

Cooperation [f]or Competition: Antalya's Global Fortune

*Reyhan VARLI-GÖRK **Helga RITTERSBERGER-TILIÇ

Introduction

The main goal of this paper is to discuss inter-linkages and hierarchical relations of Antalya Metropolitan Municipality with major cities especially with Istanbul during the culture-based urban restructuring process experienced in the (neo-liberal governance) period 2004–2009. With regard to this definitive aim, this study is concerned with the underlying relation between 'growth machine' alliance in Antalya and global players in İstanbul, as well as this relation's impact on the process of 'restructuring' Antalya specifically into a 'city of culture'.

The major argument of this paper is that Istanbul distinctly influences the various subfields of economy in Antalya and has predominated culture, art and even municipal administration. In short, Antalya draws comparisons between itself and Istanbul, sees Istanbul as an example, mimics Istanbul but does not compete with it; in this sense, Antalya is not a competitive city but a *complementary city* to Istanbul.

In respect to the overall structure of the study; the first part is to discuss some of the conceptual issues on urban restructuring along with the methodology devised for gathering the empirical data. The second part illustrates the development of tourism industry as the major economic field in Antalya with some reference to its historical geography. The third part provides details on complementary strategies of the growth oriented local alliance to cope with the the dead end of mass tourism in Antalya during the neoliberal governance between 2004 and 2009. In the final section, Antalya's cooperation with İstanbul is critically discussed.

Conceptual Frame and Methodology

Since the term restructuring is the system's attempt *to resolve a crisis*, it implies some shifts in policies concerning governance, planning, culture and economics in a specific geographical location of production and consumption in the capitalist mode. A full grasp of the present problems is only possible through an analysis of urban politics and urban policies by exploring these shifts. Since the early 1990s, the world has witnessed a global scale economic restructuring; a shift from economic to urban restructuring.

First of all, Marxian theory of *urban political economy* is preeminently a *theory of crisis*. As *capitalism struggles to create a physical landscape appropriate to its needs and purposes* (both in production

* Assist. Prof. Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Çankırı Karatekin University, Çankırı reyhavgork@gmail.com, rgork@karatekin.edu.tr

** Assoc. Prof. Department of Sociology, Middle East Technical University, Ankara. helgat@metu.edu.tr

and consumption) the most fundamental inquiry was regarding the clarification of the major reason underlying the process of restructuring Antalya. In other word, it focuses on the major crisis with which Antalya is faced and the attempts to resolve it through urban restructuring.

In order to integrate growth coalition's perspective into the analysis, in addition to the critical review of the urban restructuring, a field research had been conducted in Antalya (2006-2010). Various qualitative research methods were used to collect data; individual interviews were conducted (representatives of different interest groups like bureaucrats, local politicians, entrepreneurs, representatives of NGOs, etc.); group interviews of academics were realized; life history accounts (memoirs) were collected; and the news on Antalya in local newspapers were systematically analyzed. During the field research twenty six (26) interviews were applied on an institutional basis and two interviews on an individual basis. In this study, empirical data is derived from the transcriptions of twelve (12) interviews out of total twenty eight (28) interviews.

The 'restructuring' process becomes clearer when viewed through the lens of these interviews. During the restructuring process, since the major strategies of the growth alliance were geared towards transforming Antalya into a 'city of culture'. The very concept 'city of culture' in urban studies literature revolves around the issues regarding the *growth oriented development strategies* of cities competing with other cities for financial and capital investment.

A varying set of agents comprising the 'growth coalition', whom Logan and Molotch (1987) define as the 'rentier' class, are those centering on developers, realtors, and banks, who have an interest in the exchange of land and property. Rentiers are supported by a number of auxiliary players in the field including institutions like the media, universities, utilities, professional sports franchises, chambers of commerce and the like.

Answering the primary questions, "Is there an overarching or elite organization in Antalya?" and "How active are these organizations in the city?", the first finding of this study is that the Antalya Greater Municipality (AGM) is the leading agency in the formation of a pro-growth coalition in Antalya with endless support from Antalya Ticaret ve Sanayi Odası (ATSO, the Antalya Chamber of Commerce and Industry) as the second most important agent. As observed in news in the newspapers, magazines and broadcasts on TV, from the first day of the municipal election in 2004, both the local and the national media have supported economic development efforts of the 'growth machine' alliance in Antalya. The research also showed that the major crisis in Antalya is 'the declining prices attached to Antalya's tourism services and products in the global market'. Thus, the growth alliance sought strategies to increase the value of the tourism services and products offered in Antalya. In this sense, five major agency groups can be defined, agencies that have a vested interest in the process of restructuring Antalya; and a

potential opposition group. The pro-growth coalition brings together the five major groups; namely, the state, local government (governor, mayors and managers), capitalist entrepreneurs in any field, NGOs (Chambers of Commerce, Architects, Planners), and cultural and academic institutions. It is also argued that the potential oppositions may come from the representatives of the artists and the intellectuals in Antalya (Antalyalite Intelligentsia).

