Chapter 3
Architectural Professionalization in Turkey, Professionalism and Its Posts

Bilge İmamoğlu

Abstract The chapter discusses professionalization and development of a professional ideology in architecture by means of focusing on a historic narrative in which the process was not reflecting the sociological definition of the process (which is also discussed at length); the twentieth century developments of architectural profession in Turkey. Through this example, the chapter aims to discuss how certain ideological identifications regarding the architectural profession is still being reproduced in architectural historiography and architectural education, as well as the current architectural practice. The chapter additionally proposes to discuss possible new perspectives on how the architectural praxis is understood by utilizing the critique of professional ideologies and their reproduction within the field.

Keywords Architectural professionalization · Modern Turkey · Architectural historiography

Professionalism is one of those ambiguous concepts which can be observed to be used with a wide variety of theoretical references and discursive implications in different contexts. The everyday use of the word usually refers to the set of skills, judgment and behaviour that is expected from a professional; simply, it is the noun derived from that adjective. As language almost always contains strong hints on how we understand and reflect the world, and words we choose to name concepts carry within in a sense the biography of that concept, I will start by pointing out a plainly obvious fact in the nature of that derivation: that the noun form of the adjective professional is professionalism and not "professionality"—that word does not exist in the majority of the main dictionaries. "Professionality" would imply that being a professional is about being in a state or quality in relation to that adjective; nevertheless, "professionalism" does more than that, the suffix -ism takes the noun from a passive to an active nature and relates it to the acts, practices and processes and their manifestations, renders it a behaviour and not just a condition.

B. İmamoğlu (✉)
Faculty of Architecture, TED University, Ankara, Turkey
e-mail: bilge.imamoglu@tedu.edu.tr

"Professionalism" then, in everyday use of the word, is about acting professional, rather than simply being one. That also makes perfect sense if we look further into the etymological root of the word "profession".

The oldest use of the word in the European languages is rooted in the religious practices, and starting with around the thirteenth century the word is used for "the vows taken upon entering a religious order"[1], coming from Latin professionem, which is "public declaration", from past participle stem of profiteri "to declare openly". In that form the verb "profess" is still in use, meaning to declare openly. From early fifteenth century, the word "profession" expands from religious to occupational practices, meaning "occupation one professes to be skilled in", and from early seventeenth century on, it also means the "body of persons engaged in some occupation".[2] In this sense it is worth pointing out that, as observed in the history of the use of the word, being a professional has not only been about acting as one, but also, and even more importantly, is about carrying this action to the level of a public declaration. Even the etymology of the word, in addition to everything else to professions and professionalism, suggests that being a professional goes well beyond possessing a set of skills and training; it gains its meaning in its social manifestations. Well before the modern age, the word profession was referring to the social practices of having an occupation, as well as the occupation itself, in which the occupation holder manifests his use and services for the society in relation to a specialized set of skills, and in return for convincing the society in that sense, collects its social rewards, commercially or otherwise.

Yet despite the long history of its etymological roots, "professionalism" is a modern word.[3] The appearance of the word with this suffix in the English language is not before the mid-nineteenth century. It is not a surprise, as well; the concept as we understand it today is a modern one. As a process, the professionalization of occupations is considered by many scholars of modernity as one of the fundamental processes that the modern age underwent, together with and parallel to other major ones such as secularization, nation-states, industrialization and urbanization. Similar to the pre-modern nuances within the word profession, professionalization as a modern process is also not limited with the changes and developments in the particular ways individuals receive a specialized training and practice their occupational skills, but is understood in the radical shift in the organization of the whole set of practices in its institutional, legal and social means. Such organizational processes that end up in the formation of modern professions have been studied for some time in a wide variety by many scholars, within the field of research now

---

[1]Interestingly, more or less the same is also relevant for the Arabic word "*meslek*", that we also use in Turkish. Its root is "*süluk*", entering a route, an occupation or a religious sact; an attitude, behaviour.

[2]http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?term=profession&allowed_in_frame=0.

[3]http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed_in_frame=0&search=professionalism&searchmode= none.

mostly referred as sociology of professions. In a very rough generalization of the field's analysis, certain common patterns can be observed.[4] Such patterns include several steps and layers that can be summarized in the following form.

