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Abstract. This paper evaluates the approach to the field of modern architecture in Turkey through the public buildings of Ankara. Although the conservation of modern architecture as cultural heritage has been accepted, to a limited degree, within related frameworks and disciplines, and within theory, the inconsistency in preservation legislations have been evaluated critically. The scope of conservation is limited to the state of being old and historical, thereby rendering modern architecture not worth conserving. This is valid for many countries, just like it is for Turkey. Despite various local interpretations of the mode of modern architecture that foresees mono-typing, the connotations of “culture” and the state of being a “product of the past,” of the 20th century, are denied. The expanding and transforming characteristic of immovable cultural heritage is disregarded. As such, modern architecture in Turkey remains inadequately analyzed and documented within the framework of cultural heritage. The conservation of buildings dating back to the 20th century remains within the preference of the related Ministry. As the criteria for this preference is not determined, some public buildings that exemplify modern architecture are rapidly lost despite their being of the same style and period with other buildings designated for conservation. The threat of being torn down or destroyed due to aging functionally and physically renders the preservation of modern architecture products within the framework of cultural heritage, as well as the updating of the legal context according to new parameters, urgent and necessary. The sustenance of public buildings, which are not only products of modern architecture but also sources of the history of the city and architecture, and therefore the history of the Republic in Turkey and the modernization process, gains even more significance through its impact on the urban identity of the capital, Ankara. To this end, this paper focuses on the city of Ankara for its case study on the present status of sustaining modern architectural heritage.

1. Introduction
Evaluating products of modern architecture as cultural heritage has, since the 1980s, been among the basic issues within the preservation theory and practices of Western countries which re-constructed their cities after the Second World War through modernism. Within the framework of 20th century heritage, studies towards documenting, preserving and sustaining modern heritage has expanded the concept of immovable cultural heritage and has changed its characteristic. Defining the scope and criteria for this new component of heritage has been on the agenda of all parties internationally and locally. As such, through the dynamics of the discipline of heritage, in accordance with changes in the thought and practice of architecture, forms and conditions for application is being re-defined.
The present and the future of architectural composition, dating back to the 20th century in Turkey, is discussed, in the years of 2000, by a limited group of experts, through “awareness and the anxiety that these values are being destroyed.” This anxiety is increased as these buildings, which have high plot value due to their urban location, are demolished and re-built by the unearned income-focused building investments in the globalization process.

That modern architectural heritage in Turkey is sustained as witnesses to the efforts towards internalizing the modernization process from the early years of the Republic until the 1960s is a privileged field in heritage. In the re-construction of Ankara as the capital in such a way that it would guide urban-public spaces in line with the Republican ideology and that it would set a pioneering and teaching example for the country, the meaning of modern architecture is of more priority than other cities. Nevertheless, the approach of the public, which would be expected to support preservation, to renew the modern architectural-style public buildings in the capital, and even to apply urban regeneration will speed the loss of these values. To this end, this presentation aims at documenting the heritage value of public buildings that exist today in the capital but are being or about to be lost through some striking examples. As such, it re-evaluates, in line with developments on international platforms and intrinsic conditions, the definition and scope of modern architectural heritage, a relevantly recent preservation area in Turkey, thereby strengthening awareness.

2. Modern Architectural Heritage

Various ideas are offered on the issue of the beginning of modern architecture. According to modern times, it is rooted in the Humanism of the 15th century, concurrently with the Renaissance, and in the Industrial Revolution of the 18th century [1, 2, 3]. The widely accepted idea is that it emerged with the changes brought about by the Industrial Revolution in mid-18th century, the beginning of positive thinking and technical progress through the “Enlightenment.” If architectural accumulation produced through an acute break-away from the conventional is observed rather than the buildings of one specific style or if, in a historical perspective, the factors that led to the modern period, and in turn, to the shaping of architecture are analyzed, all of these dates may be regarded accurate. However, the common perception of modern architecture today is the rational and simple architectural approach that emerged by the end of the 19th century. This simplification evolved in the period of early modernism by either overlapping partially with or by diverging completely from Art Nouveau1 [4].

