everyone, must be open to be experienced and converted by everyone. All these relation mechanisms must be open to be organized by the government with the urbanite, as the government is the controlling mechanism of city’s continuum.

Nowadays, on nationwide the governments and on the basis of cities local authorities take on this task. In order to discuss in what sense the public sphere exists in Turkey and what kinds of contributions/sharing/existence the urbanite can have in public sphere, we have to examine the urbanization experiment in the country [9].

It showed development in predictable limits from 1930s to 1950s with the reasons such as decrease of population in postwar period, the reflection of the urbanization policies to the physical sphere and planning the urban areas with the foreign professionals. The aim at these periods was making cities “the examples of health, cleanliness, beauty and modern culture” as Atatürk said [10] and these years are named after “reconstruction” years.

Post 1950 period is the industrialization period which required labor force as a consequence of that, migrations from countryside to the cities began. At that time, there was a common tendency of seeing the urbanization as a dissuadable migration, it was an era that the decisions were made in nationwide or on regional basis, that the country’s development policy gaining momentum in the cities.

Thereby, shanty houses were tolerated and those phenomena were supported by the government with the new laws. In addition to that, public spheres, which were located in the city centers and which were not lost yet,
were formed and a similar public usage was observed in unplanned shanty house areas which were legitimatized especially. That way, the third phase, which aimed to explain the urbanization, was proceeded and theory problematic was considered in terms of the new comers of the city and their cultural transformation.

Theorists or the old settlers in the city called the new comers “villagers in the city” and as they could not restrain people from moving to urban areas, they claimed that they would organize their cultural transformation and that would be no longer a problem. However, this dual structure which was thought to disappear in time, led to moving the next phase in comprehending the urbanization phenomena by preserving its existence. In that era, by accepting the continuity of this dual structure, the denominational/economical identity of the “new comers” of city came into prominence.³

Another point to be underlined herein is the projects that were applied in cities were; large scaled problematic of how the “new urbanite” agreed to that collective housing projects, pedestrianisation/situation. Why didn’t there a counter-social movement reorganizing the pedestrian spheres in the city centers happen, why didn’t the new urbanite assert their rights? Tekeli explains this situation in three different topics. The first one depends on the Relative Deprivation Concept [11]. The migrant from villages in the first generation were comparing themselves with the groups in the villages and they were satisfied with their situation so there was no reason to participate in the radical social movements at all. Another argument supporting that explanation is the idea based upon the dual labor market that the ones who work in marginal jobs are not in a regular work relationship so class formation doesn’t occur. Even if they live in the city, this formation falls behind because of the quality of business relationships. Another explanation in the same direction is the reality that the people living in shanty houses adopt the values of the other people living in other areas of the city. According to many researches, climbing the other areas of the city has become a longing for the people living in shanty houses and that hope prevent the squatters from participating in radical political movements.

The awareness that did not come up in the first generation squatters, responded in the second generation and in 1973 elections this group of people did not vote for conservative party. Parallel to that transformation, “a new municipalism ideology” formed in order to represent the labor populace and extensive public masses in the governing bodies that were kept off of the government and concessionaires’ benefits were in the first places till that time. In order to achieve that, democratization is essential. The guardianship on the “democratized municipalities” will be reduced and they will become rule makers in economical, social and cultural domains that the local life requires.

1980 era is the strongest proof that the transformation of city planning heavily depends on changing regime and politics. Privatization policies were on the agenda and in that direction, it can be seen that the large and empty parcels in the city, public spheres, coasts, parks and large urban areas were opened to structuring with the special laws that were made. It is an era that the cities were marketed with touristic focuses by making segmental analysis with postmodern planning concept. The primary projects that were applied in cities were; large scaled collective housing projects, pedestrianisation/reorganizing the pedestrian spheres in the city centers and visual standard developing/application projects, protection aimed construction plans which generally settle tourism as locomotive and urban transformation/renewal projects. [12] In addition to that situation, City Councils that were formed in the cities performed the works such as protecting, identity developing, continuity, participation and increasing the quality of the environment with the non-governmental organizations within the scope of Local Agenda 21, which started after Habitat II City Summit in 1996.