One layer is the formalization of the production and circulation of the knowledge specific to the occupation within centralized educational institutions, such as established and acknowledged schools of architecture. The circulation of knowledge produced in such institutions is reinforced by publication of scholar and professional journals, a process which also organizes the professional means of circulation itself, as well as the content of the knowledge to be circulated. A second important layer is the formation of professional organizations, preferably operating nationwide rather than local. Through both these institutions, development of a self-implemented code and set of regulations that go beyond issuing quality standards of the practice and extending into a form of professional ethics follow. And finally, as the ultimate aim of all these, acquiring on the one hand the social legitimacy of explicit rights for occupational privileges, most important of them being the exclusive rights to monopolize the market for the service provided by the profession for its members, and on the other, the state's legal approval for those rights and privileges comes forth. All these processes do not only occur within a series of interactions and negotiations between the professional community and the society and the state, but also professions confront and dispute each other in debating jurisdictional boundaries. Throughout the processes of professionalization, such jurisdictional boundary disputes mostly happened when sub-specializations within a single profession developed separately enough to become separate professions on their own. One of the oldest of such cases is architecture and civil engineering. Or a more recent one can still be considered to be in progress as computer engineering is born from electrical engineering. Through all these debates, disputes and negotiations, social identifications of professions are formed, defined and publicly manifested; in other words they are literally professed.

Sociological studies on professions did not stop at describing and defining the organizational processes through which professions are defined, but went on to study the nature of this self-definition asserted by professions. One important aspect for any disciplinary field of knowledge to become a profession is the autonomy in the definition of cognitive norms. Studies like Freidson's analysed how such cognitive and normative aspects could also provide a potential for bringing in a distinct definition regarding the social relations and their meanings in the area in which the members of the profession function.[5] Starting with the 1970s, rather critical studies on professions began to read the term "professionalism", not merely as certain behavioural and organizational patterns, but also as a "professional ideology" with all the critical

---

[4]For a wider overview, see: MacDonald (1995).

[5]Eliot Freidson is considered to be among the founders of the field with his study on medicine. See: Freidson (1970).

Marxist emphasis on the term ideology. Ideology in the professional context is seen as a false consciousness on one's social identifications that is developed not through actual class relations of production and distribution but through some other norm, which are training, skills and social values assigned to professional services.

One important name among such scholars whose studies are also significantly important for architectural profession is Sarfatti-Larson.[6] She studies the whole modern age as one wide and large professional project, emphasizing the important relation of professionalization to two other major aspects of modernity, the scientific knowledge and the free market. In analysing the professional practices in which specialized knowledge is transferred into social and economic rewards, she points out that the construction of "institutional means for self-definition and corporate defence" and the search for "adequate ideological legitimations for the monopolistic exclusion of competitors" from the market of services become two levels of the same professional project.[7] Larson also singles out architecture as an exemplary case where such ideological legitimizations could not be built as smoothly as in others, such as medicine and law. Architects' claim that architects and only architects should be producing architectural designs was not as compelling as the ruling out of, say, amateur surgery or unprofessional practices of law. Especially as engineers were building more and more types of structures that the modern age required, architects defended their disciplinary autonomy in a distinction of their "architecture" from the ordinary "structures" produced by non-architects, with ever-increasing references to the symbolic, cultural and theoretical forms that architecture operate with, and underlining their function as creative individuals who invest meaning in structures.

There are numerous other studies on professions that can be consulted in questioning how architects increasingly defined the social meaning and value of their services in the field of production of cultural forms and cultural norms and not necessarily referring solely to the inner and autonomous mechanisms of the discipline's discourse and knowledge production, but also by taking into the account such societal practices in which the discipline and its members are actors and sides and reflexively respond with professional agendas. One of the courses may, and many have, also refer to studies that are not built on the same concept. Foucault's studies on discourse and disciplines have many similarities to the concepts discussed here, only with a difference that shifts the focus to the vintage point of those that are subject to such discursive formations.[8] One other study on the other hand, Steven's, used Bourdieu's concept of "field" to discuss architecture, to arrive at similar observations to Larson's, where he argued that in the pursue of an autonomous control of the rewards of their field, architects chose to define their production within the "cultural field", where architecture with a capital "A" can actually claim autonomy to validate architectural products, whereas the everyday

---

[6]See: Sarfatti-Larson (1977); Sarfatti-Larson (1983).

[7]Sarfatti-Larson (1983, p. 61).

[8]See, for instance: Goldstein (1984).

production of ordinary buildings, which is "not architecture proper", happens in the economic field, and in that field architects are far away from claiming autonomy to assign and distribute value.[9]

As mentioned above, this social pattern of organizational processes of professions is observed as a process of modernization; historically, though changing both from one context to other and from one profession to other, it is roughly dated to the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As we discuss post-professionalism in architecture and urbanism in the context of this book, we are basically acting upon the premise that some fundamental things about the operational context of professions, or at least of ours, have transformed in our age, in the late twentieth and the early twenty-first centuries. That's parallel to the studies on modernity itself; theories and/or discourses on the modernity and modernism dated to the first half of the twentieth century is not seen completely encompassing to define what we are going through in our day, yet at the same time it is also not quite different enough to come up with entirely different names. So, we have been discussing about post-modernity, and yet not without dispute and ambiguity. The post in "post-professionalism" can also be argued to be sharing the ambiguity of similar other posts, as well as their usefulness in broadening the perspective of the discussion. Scholars of professions, such as Burns, acknowledge such usefulness in assisting further resolution of certain problems in the contemporary theory on professions, however only after reminding that the term has not actually been devised within the mainstream study on the field but in a variety of other disciplinary contexts, and that in many aspects contemporary analysis of professions has already been post-professional before the term's appearance.[10]