Modern architectural movements foresee the application of scientific and technological developments from the stage of the design to the construction, and work towards social necessities through a rational and functional approach, the aesthetic norms of which are devoid of historical references and ornamentation [5]. Modernism2 and/or the modernist mind supports that these rules are valid everywhere, therefore supporting universality. At the present, however, it is associated with non-aesthetic, cold, inhumane “heaps of concrete in the city.” Another opinion is that modern buildings are temporary according to the idea that modern architecture “is torn down or changed when it no longer serves the building function” or that “every generation-society holds the right to create its own living space and architectural approach.” [6,7].

Through this roughly defined component and its designs that are shaped by social needs and that prefer being ordinary, modern architecture does not reflect the magnificent, monumental characteristics required for cultural heritage that should be preserved. Indeed, claims are ongoing as to how a building made of reinforced concrete and glass cannot bear the traces of the past. Along with these views, in societies in which preservation is not internalized, the preservation of modern architecture is easily rejected based on the assumption that it does not relate to the society’s memory, habits, and culture, and that it denies local values due to a universal approach. Yet architectural products that date back to the modern period(s) also have the potential to signify elements such as a society’s culture, its level of development, life style, traditions pertaining to the use of space, and the
like, just like architectural products designated as immovable cultural heritage. The way socio-economic, political, cultural enforcements shape architecture is discussed objectively. Moreover, it demonstrates the face of architecture in the development-progress planned, designed as foreseen by the modern mind. It should be accepted that it has a status of intrinsic values in the culture of architectural design. The excuse for “time” in the preservation concept presented by the modern times not aligning with modern architecture may be rejected through the argument that if the 20th century is long gone, therefore a part of history, then the architecture of this period also belong to the past, and is, thus, of preservation value. In line with this approach, it has become important to preserve modern heritage on international platforms as of the 1990s [8, 9]. Established for this purpose, DOCOMOMO (Documentation and Conservation of Modern Movement) defines modern heritage as “products that embody modern design principles based on function, technique or spatial conditions instead of on ornamentation and decoration, and that do not have historical references” [10]. Through the 1991 advisory jurisdiction on 20th century architectural heritage of the European Council and ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites), the most significant international organization in the field of preservation, carrying this heritage to the agenda at about the same time, preservation of modern architecture gained momentum. In 2002, the International Day of Monuments and Settlements was dedicated to the heritage of the 20th century, and in the same year’s Report on Endangered Heritage this period was emphasized [11].

3. Modern Architecture (Heritage) in Turkey and Its Sustainability

Since the conservation of immovable cultural heritage in Turkey has not yet been internalized by the society, it is being carried out by means of legal enforcements. However, along with the law on conservation, there exists counter laws, resulting in the ongoing dilemma. In this context, the conservation of modern architectural heritage will be briefly discussed within its legal framework and in relation to the awareness of the parties, and the present status will be evaluated through the approaches of sustainability and integrated conservation.

3.1. Modern and Internationalist Architecture

The modernization period initiated in Turkey by the Republic as represented in the field of architecture is defined, as of the founding of the Republic, through consecutive (compatibility) or conflicting (duality) “national” and “modernist” approaches. Named also as 20th century architecture in the related literature, modern architecture is analyzed in three different periods. The “First National Architecture” is the architectural style that brought together façade formation which unified fragments and was formed by borrowing the plan scheme from the west, initially defined by Seljuk, Ottoman, Northern African (Magrib) and even Muslim Indian architecture, and later, in the 19th century, by the Baroque, Neoclassical and Imperial styles in effect in Europe at the time. This style was effectively used from the years of the founding of the Republic to 1927. Almost all of the limited number of architects in the country, who fed on feelings of nationalism and who acted as pioneers of this style that was supported by the administration, analyzed architectural elements of the past, and along with the Neo-Classical style of the period, emphasized not plan forms but façade designs, therefore the image. (Architect Kemaleddin’s designs in Istanbul; Kemer Hatun Mosque, Laleti Tayyare Apartment, Architect Vedat’s designs the Main Post Office and Haydarpaşa Pier, Arif Hikmet Koyunoğlu’s designs in Ankara State Museum of Painting and Sculpture, Ethnography Museum, and the like). Due to its incompatibility with new technology and modernism, this style remained a selective, formalistic, emotional and academic movement [12, 13].