And the city planning after 2004, the roles of the institutions were regulated, that the authority was expanded and as a result of the expanded authorities, the cities were shaped accordingly with the laws made by the AKP government whose period started in 2000. As a result of the adopting the development of the construction sectors as nation’s economic activity, that was an era that the cities were full of construction sites and they seemed like jigsaw puzzles. Especially, by expanding the authority of Housing Development administration of Turkey (TOKI) and letting them act independently of local governments in making and approbating their own plans, the cities began to form themselves. In the light of the real estate investment trusts between TOKI and private firms, the empty areas

³This period debates formed the parties of these two situations and help them form their own discourses. The ones who said that the countryside pushed people and they wanted to slow down the migration by taking precautions for production order in countryside; the ones who believed the attraction of town offered to strengthen the social services in the country. By the end of this period “should they come or shouldn’t they come” debates ended and they started to find a solution for “what will happen to the comers”.
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within the cities turned into development areas and there arouse areas which contained public spheres, shopping malls and etc.; however, those areas were extorted from the city centers with high walls and securities. As a consequence, there began not only extortion from urban and public spheres but also there began extortion of different classes in the community and that reflected to the physical and social life. The necessity was social dwelling but the production was luxury dwelling and that situation left its mark on the era with empty housing zones, abandoned construction areas and aborted projects.

At this stage, today we can say that squares, parks reinforcement yards and etc. which form the public spheres in our cities have been structure through a marketing policy and that the cities have turned into artificial, soulless and unsustainable physical areas which have lost its publicity; and social discrimination and extortion from public sphere have started with the increase of gated communities which contains every equipment in itself. In this regards, stating the question that what kind of a public sphere understanding forms itself with the limits that specified by the dominant voluntary power in today’s world where globalization is dominant; and in the next section, it will be studied that what kind of responses the public sphere production, which is a representation of public transformation, get. 

**Can Public Spheres Be Produced?**

**Can Public Life Be Shaped by Planning?:** Here, what kind of responses sphere productions get, is being discussed.

The cities and city centers are the points that the pressure of globalization and accordingly they are points that are rapidly transformed. Especially, these areas in big cities, which are the competition means with other cities at an international level, are the indicators of funds, capitalism and being a consumer society. Wishing to use the same symbolical production for each city and the effort of dominant authority for using this transform and change the cities constantly. Especially, the government uses the cities and even the urban public spheres as a competition mean. Effort in branding allows every kind of capitalism product in spheres and these spheres are positioned in every area of the city senselessly. That way, the city always forms the typology of an ideology for an understanding that the government is the power and therefore, the government’s point of view towards the cities is based on town planning. The important problem here is that the urbanites do not have any contribution while they are the ones who have to have the right to speak and the situation that they are under the pressure of typology which is produced as contrary.

According to Lefebvre “sphere production is the production of human relations and social relations” (Lefebvre, 1991). In historical process, it is used in order to guide the society and to exercise power over society. On the other hand, Foucault defines it as; “sphere production is the conflict area of organizer, discipliner and living, existing” [13] and that way, the conflict constantly transforms physically and symbolically according the social, cultural, societal and political processes that the city witnesses and the sense of belonging becomes uncanny.

In that case, when the “organizer”, “discipliner” as ruling power and its sub-organizations as local governments take action as the state force, they play the role of a repressing being. If the architects and town planners become distant to the critical, contributor and sharing missions of theirs inside this being, it is inevitable that there would be a weak publicity. Habermas says; “the public sphere is where the public opinion molded and where the autonomous policy and it matrix –culture- is produced [14]”. However, the questions like “who produces and how it is produced” are critical, nowadays. For example; the reflection of the sphere production of the force shows itself as controlled by the civil/military state force in the process of nation-state model along with the Republic. As the aim is a democratic settlement; the competitions are considered as a healthy method in terms of “national-building” as they relatively point a sharing environment instead of monolithic pressure. In terms of achieving it with competitions, Ankara Town Plan is the first example [15].