The assistance that can be employed on broadening the contemporary theory on architecture, and especially on the pedagogical perspective in architectural education, is most certainly welcome, considering to what extent the everyday educational practice in architectural schools is equipped to meet the realities of global architectural practice today. We actually should be updating our discourse on architectural knowledge, practice and education with renewed observations, not withholding the ultimate hope of arriving at another, a better architectural practice for all. Observations and interpretations of contemporary organizational realities of architectural profession can and will open up renewed critical positions that are deeply required for such hopes of betterment. But before proceeding with the topic here on the context of Turkey, let me give out the little note that the aim here in this text also includes the reminder that the studies that have been summarized above on professions and professionalism actually do include such critical positions which can be utilized to produce theoretical and pedagogical responses to whatever the professional practices are bringing upon the field. The argument here is that we can still provide great insights from the existing literature on professions in our attempts

---

[9]Stevens (1998).
[10]Burns (2007a). Also see: Burns (2007b).

to understand the architectural and urban reflections of this new condition that we label as "post-professionalism", before rushing out to create a post-professionalist theory of our own profession.

Yet in any way, this text cannot put forth such a claim, as the author is not after all equipped to propose a post-professionalist study on professions, as not being a scholar of sociology, but just an architectural historian studying modern architecture of Turkey. In fact, the research that is cited here did not initiate at a predefined interest in the studies of professions; its intention was not bringing in sociological definitions of professions to the field of architectural historiography on Turkey. The field of professions presented itself to the research on the way, as a useful tool to help answering some fundamental questions that was hard to answer without some insight from the theories that are formed outside the discipline. It all started (if I am allowed to carry this text a little into being a personalized narration, something of a "how I met my research topic" kind), when I was working as a research student for the digitalization of the visual archive on modern architecture in Turkey in Middle East Technical University, Ankara. At a later stage of the project, when the database we built for the archive was big enough to provide some statistical data, we wanted to see who the most cited architect in the archive was, hoping to get a quick list of the most prominent and/or important architects of the modern period in Turkey. According to the database, on the top of the list (and with a great portion that sums up to something around a quarter of the whole archive) was the letters NA: "Not Applicable".[11] We were curious, because as people in charge of building up the database, we knew for fact that we did not have that many buildings with architects unknown. When we looked into the archive, we found out that lack of information about the architects was not the majority of the cases; for a greater part of the NA's, the archive had the information where, when and how that architectural project was designed; but just not who. For most of such cases, buildings were designed by an office of a state institution, and for especially for the period from the late 1930s to the 1950s, by the Office of Construction Works within the Ministry of Public Works. Though we had this information for these cases, while applying them in the database we chose to put down this information in the "notes" part, and not in the part in the database reserved for the "architect" of the given building; since we did not know by whom and which architect individual the building was designed, we had decided that the authorship information in relation to such buildings was "not applicable" for the purposes of our database. In the cold-hearted rationality of the

---

[11]There were a total number of 698 buildings and/or projects in the database, 172 of which were registered with NA in the "architect" column. For those who wonder, architects who followed NA were: Sedat Hakkı Eldem (41 projects), Kemalettin Bey (27 projects), Clemens Holzmeister (25 projects), Seyfi Arkan (19 projects), Doğan Tekeli – Sami Sisa partnership (19 projects), Ernst Egli (17 projects), and Behruz Çinici (17 projects). The archive was significantly more complete for the first half of the twentieth century and around 60% of the content belonged to the period 1920–1950. Among NAs, 114 projects were produced in various state offices and rest were mostly residential buildings with actually unknown stories.

software, that decision led to the statistical conclusion that "NA" was the most important, prominent and productive architect of the early Republican period of Turkey.

This almost overwhelmingly simple observation led us to two basic points: one pointed out a well-defined research topic and architectural production in state offices, and the second to an additional research question: how come we know so little about this obviously major topic. There was a huge building stock that is dated to the two decades mentioned above and that is so large in numbers and wide in variety that it should have established the major perspective in all attempts at narrating, understanding and defining the architectural practice and discourse of the period in Turkey. The numbers in our database alone made it very clear that the production of the state offices constituted an important portion of the whole production. Among the NAs in the database, 114 projects were produced in various state offices and rest were mostly residential buildings with actually unknown stories. As a matter of fact, to be able to estimate the total share of the production of the state offices in the whole database, another 126 projects should be added to that number, which were buildings with known designers and had their place in the database in reference to those architects, but who in fact produced those designs as employees of certain state offices. Some of such architects were well-known names such as Ernst Egli and Bruno Taut; and some others had the privilege of being credited with the authorship of their designs because they personally published the projects in contemporary journals. All in all, 240 projects out of the total 698 were produced by various state offices, making the ratio 34%. Yet this field was not much researched at all, at least not with a perspective which took the mode of occupational organization into focus. Instead historiography insisted on architect names (such as the ones named in footnote 11) and observed the totality of the production as the individual's creation, not differentiating individual authorship from institutional practices. The general narration on the other hand has a lot to gain from a shift on the focus.