With the First National Architecture in 1927, the period named as International Modernism or foreign architects became effective as one of functionalism and rationalism until the 1940s. In this period, buildings were designed according to solutions appropriate to their functions and façades were cleared of ornamentation, thereby becoming simplified. This movement is evident through public buildings (such as Architect Nazım’s design of Court of Auditors building, Giulio Mongeri’s design of
Osmanlı and İş Bank buildings, Clemens Holzmeister’s design of Department of Chief of Staff building and Emlak Bank buildings in Ankara). Following up on this style, the Second National Architecture movement is defined as the authentic commentary on Turkish Architecture’s modernist lines without being imitated and falling into eclecticism. In this period (1940s-1950s), there was a move away from the international understanding of art, as was the case in every field due to a return to the conventional understanding (such as Sedat Hakkı Eldem’s design of Istanbul Faculty of Science and Letters, Ankara Faculty of Science, Paul Bonatz’s design of Ankara Saracoğlu Neighborhood) [12,13,14,15].

In the literature of Western architecture, the period from 1950 to 1980 is defined as Internationalist Architecture. This period is that which embodies all the characteristics of Modernism, of buildings all around the world utilizing reinforced concrete and glass, and steel in wealthy countries. They can be identified at one single glance through cubic masses dominated by horizontal and vertical lines, horizontal line windows and flat rooftops. Nevertheless, in the 1950s’ Turkey, various different architectural styles were visible at the same time, from approaches feeding off of foreign publications and effects (Rationalist Purist style, Brutalist understanding, search for independent style) to a re-evaluation of conventional architectural values. Despite these periodical differences, in this period in which Turkish architects produced up-scale works in Turkey, gross concrete buildings, for which the reinforced concrete was left unplastered, were produced towards the end of this period. Postmodern and global architecture surfacing in the 1980s has been excluded in this study.

3.2. Conservation Practices and Awareness

The significance of 20th century Republican Period Architecture was only discovered in the 1970s and was included in the studies of researchers interested in the history of architecture. Yet the conservation of modern architectural heritage started appearing in academic contexts only in the years of 2000. “20th century Architectural Heritage” was mentioned, for the first time, by the Chamber of Architects at Bursa in 2001 during the 18th International Congress on Construction and Life. In 2002, ICOMOS organized an international symposium titled “Conservation of the 20th Century Architectural and Industrial Heritage.” At the same date, academics specialized in conservation established the DOCOMOMO Turkey National Study Group [9, 16]. Since 2004, this group has been organizing annual “conferences and poster presentations” that introduce and evaluate examples of modern architecture that date back to the 20th century, up to the beginning of the 1970s, through their visual and written documents. These meetings aim to expand the studies towards the documenting and registering of modern architecture, and to share, on national and international platforms, training, especially in architecture and related occupational fields. Such efforts are supported through exhibitions and the media, and, as such, the attention of the public and of public opinion is attracted and social awareness is being built up. In 2004, the founding of the Study Group on Building Identities and Inventory, at the Ankara branch of the Chamber of Architects, is yet another significant progress in the conservation of architectural heritage. The first meeting of this group has contributed to the expansion, up to the 1970s, of the “Building Identities and Inventory Project and Talks,” initially started in Ankara for the first ten years of the Republic (1923-1933), and to their transportation also to the rural cities, to the creation of a public consciousness through the opening of a web site with the same aim, and to keeping alive public memory. By means of the “Project on Criteria for Researching, Documenting and Conserving Civil Architectural Culture Heritage of the years 1930 to 1980 in Ankara,” residential buildings were brought to attention and documented, and a virtual city archive (museum) was established and conservation criteria were developed. The Project was conducted under the auspices of Başkent University and supported by TÜBİTAK and VEKAM. Completed in 2017, this project is being made prevalent through numerous national and international workshops, books, articles, conference presentations and bulletins initiated in 2012, and through exhibitions, written and visual media initiated in 2014 [16]. This project has been successful in providing the participation and support of the public and in developing social conscious and awareness.
Despite the efforts and success of non-governmental initiatives, the dilemma of conserving/destroying buildings and spaces that are of modern architectural heritage quality is ongoing in many cities, primarily in Ankara. In the 1970s, some modernist period buildings (İstanbul Atatürk Cultural Center, Ministry of Internal Affairs, and the like) pertaining to the first fifty years of the Republican Period were preserved. Those that were within the scope of modern heritage yet outside of legal boundaries, and even dating back to recent history, were also frequently registered. However, the conservation of modern architectural products dating back to the post-1950s was often deemed problematic as they were new (modern).