The urban competition organized in 1927-1928 for Ankara can be considered as an operation for shaping a new public life as it aims to create a contemporary capital out of an Anatolian city with a population of 25,000, to construct the city with the limited sources. With this aim, a list of 19 requirements was given to Jaussely, Jansen and Brix who came to Ankara in 1927 to sign the specifications for the competition. Within the list, there were articles such as: drawing the boundaries of the
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4 Power: Influence, the power to make people do what is wanted
5 Ruling Power: The authorization of possession of state government and the authority to use state power
Fig. 1: The offers of Jausseley, Brix and Jansen who participated in Ankara Construction Plan Competition in 1927

Fig. 2: Jansen development plan prepared for Ankara
Fig. 3: Ulus Square (1930’s)

Fig. 4: From the new town to the old center

Fig. 5-6: AnkaMall, Ankara-Akmerkez, İstanbul

Fig. 7-8: Existing Public Sphere and Architectural Intervention Offer
historical settlement core, preservation of the Old City, re-evaluation of the railway station, organization of the İstasyon Caddesi (Railway Street) as a green land prioritizing the view of the old castle and the design of İstasyon Caddesi as a commercial axis [16].

The main objectives of the Jansen plan (1929) were “the provision of public health-happiness” and regarding the conditions of the period: “the economical applicability of the plan.” In this context, regarding the principles of planning, the aims were: making use of climatic and natural data within the decisions of land-use, giving importance to urban health (plenty of green land, workmen quarters, low-density settlement, insolation, urban infrastructure), preservation of old city center, enhancing the connections between the existing city texture with the development areas, settlement in the housing regions with low-density and with gardens, green belts between quarters, streets with trees, making the Castle, as an urban crown, visible from the whole city [17].

Bademli, in his study titled “1920-40 Döneminde Eski Ankara’nın Yazgısını Etkileyen Tutumlar” (Attitudes Effecting the Destination of The Old Ankara in the Period of 1920-1940), has defined the new public perception and its reflection on the city center and mentioned a dual structuring in Ankara as “the old center” and “the new center.” Duality of “the old center” (traditional center serving locally) and “the new center” (the center which was established by the commercial bourgeoisie, administrators-bureaucrats, Greek and Armenian minorities, as a result of the developing commercial relations with the west) is stated. The new center developed after Ankara bearing the function of a capital was around Ulus; the center around Kâleönü, Atpazarı and Samsanpazarı region was defined as “the traditional center.” Hence, Jansen also has handled Ulus as the main center both within the competition project and also within the actual development plan. Therefore, it is obvious that speculative pressures would be concentrated especially around Ulus –the traditional texture where Jansen wished to preserve- along the connections with the new settlements suggested, around the neighborhood of the new functions and tendencies for renewal would be sprouted. This case requires the suggestions for renewals in Old Ankara while also requiring a step back from the idea of extremely strict “Old City Regulations.” In other words, in a medium where speculations cannot be controlled, the dilemmas of thinking the old and new Ankara, making Ulus the main center of the whole city and also protecting Old Ankara from the development could not be solved with a rough and general “Old City Regulation” [18].

There is a great transformation between what public spheres were constructed by “creating a new nation” ideology and what it has become in today’s public spheres and “the display and share point of urbanite” has turned into “assimilation area of the urbanite”. This era’s most produced simulation public/urban spheres, Shopping Mall Projects, are the biggest indicators of that and they are built upon the urban memory by destroying it if there is one. Consequently, they confront as spheres which are produced as any place that are independent from “place” just like any other bringing of capitalism.

On the other hand, although producing new urban design projects and strengthening public relations are desired, public sphere offers as design product are the productions of a global popularity and they are a “meeting point which belongs to that are”. The greatest danger of those projects, which are produced independent from place with the same means and notions, is that they are produced independent from their users. Also, the force of local governments on cities prevents designers and the urban design projects cannot go beyond an ended town without the participation of the urbanite.

As contemporary examples of the projects that urbanite had no right to speak for himself in terms of the town he lives in are “Crazy Cannel Project in Istanbul”, “The Third Bridge Project” and “The Attempt of Reconstruction of Artillery Barracks”. In all these examples, the government, who is in charge of protecting the life quality of all living creatures in this city, ignores the damage that they will cause not only to the people of town but also to whole world and claims that they are creating a brand city which has image value in the project that they dictate as design projects [19].

However, when the government reattempted to realize “Reconstruction of Artillery Barracks Project”, which was involved in “Taksim Pedestrianization Project”, a conflict between the government and the urbanite arouse and the aforementioned contact partly came true.