In the beginning of the Republican period of Turkey in the 1920s, when the young state was initiating a grand modernist construction program nationwide, the professional manpower to realize this program was too weak, almost even absent. There was almost no construction industry, know-how was limited and technical expertise was far from being extensive. There were schools of engineering and a fine arts academy that included a school of architecture in İstanbul that were all founded in the late nineteenth century, but still there were only a handful of architects. The lack of experts grounded the decision by the state on an extensive program of enrolling foreign expertise, not only in architecture but in many fields including education, medicine, law. That foreign expertise invited to Turkey was not only expected to practice but they also either founded or reformed the higher education institutes for the training of the future generations of Turkish experts. Ernst Egli from Switzerland, for instance, reformed the school of architecture with a revised curriculum in the 1930s on the one hand and designed many educational buildings in the office that was practically run at the academy but which was officially the Office of Construction for the Ministry of Education.

State's modernization program included aspects of industrialization and urban renewal, but an economic class capable of financing that was also lacking; so the state itself also directly undertook a planned industrial program, as well as almost all forms of construction throughout the nation. By the second half of the 1930s, the Ministry of Public Works was designed as the state institution assigned with all levels of responsibilities in handling almost all construction projects of the state, including infrastructure and planning.[12] The Ministry performed this responsibility within its own institutional means, and apart from some very limited exceptional cases of architectural competitions and private commissioning, production of architectural designs of various types of public buildings, as well as duties related to realization and control was handled within the Office of Construction Works within the Ministry of Public Works, and by architects and engineers employed here as civil servants. Considering the state's greater role in the production of the built environment at the period until 1950s when compared to private entrepreneurs, it is not a surprise that a significant portion of new construction in big cities like Ankara and İstanbul apart from private dwellings and limited number of commercial investments and almost all of designed buildings outside major cities was produced by this office, or some similar offices in other state institutions, as our database in the METU Archive project also confirmed.

Yet the appearance of these architectural products in the literature of the architectural history of the period is not proportional to this fact. The anonymous production of the prominent "NA" is hard to find in the literature. When these buildings are examined, one can put forth that the reason is not related to their architectural qualities. The number of well-designed buildings that have consistent connections to the architectural discourse in circulation in the country at the time is not significantly less when compared to the building stock designed by free architects of the time. It is also true that "ordinary" buildings that lack outstanding design characteristics are also many, but it only should be expected to be so, since the total numbers here at the side of the state institutions are also much greater, both in terms of buildings and number of architects involved. It would not be wrong to conclude that the average design qualities are not significantly differing, not at least enough to explain the exclusion of one side totally from the canon of architectural history. The only unquestionably apparent difference is in the institutional and organizational means of production, the state employment versus free practice.

At exactly this point, the question invites in the input from the studies on professions and professionalization. A viable interpretation to the absence observed here relates to the possibility that we, as architectural historians, are not also free of the professionalist definitions of our discipline. And that is understandably so, since at least for Turkey, people studying architectural history are mostly trained as architects. Those definitions include, if nothing else, an unbreakable bond between the two assumed ends of the process of architectural production; at the one end, we need to see and identify the architect, as the creative individual or at least a group of

---

[12]For a detailed narration, see: İmamoğlu (2010).

individuals, and his/their individualized, identifiable professional work at creation and at the other hand the unique architectural product as a single artefact. The production of the state offices blurred both ends of this assumed relation. When documents of the Ministry of Public Works are studied, especially the journal Yapı İşleri (Construction Works), it can clearly be observed that authorship was almost always denied in a consistency to individuals who took part in production, in a consistency which implies conscious choices. The buildings, either small and ordinary or big and prestigious, were credited as the production of the office in its institutional identity, even when a single building was designed by a single architect. At a later and very interesting case in the late 1940s, when the journal finally started mentioning the names of designer architects, the citation was only used in reference to the illustrations showing the architectural drawings; thus the architects were tacitly referred as "the producers of architectural projects", not as the designers of the building and not as its authors or its creators.[13] This shows very clearly how the institution reflected an environment in which usual assumed professional definitions on jurisdictional boundaries were irrelevant to the identification of various roles in the production of a building within the institution and secondary to its collective character. And also in many cases, architects involved did not assume their architectural roles in usual individualized ways; architectural projects were produced by many architects collectively or in a rotating sense, mostly unavoidably because of the high mobility of employed architects in between different state institutions, and the office made an extensive use of practices like type projects, modifiable model designs.[14]