It is hoped that this problematic with dating will be overcome through ICOMOS Turkey Committee’s proclamation of 2013. The proclamation states that “cultural heritage embodies historical, documentary, aesthetic-artistic, emblematic, social, economic, religious and spiritual, and all or some of the characteristics of the environment shaped by interaction in time between people and spaces. Architectural heritage is a major component of cultural heritage and should be addressed along with all of its values.” By means of this claim in the proclamation, the scope of architectural heritage does not depend only on historical value. It is believed that this context will be significant and influential in relation to the shaping and evaluating of the conservation process in Turkey [17]. Nonetheless, because modernism, as a tool of social reform, is still not embraced by a significant portion of the population, even by people of related occupations, the shortage of information towards the equivalent of modernism in architecture is a fact.

3.3. Legal Framework
Conservation of immovable cultural heritage is conducted in Turkey in line with the Law on the Conservation of Cultural and Natural Assets, numbered 2863 [18]. The provision in Article 3 of this Law of “belonging to pre-historic, historic periods” does not suggest a temporal limitation. When the past is viewed from today (21st century), 20th century, too, is a historical period. As such, it is clear that, in the conservation of architectural constructs dating back to the 20th century, the legislation is not a barrier, and that, on the contrary, they can be worth preserving not for their historical value but for other characteristics. According to the same Article, the idea of “the construct being a topic of social life,” among other characteristics, makes it clear that the cultural heritage value of modern architecture is not to be discussed. Thus modern architecture, too, is a product of the art of architecture and a concrete-objective expression of the abundance and variety of cultural heritage. Like with any other architectural work of art, this cultural source should be transferred to future generations as a sign of the progress and understanding of art of the period in which it was produced, and as a witness to history. This necessity is best expressed by “today’s new buildings are tomorrow’s heritage” [19]. Article 6 of the same Law states that those immovable produced after the end of the 19th century deemed worth preserving, for their significance and characteristics, by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism can be registered as cultural property. While many modern architectural examples are being destroyed in accordance with this statement, many modernist period buildings were registered even in the period (especially between 1979 and 1980) when, before this Law, architectural examples dating back to the 19th century were regarded worth conserving. This dilemma attests to the desire and enthusiasm of the members of the District Council on the Conservation of Cultural Property, authorized in registering immovable cultural heritage, to their adequate and competent knowledge on the topic, and to the fact that they make decisions according to the institutions of which they are members. The members of the council are introduced to a building considered for registration through the report prepared by the reporter. If the reporter’s knowledge, experience, and vision in the field is limited and narrow, the members in the majority may be affected, even though the expert members do not take this seriously. Moreover, it is known that at the same meeting date, the same board members consider worth conserving some of the buildings dating back to the same period, and that they consider some buildings unworthy. However much this may not be an incident to be generalized, its validity is probable. Objections to registered or unregistered buildings of modern architectural heritage
quality are legally addressed first to the Higher Council on the Conservation of Immovable Cultural Heritage, and then to the Court. Considering that bureaucrat members are in the majority in the Higher Council, decisions are made in accordance with the vision and judgment of the administration. During the Court procedure, the negative attitudes of the expert witnesses may also influence the decision. What is more, because of public institutions that do not abide by Court decisions, many modern architectural heritage examples are rapidly lost. During the Court procedure, the attitude of embassies about the conservation of buildings with foreign architects is noteworthy for being on the side of conservation.

That some Laws which contradict the conservation regulations are in effect is a barrier, in the sustainability of modern architectural heritage, difficult to overcome, just like in the case of the conservation of other immovable cultural heritage buildings and urban spaces. This discourse is being supported through urban regeneration or transformation processes and renewal-based conservation approaches (!), which are enforcements of globalization, brought to the agenda in the years of 2000. Founded by this approach in 2006, Conservation District Boards on Renewal Areas (at Istanbul and Ankara) have also paved the way for renewal projects and practices rather than conservation” [20].