“Taksim Gezi Park” which is a sphere that belongs to the soul of Republic Era (Figure 9-10) was accepted as a “symbol of a new regime” by shouldering the public function of Sultan Ahmet and Beyazıt squares after Republic Monument’s grand opening in 1928 and this situation was clarified with the resistance that the urbanite showed against the wish of intervention to the city without the consent of the urbanite and with the government’s pursuit of being force.
Fig. 9-10: Takim Square – Artillery Barracks and Gezi Park that was constructed with the Republic Era, instead

Fig. 11-12-13-14: Taksim Square – Gezi Park Protests

Fig. 15: Taksim Square – Gezi Park Temporary Library which was founded during the protests.
As a result of perceiving the pressure that is made to public spheres as a pressure which is made to “self”, the urbanite reproduced here as an area of resistance (Figure 11-12-13-14). Spatially, it is an example of motivational approach and it is transformed through the different structured community’s needs and sharing of a common place and it is produced by the “coexisting” program manner; it became the indicators of only “body-sphere” relations independent from place. Along with this, it is a proof that they can exist in this area as freely as they wish by being articulated into the urbanite’s daily life by itself and that actually publicity is not shaped in the hands of capitalism and that it is a sphere belonging in itself [20].

The result of this behavior, the temporary but self-appointed structuring on the square and park, forms a critical range for the architectural environment. Since, these areas came into the picture as a production of a freedom area without a force except for the urbanite where “architectures without an architect”, sphere and publicity which is questioned by “the urbanite and architects as urbanites as well” (Figure:15-16-17) [21].

A similar example of this formation occurred in Puerta del Sol Square, Madrid, Spain. This medieval square, which was designed in 15th century and which has an important place on city’s mind, became a similar resistance area although it does not show any similarity to the period of design of Taksim or its architectural features.

8http://occupygeziarchitecture.tumblr.com/

7When it is exemplified on the relief of production that can be seen as an awakening of being from urban area awareness. This awareness is experimented in early ages and it is loaded but it is shaped by the experiences. If the individual is shaped with this awareness, he has to be included in the urban area with the acceptance of the existing order. (http://occupygeziarchitecture.tumblr.com)

8Some examples that “Architecture for Everyone” – a civil architecture organization- took from temporary unites that were founded during the Gezi Park Protest http://occupygeziarchitecture.tumblr.com/
Table 1: The plot that shows the temporary programs founded in Gezi Park Protests

![Plot of Gezi Park Protests]

Fig. 18-19: Puerto del Sol Square, Madrid and the Democracy Protest of 2011

In 2011, it was the area of invasion with the wish of democracy and typologies very similar to 2013 Gezi Park Protest were produced with the temporary areas during the invasion. Even though they are in different places, languages, cultures and dates, the “protest’s itself turned into a program” and the same sorts of areas were produced with the same motives.

Also, this production area was evaluated as a very special production of the century’s contemporary debate platform and it enjoyed one of the European Urban Area awards who has requirements like “functionality”, “adaptation to urban memory”, “participation of public in the project”, “acceptance of the project”, “eliminating the physical and symbolical barriers” and “ensuring the...
urbanization/urbanized change”. This award was given to the invasion and the urbanites that produced temporary areas instead of the square.

It is seen that the attempt to be a force in design continuous with the competition titled as “Open Mind Project Competition: Alternative Offers for Taksim Area” for S.O.S İstanbul Architecture Students after the 2013/Taksim – Gezi Park Protests. [22]. The important point is that the intervention to the public area will be forced by the governing power by being fictionalized independent from the urbanite and this time the governing force play the part of designer.

CONCLUSION

The main matter of fact questioned in the content of the study is: “whether urban space and urban sense are producible, or are they things that change and transform by articulating to the existing structure? “Planning,” which appeared as a system for providing the sustainability of participation to the global capital, has tried to define the public spaces of modern cities; however, isolation and divergence from the sense of citizenship, emerged as a result of publicity settled apart from daily life, have experienced a break since 2000’s and has started to develop their own new public spaces. Cases of Madrid and İstanbul as two cases of public spaces of different periods constitute good examples of “new publicity,” and draw attention to the question of “whether urban/public space can be produced by a single power.”
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