If we continue to read the publication of the Office of Construction Works in the Ministry, we can also observe that issues and debates on architectural style were also completely absent in its pages, an issue which was a most popular topic in the architectural publication of the time run by free practicing architects. Instead, two issues dominated its representational attitude: one being a special emphasis on the quantity of the production, underlining again and again the fact that the Republic is constructing, and in huge numbers, in various scales, for towns and cities big and small, a fact that is rhetorically tied to the revolutionary character of the Republic. The qualitative value assigned to this production on the other hand is always grounded and sought legitimization on the concept of public interest. That of course is not particularly an architectural ground; it is put forth as the base for everything that the Ministry did and architectural production is not seen as an exception. These two recurring themes, the extensiveness of production and public interest, as its definitive motive formed the whole ethos that can be read through the pages of the journal.[15] The Ministry had no interest in the cultural forms of architectural meaning and did not approve the production of it as a separate marketable service.

---

[13]Anon (1948).

[14]İmamoğlu (2010), 90–92.

[15]See, for instance: Anon (1938).

This indifference towards discursive issues of architectural discipline also explains why this journal published by the Ministry is not much popular among the architectural historians studying the period, although it does include extensive statistical and material data on a significant portion of the production of the built environment of the time. Instead, historians exhaustively studied Arkitekt, the only journal published by the professional architectural community starting with 1934. This journal is in fact a heroic deed, managed by a handful of architects for numerous decades, and thanks to it we now have information and documentation on many buildings that do not exist anymore, or designs that were never built. But on the other hand, its position in our literature as a single reference is so strong that we are tending to treat its documents and manifestations as a direct and holistic reflection of whatever was going on in that period in terms of architecture, forgetting from time to time to preserve our critical distance to its discursive formations. We are tempted to overlook the fact that it was published by architects who were still at an early phase of professionalization, in which they were still far from securing their practices and their control on the field of their practices, both in legal terms and in terms of social prestige and approval. Foreign architects, as mentioned above, were an issue, as they were given almost all prestigious public buildings. On the other hand, the state was making it very manifestly clear that, for its construction program, it preferred to employ architects within its own bureaucratic organization, rather than commissioning free practicing architects. (That was also so for foreign architects, they were actually employed by the state, with the exception of Clemens Holzmeister, who designed numerous prestigious administrative buildings in the capital city Ankara.) Even for the limited amount of commissioning that these architects could find for themselves, either from the state or private investors, the market was not in a full sense protected legally from external competitors; laws which make sure that only architects can produce architectural designs were appearing slower and less effective than they should. In this context, it should be very hard to read discursive and even theoretical articles in the journal as free from this very pressing professional agenda.

In this context and in a way that perfectly follows the abstract model put forth by Larson, the journal Arkitekt became one of the lead medium where theoretical debate on the style proper for the architectural representation of the cultural values of Republican revolution was held. By the endless debate on the national and modern identifications that should be reflected through the architectural language of the Republic, architects of the time tried to convince the state that they possess the necessary expertise and means to provide the architectural form that is necessary for a proper representation of republican values, for the creation of a Republican Turkish architectural style, with an enthusiasm that the state itself or its construction offices did not actually share.[16] In accord with the same professional agenda, the

---

[16]A large number of articles in the journal, especially the editorials maintained a non-aggressive yet insistent debate against the state's architectural policies. See as examples: Sayar (1943a, b, 1944, 1946), Eldem (1940).

journal Arkitekt also completely ignored those offices' actual architectural production, except for the times they were harshly criticized. (And that in fact is another basic reason why those buildings are still absent in our literature, as many students of architectural history use Arkitekt as their sole primary resource.) Such criticism aimed at the practices of state employment and its forms of organization but utilized almost every time the argument that was derived from issues of style. The architects gathered around the journal Arkitekt were trying to establish the definition of their expertize on the cultural field, for the goal of a greater autonomy in order to free the profession's control on the rewards of the field from the actual relationships of production and consumption that was at the time mostly happening in state control.