4. Examples to Public Buildings that are of Modern Architectural Heritage in Ankara and Approaches of (Non)Conservation

When it is considered that modernism played an active role in the nation-building process of the Republic, the significance of Ankara, the Capital, is evident. This image of Ankara and its pioneering, leading and teaching mission has made a reference to the government. Modern architectural examples, which signify the Republic and date back to this process, are components of culture that refresh and strengthen the national and urban memory. Among them, public buildings (such as military, administrative and management buildings) and buildings that are within the use of the public, such as spaces of health, education and culture, are privileged. Yet these buildings and spaces, the plot values of which are increasing due to their location in the city center, are easily discarded for various excuses (losing function and prestige, having outlived their technical and economic life spans, getting old), such as their being new (modern), and they are abandoned to unearned income of zoning. Aside from non-governmental initiatives, a limited number of academics and urbanites, the society tends to either disregard or accept more easily the interventions that block the conceptualization of these buildings and the destruction, as they are not within the possession of the society. Despite this (non)sensitive context, legal-administrative barriers of different periods or arbitrary interpretation of the legislation, authentic modern buildings are also among the total of 287 registered buildings and sculptures in Ankara dating back to 20th century.

4.1. Examples of First National Architecture (1923-1927)

The majority of public buildings realized in the style of First National Architecture (such as Exhibition House-Opera Building 3, Ethnography Museum (figure 1), Public House Building-State Fine Arts Museum (figure 2), Ankara Palace (figure 3), State Railways, Sümerbank, Erzurum Hotel buildings) have been conserved for not only their architectural value but also as signs of the establishment period of the Republic, as well as their monumental nature.

New formations in physical space that developed in conjunction with social revolution and transformation (like Ulus Square and People’s Garden) and architecture may be regarded also as “image architecture,” in the city which, in the 1920s, was regarded as the model capital of the Republic. In the city center of Ulus and its environs, primarily the Second Assembly Building, and school, university, hotel and bank buildings have been actualized in this style for the purpose of meeting the needs of changing urban public (modern) living [13,16].
Throughout this period, Giulio Mongeri, Vedat Tek, Kemal Eddin Bey and Arif Hikmet Koyunoğlu were influential in the construction of Ankara, the new capital. The typology formed through the Turkish State Liquor and Tobacco Monopoly Directorate (figure 4), Ziraat Bank (figure 5), İş Bank (figure 6) and Osmanlı Bank (figure 7) buildings, located along Bankacılar Street at Ulus, especially, remained to this day and have been conserved. It is evident that these bank buildings also represent economic independence and the national economy.

4.2. Examples of Functionalist, Rationalist, - International Modern- (1923-1927)

In the period of the Early Republic, the synthesis of the “Modern and National” was a primary discussion topic within the framework of architecture and art. At the end of the 1920s, there was a move away from the national architecture approach, and the modern movement that supported rationalism and simplicity was embraced. With the government’s support of this tendency, public buildings were predominantly designed in line with this approach. Considering the fact that some of the public buildings were designed, at about the same time, under the influence of the First National Architecture, like the banks, it becomes difficult to clearly distinguish between this design style and international modern architecture with respect to time and form.

At a time when foreign architects were influential, the approval of the Presidential Palace project, designed by Clemens Holzmeister (1886-1983) in line with the modernist approach, provided momentum for the expansion of this movement. Identified by reinforced concrete bearing systems, cubic mass approach, façades with wide windows and free design, the design tendency of this period may be observed through many public buildings that exist today [13, 15,16]. The examples of buildings considered worth conserving are the Exchequer and Audit Department building (figure 8), designed by Holzmeister, Turkish General Staff building (1929-1930) (figure 9), and Emlak Bank building (1929-1930) (figure 10).
4.3. Examples of the Second National Architecture Period (1940-1950)

In the design of public buildings of this period, the evident characteristics are the re-evaluation, in a simpler form, the traditional, local, national civil architecture elements, the transfer of function to form, symmetry and stone cladding on the façade, and monumental mass form [16, 17]. Architects arriving at Turkey due to the Second World War and Turkish architects who adopted this approach strengthened the city’s identity of the capital by the public buildings they designed, primarily the Turkish Grand National Assembly (TBMM) building, the Mausoleum of Atatürk and Ministry buildings (such as Clemens Holzmeister; Turkish Grand National Assembly-1938-1960 (figure 11), Ministry of Construction 1933-1934, Emin Onat and Orhan Arda; Atatürk’s Mausoleum-1941-1953, Paul Bonatz; Old National Library-1946, Saraçoğlu Neighborhood-1945-46 (figure 12), Sedat Hakkı Eldem; Ankara University, Faculty of Science 1943-1945 (figure 13). A majority of these buildings are under conservation and are utilized for their original function.