Professionalization narrative in Turkey did not conclude with this dispute of architectural community versus state offices. The 1950s witnessed a change in the political power with a new and much more liberal government, which is also more sympathetic towards free practice when compared to their predecessors. In the year 1954, the national Chamber of Architects was founded, which marks an important milestone in the process of professionalization. In 1950s, there was an accelerated urbanization, and the first waves of migration to big cities appeared. New schools of architecture and planning were formed and this time not only in İstanbul. There was an increase in commercial activities but the state was still a major commissioner of architectural projects, but luckily it was much more open to the idea of architectural competitions as well as private commissioning. The period 1960s–70s brought again a turn. With the overthrow of the liberal government of 1950, there was a renewed role of state and planned development. Following the effects of 1968, the Chamber of Architects also radically changed its motives and themes. Architects organized in such professional organizations this time were characterized by being politically engaged in a manifest left orientation. The word "professionalist" at this time, translated as "meslekçi" in a downgrading manner, became an accusation in the debates of various groups within the Chamber, as a critic of prioritizing abstract qualities within the discipline over the social consequences of the production of the urban space. Everything shifted again after the military coup of 1980, and a completely liberal ground was formed paving all the way to the neo-liberalism of today. There was a significant rise in the construction industry, small investors were working hard to meet a never ending housing demand and architectural trends were following the exchange value rather than the use value, not very differing in today's big real estate development based corporations, except for scale. And finally today in Turkey we are living in the absolute dominance of a construction industry based on an endless production of shopping malls and residences.

Today in Turkey, the construction industry is enjoying a livelihood and upraise in the volume of business. In terms of the relations of the economic and political histories, there is a pattern that can be observed here, as was observed by Balaban[17]: Right after the military coup in 1980 with the election of 1983, Turgut Özal's party

---

[17]Balaban (2011).

that consolidated the decisively liberal and scattered conservative sides found a chance to maintain an almost unchallenged rule that lasted well into the beginning of the 1990s, and in the period the share of construction industry within the whole economic life increased significantly. A similar rise is now seen, as Erdoğan's conservative and neo-liberal AKP is establishing an even stronger authority on all levels of political and economic decision-making processes since the first years of the twenty-first century, after a brief period of coalitions and shifting shares on power. The urban spaces now and especially the urban public spaces are becoming targets for commercial investments with ever-increasing ambitions. As the political power is establishing its unchallenged rule more and more, they are also following the much older and commonly shared pattern of building their monuments as signs of their rule. The latest example is the presidential building that is built at a site which has been protected as a public urban green area with special laws since the beginning of the Republic.

Academics and professional organizations in Turkey such as the chambers of architects and city planners are trying to challenge such uses of public space. But the ruling party has long shut down communicative access to such NGOs in decision-making processes. On the other hand, the professional community at large also does not always share the critical position that the professional organizations assume. Numerous commercial projects with large shopping malls and luxurious high rise housings that are developed for previously state-owned public spaces with questionable (and questioned) legal procedures are designed by well-known and respected architects. The government also found for itself a particular architectural style to be assigned for the identification of its own prestigious buildings, as exemplified in the new presidential palace. This is, as expected, an eclectic historicism based on the common neo-classicism and traditional Turkish decoration, and particularly with Seljukid decorative forms. The choice of the stylistic language can be discussed at large, as a contemporary addition to the long history of eclectic historicism in the context of conservative political authority. However for the purposes of the discussion here, how the architectural profession is expected to provide its services to the political authority in terms of the stylistic and representational language, and nothing more, is more thought provoking.

For a long time in the Turkish urban history, which goes well beyond the beginning of AKP's rule, political authorities have found it too easy to dismiss criticism coming from professional organizations on the policies on urban spaces and built environment, simply by pointing out that the critic is "ideological and political" and not "professional". The professional vocabulary on architecture that seems to have met acknowledgement of the state today is the stylistic discussion, as exemplified by Birkiye, the architect of the presidential palace, who puts forth his design approach as "whatever that is classical is long lasting."[18] Such comments

---

[18]Birkiye remains mostly silent on the heated discussion on the latest project, this comment is related to a previous, smaller local administrative building of his design. http://www.arkitera.com/haber/11068/sefik-birkiye–klasik-olanlar-uzun-omurludur.

demonstrate that the architect is willing to discuss his designs on their stylistic choices, the issues that the critics are willing to urge on the other hand are simply dismissed, because the idea that the decisions on what to build, where to build, for what purpose and with what social and economic consequences have nothing to do with the architectural profession is maintained at large. In a disciplinary perspective, looking from our positions as scholars of architecture and through our body of knowledge defined within the discipline, that idea is far away from how we wish to see it. But if we take a rather wide step outside our disciplinary boundaries to be able to view things in a critical distance, that is, also critically distant to those boundaries, too, we may have to admit that such a limited definition has a lot to do with the social identifications of the professionalization of architecture throughout the history. The way political authority denies the architects the right to provide professional opinion on the social aspects of architectural production is not unrelated to the way the society at large understands or assumes definitions on architectural profession. And that is only so because architects themselves demanded for ages the social acknowledgement on the autonomous nature of architectural value. The existence of the notion of architectural value itself, which is produced and controlled autonomously and free of economic, social and political dynamics that are impossible to claim an autonomous control on, can in fact be considered to be the product of the profession itself, in its efforts to persuade the society that buildings have meanings that can only be produced by architects and their training and their knowledge field.

Here, there is no intention of discussing the architectural qualities of the projects that have been mentioned above. That is also why I am not providing any images of those buildings; what does that Seljukid historicism look like is irrelevant. The choice on historical eclecticism is also not the question that only makes it an easier target for architectural criticism; but the issue on professional identifications and its boundaries is unrelated to the name of the particular style. The question at hand is not very different when compared to other cases in which the architectural language is not historicist but high modern, such as Hadid's latest work in Azerbaijan.[19] In terms of basic professional services, what the architect provides in all is a translation to the architectural language of some predefined representational forms. The social, political and economic consequences are predetermined and are given to the designer as inputs of the design problem, and the architect in this context is the expert who translates those inputs into outcome as the architectural form.

I will go on to suggest that, even the cases in architectural history, where architectural production included concerns on better social consequences and where

---

[19]The works of "starchitects" in the non-western context of the "developing" world has for long been subject to debate in terms of an "architecture arms race". With the latest case, a New York Times article in 2013 answers the question "Who is Winning the Architectural Armsrace" as: "Baku, Azerbaijan, where the government is spending an estimated \$6 billion a year on architecture projects. As we wrote in February, Azerbaijan's leaders want to make their capital city a destination for the rich and fabulous". http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2013/10/13/magazine/look-architecture-arms-race.html?_r=0.

architects had invested social awareness in their designs, cannot avoid being reproduced epistemologically in the disciplinary field with reflexes and habits of the professional ideology. A straightforward example is how some important modernist housing projects appear in many architectural history classes of our architectural schools, at least in Turkey. Siedlungs of pre-war Germany or Corbusier's housing blocks in post-war French are mostly discussed with their avant-garde forms and strong innovative architectural language. Such notions are of course not wrong, but limiting the narrative with aspects that are distinctly and only architectural is not making justice to those masterpieces; on the contrary, it is underrating their importance in the history of the built environment. The professional definition at work that results in the misconception of these projects here is the same with the one that is referred above on the case of architectural historiography on 1930s and 1940s of Turkey, the assumed direct link between the architect as the creator and the building as the product. Our students mostly assume that those housing projects could be created because those architects were good architects capable of creating them. True story, on the other hand as well known, has also a lot to do with the local governance and their unique policies on housing in the Weimer Germany, or with the French Ministry of Reconstruction and some open-minded intellectuals who ran it. Such should not be just details of the narration reserved for graduate students in architectural history. Or else, inclusion of such modernist avant-garde narratives in our undergraduate education will only serve for the reproduction of idealized assumptions on our profession, which will not be very helpful for our graduates especially in this contemporary context in which such idealized assumptions are bouncing back to hurt the profession itself in its claims to have a professional word on the urban spaces.

The sad truth about the dismissal that the professional criticism on architectural and urban policies of the authority in Turkey has to confront is that the society at large approves this dismissal. A very enlightening example is a campaign held by the taxi and minibus drivers of Ankara at the late 1990s: when both the chambers of architects and planners took on legal action to stop construction of overpasses in the city centre that are being built by the local government in conflict with the existing plans, the taxi and minibus drivers organized holding posters on their vehicles which say: "architects should mind their own business and leave the issue of roads to us, who actually live on the road". The social response to our chamber's campaigns has not changed much ever since. Such examples make it very interesting to discuss post forms of professionalism, because these cases, and there is plenty of similar ones, remind us that the way in which everyday realities introduce themselves can also be pre-professionalist as well (and that one is so not only because of the sentimental remark on "living on the road").

Yet it is still extremely important to discuss what have recently been changing in our professional environment. Such discussions are providing good opportunities in reassessing our disciplinary conceptualizations in the ways they may still be reflecting older ideological identifications of the professional service. And they may still be ideological indeed, because for most of the time we are willing to propagate such identifications as conclusions of a "professionalism" which is a noble pursuit

for knowing better and acting better, and they still are products of a "profession-alism" which simply formulizes and controls the marketability of professional services. One example for how such ideological identifications can limit our per-spective is summarized above in the field of architectural historiography, where we as historians of architecture in Turkey for so long tried to read and understand the whole story following the theory and practice of the free practicing architects only and ignoring an equally large and important portion only because that did not fit our professional definitions. Studying history functions and means best when it pro-vides a full narration, including narratives that defy the limitations of strict norms, and so also pointing out to the future possibilities where that norm can again be challenged. Of course, no conclusion as simple as "it was all much better in state employment" will follow. Nevertheless it is worth remembering that in contexts like Turkey, both the development of the profession itself and the development of market forces that originally created the western notion of professionalism may not be typically similar to the contexts where such concepts originated. In the Turkish narrative, some particularities lead to the fact that the political and commercial influences of modernization started to affect the architectural practice and discourse much before the field could establish itself as a profession in the modern sense and thus issues like autonomy and social identifications in relation to professionalism have even further twists than usual. In this context, discussions on new concepts such as post-professionalism can indeed bring in some fresh air and help for a better definition of the social role of the discipline. However, it is equally possible that they get lost in the maze of the unresolved complexities of their pre-post forms and end up being just used for a re-polishing of the old idealizations of the profession as marketable expertize in a postmodern disguise.