4.4. Examples of the Post-Second National Architecture Period -Internationalist Architecture- (1950-)

The transition, in this period, to the democratic multi-party system in government and to liberal capitalist systems in economy provided momentum for multi-storey construction and freedom and/or variety in architectural design(s) through the Property Law. Most of the public buildings that date back to this period are of landmark quality, and, therefore, of conservation status. The Kızılay Office Block, as the first skyscraper of the city and the country, is a living example to the rationalist-purist design approach through its basic geometrical pattern of the mass and façade elements, its modular system and its glass and steel construction material. Nevertheless, the Ministry of Development and Housing building, put into service at the same date and constructed according to the same approach, was demolished without waiting for a conservation council decision. The demolition of many school buildings, dating back to the same period, is also on the agenda (such as Yenimahalle/Zübeyde Hanım Vocational School of Health, figure 14-1). METU Faculty of Architecture, Stad Hotel and Turkish History Institution (figure 14-2) buildings, on the other hand, are public buildings of the brutalist design approach, and they reflect the internal function onto the façade and provide the reading of the
constructs’ structure from the outside. In the same time period, the Grand Ankara Hotel (figure 14-3) and Ankara Gülhane Medical Academy (1962) emphasize their search for an independent form as a design approach [14,15]. The Etibank Directorate General building (architectural design Toğrul Devres, Yılmaz Tuncer, Vedat Özsan-1960) of the same group, was demolished in 2012 (figure 14-4).

Figure 14. Examples of the Internationalist Architecture
Zübeyde Hanım Vocational School of Health Building 2- Turkish History Institution Build 3- Grand Ankara Hotel 4- The Etibank Directorate General Building

In the 1960s, architects who stood against modernism by attaching importance to traditional architecture designed buildings without denying the current technologies and enriched both the literature of architecture and the urban identity, and most of these buildings continue to exist. Hacettepe University Cafeteria and Indian Embassy buildings are examples of this design approach. The postmodern design approach, which surfaced in architecture in the post-1970s and which is beyond the scope of this paper, demonstrated itself in the public buildings located on the south-west corridor of the city in the years of 2000.

5. Conclusions and Commentary
Due to globalization and by the global capital becoming fluid and/or urban space being re-constructed, the sustainability of the conservation of immovable cultural heritage is becoming harder by the day. Within this framework, and when the value of and conservation criteria for modern architecture, mostly dating back to the 20th century, are considered, they are being more easily discarded for reasons of datedness, aesthetics, lack of historical document value or being new (modern). However, when the past is viewed from the present, each “architectural work of art” made “yesterday” should be transmitted to the future with its cultural heritage values. When the situation is interpreted for Turkey, it is privileged for demonstrating how modern architecture was utilized by the Republic in actualizing the nation-building process. Ankara, in this project, is of priority for its mission of the capital and for its public buildings as signifiers of power. Nevertheless, it is equally under the threat of destruction like the examples of modern non-governmental architecture. To this end, the necessity to urgently define new values on conservation criteria and value for all modern architectural heritages is evident.

Notes
1. In everyday language, modernism is used for the reflections of modern thought on any field, or for the characteristics of a style or product that are of the modern period. The scope of this concept is, however, within the field of universal, rational, progressivist, positivist world view. As a transformation field for the life styles (modern) of enlightened individuals and of culture (modernity), modernism foresees the city as the place where modernist culture is created, taught, and transmitted to new generations and to newcomers. Hence, examples of modern architecture are mostly located in the cities [21].
2. The Art Nouveau movement led art and architecture to purify from classical styles. Instead of buildings that take historical styles as reference, Art Nouveau architecture foregrounded Neo
Baroque motifs and botanical decorations (1896-1900), and later simple ornamentation (1905-1914), and after 1925, established a functional parallelism through curves, geometrical figures and decorations as an international style. The functional and decorative use of iron through this movement is an architectural revolution. The use of glass along with iron has brought about different solutions to lighting [3, 4].

3. The authentic architectural design of the building, constructed between the years 1933 and 1934, belongs to Şevki Balmumcu. This building was appropriated in 1948 by the German architect Paul Bonatz in line with the Second National Architecture Movement and transformed into an opera building.
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