Apart from the Turkish context, many concepts that come in the package with the debate on post-professionalism can already go either way. The concept of interdisciplinarity for instance; if the concern is that traditional "disciplinary" professional practice is resulting in a loss of professional roles in the market, it is simply logical to assert that interdisciplinary approaches to architecture can bring in some new equipment for reassuring those roles. Yet, referring to the studies on professions given above, there is nothing post-professional in such an assertion. In fact it is professionalist to the bone; interdisciplinary in such an approach is merely about formulizing (or inventing, if that need be) new professional niches of mar-ketable specializations. Or in a better scenario, we can utilize the concept of interdisciplinarity to get rid of epistemological reflections of jurisdictional bound-aries that limit our pedagogical methods and integrate its implications to the ways that we train new architects in which they are also trained in the ways they com-municate with the non-architect and even the non-professional actors in the shaping of the built environment, with the ultimate hope that they do not only become good designers capable of creating good architecture but also be equipped with tools to take part in the collective creation of the social ground that can create better urban spaces.

References

Anon (1938) Cumhuriyet Nafıasında Hukuk İdeolojisi [The ideology of law in the republican public works]. T.C. Bayındırlık Bakanlığı Bayındırlık İşleri Dergisi Yönetsel Kısım [Journal of Public Works, Administrative Part], vol 5, no 5, pp 489–495

Anon (1948) T.C. Bayındırlık Bakanlığı Bayındırlık İşleri Dergisi [Journal of Public Works], pp 162–163

Balaban O (2011) İnşaat Sektörü Neyin Lokomotifi. Birikim 270:19–26

Burns E (2007a) Developing a post-professional perspective for studying contemporary professions and organisations. In: 5th critical management studies conference, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK

Burns E (2007b) Positioning a post-professional approach to studying professions. NZ Sociol 22(1):69–99

Eldem SH (1940) Yerli Mimariye Doğru [Towards a national architecture]. Arkitekt 10:73

Freidson E (1970) Profession of medicine: a study of the sociology of applied knowledge. University of Chicago Press, Chicago

Goldstein J (1984) Foucault among the sociologists, the "disciplines" and the history of the professions. Hist Theory 23(2):170–192

İmamoğlu B (2010) Architectural production in state offices: an inquiry into the professionalization of architecture in early Republican Turkey. Publikatieburo Bouwkunde, Delft, pp 90–92

MacDonald KM (1995) The sociology of professions. Sage, London

Sarfatti-Larson M (1977) The rise of professionalism. University of California Press

Sarfatti-Larson M (1983) Emblem and exception: the historical definition of the architect's professional role. In: Blau JR et al (eds) Professionals and urban form. SUNY Press, Albany, p 61

Sayar Z (1943) Biz Ne Yapıyoruz? [What are we doing?]. Arkitekt 9–10:193–194

Sayar Z (1943b) Bir Yapı ve İmar Politikamız Var mıdır? [Do we have a policy of buildings and construction?]. Arkitekt 5–6:97–98

Sayar Z (1944) Resmi Binalarda Otorite İfadesi [The authoritarian expression in official buildings]. Arkitekt 5–6:126

Sayar Z (1946) Devlet Yapılarının Bugünkü Durumu [The current condition of public buildings]. Arkitekt 11–12:249–250

Stevens G (1998) The favored circle: the social foundations of architectural distinction. MIT Press, Cambridge

Author Biography

Bilge İmamoğlu graduated from the Middle East Technical University, Department of Architecture, in 2000 with the degree B. Arch. He completed his thesis on the workers' houses designed in the early Republican period for the Zonguldak coal field in 2003 and got his M.A. degree from the History of Architecture program in METU. He assisted architectural design studios and courses on modern architecture in Turkey, while he was employed as a research assistant in METU from his graduation to the year 2007. In this year he went to the Netherlands, to carry on his research on the professionalization of architecture in Turkey that he began in the doctoral program at the Department of Architecture, METU, at the Institute of Art, Architecture

and Urbanism in Delft of Technology. He was employed by TU Delft as a Ph.D. Researcher until he defended his thesis and got his Ph.D. degree in 2010.

His studies and researches into various fields in the general frame of modernism and theories and applications of modern urbanism and architecture are such as twentieth century architecture in Turkey, professionalization of architecture in Turkey, documentation and conservation of modern architectural heritage.