During the the culture-based urban restructuring process experienced in Antalya between 2004 and 2009, it is observed that the AGM has put the neoliberal urban governance into practice. In the neoliberal view, the “preferred form of governance is that of the ‘public-private partnership’ in which state and key business interests collaborate closely together to coordinate their activities around the aim of enhancing capital accumulation” (Harvey, 2006: 27). For Harvey, in the neoliberal state, competition between—individuals, firms, and territorial entities (cities, regions, nations, regional groupings)—is deemed to be a primary virtue. Replacing the concept of the competitive city for creative purposes, especially to attract the global capital, de Roo (2007) introduces the oncept of the “complementary city”, by which he suggests a collaboration of agencies in the specific fields of two cities to reverse the money flow from the periphery to the center. With this concept, de Roo proposes a planning model for cities at the peripheries to complement the global projects developed by cities occupying positions of higher rank within the hierarchy of world cities.

A Short Historical Geography

Antalya is a city on the Mediterranean coast of Turkey. Its climate, nature, tourism investment possibilities and ever-increasing influx of migrants from other parts of Turkey have made Antalya one of the most rapidly developing cities in Turkey, and it is also the seventh most crowded city with a population around 1,100,000. Antalya is the second in Turkey in terms of rapid population growth rate, due to migration for nearly 40 years (Kıvrın and Uysal, 1992: 37; Güçlü-Özen, 2002: 45). Because of its quiet atmosphere and short winter *seasons*, the city has been a destination for retirees from EU countries, too, especially from Germany, Austria and Holland and England since the beginning of the 1980s, and from Russia, the Ukraine, and the countries in the northern Caucasus since the beginning of the 1990s.

Antalya has never been a sizeable urban settlement since ancient times till the midst of the twentieth century. Although Antalya was famous for malaria during the Ottoman period, since the beginning of 1940s it has become the center of attraction and fascination with its newly constructed parks, boulevards by the co-operation of government and the people in Antalya (Va’la Nureddin, 1944: 8).

Rather than an industrial city, Antalya brings to one's mind a destination for tourism, tourism investment, or holidays. The region appeals to both foreign and Turkish tourism investors because of its historical treasures and natural beauty with its untouched shores and translucent sea (Kıvrın and Uysal, 1992: 52). In the early 1980s, the central government passed a law permitting the 49-99 year leasing of and construction on the forest land along the coastal line, which has resulted in a great deal of tourism investment both in the city and along the 640 km shoreline in the form of hundreds of licensed establishments built to date. The opening of these establishments dramatically changed the whole economic, social, and cultural structure.

Toward the 1960s, the establishment of tourism industry was proposed by the UNDP, as one of the most important development strategies for the Antalya Region (FAO-UN, 1966: 19). In those years, the reporters saw the natural and cultural potential in the region as an asset in its transformation into a tourism center for wealthier European vacation goers, who were looking further and further afield for new resorts synchronous with the transformation of European Mediterranean shores into holiday resort centers.

In the early 1960s in Turkey, one could not talk about a 'capitalist entrepreneur' nor a 'culture of capitalism' in society. In the *Preinvestment Surveys of the Antalya Region*, the reporters wrote the following about 'entrepreneurship in the Antalya region' at that time:

A large class of adventurous and confident businessmen does not exist. The small entrepreneur encounters a formidable psychological barrier in the transition from 'working boss' to 'supervising boss' because this involves him in matters beyond his knowledge and experience. He is reluctant to seek bank loans which may be available to him. He has little sense of salesmanship or knowledge of markets and he is inclined to wait for customers rather than to seek them. Added to this is the tendency of workers to seek independence and a higher status and income by starting their own business after a few years of employment. Thus, the very small enterprises tend to proliferate rather than to grow into medium-sized units. There are also other factors such as the tax structure and certain regulations which, though admirably intended, hamper the growth of the smaller enterprises (FAO-UN, 1966: 12).

The field research shows that no noteworthy businessmen came out of Antalya until the end of the 1980s. One of the interviewees, R3, believes that it is still hard to think of the name of any native Antalyalite entrepreneur investing in the tourism industry and says the following about the issue:

R3: *Antalyalites have no idea what it means to actually earn money by working and how hard it is. But from Adana there is Sabancı, and from Kayseri others. Then there is Koç from Ankara. I am not even sure if there are small entrepreneurs from Antalya. Even if there are, they are probably second generation Antalyalites.*

As an alien sector within the economic, social and cultural structure of Turkish society between 1960 and 1980, the tourism industry and tourism as a social phenomenon was hardly

understood. Informant R6, who had also been involved in some part of the *Güney Antalya Turizm Gelişim Projesi* (GATGP, South Antalya Tourism Development Plan,) in Antalya in the late 1970s, implies that the meaning of ‘being a hotelier’ in those years had some negative connotations and says the following about the ‘tourism investors’ and ‘hoteliers’ of the period:

R6: *In the 80s, in 79 no one wanted these beautiful places that the Tourism Ministry offered. This is because there was no one who could do the job. There was no one who knew about tourism. Running a hotel is not everyone in Anatolia could do. It didn't exactly have a good reputation. People saw hotel owners or managers as ... [equivalent of brothel manager]... (snickering...).*

On this matter, it is suggested in the *Preinvestment Surveys of the Antalya Region* prepared by the UNDP that the infrastructural facilities should be provided by public authorities, and the costs should be considered as an investment to be repaid out of the tax revenues of the private establishments (FAO-UN, 1966: 88). As a result, the reporters proposed the ‘Regional Development Plan,’ whereby Antalya would be developed into the ‘largest tourist center’ in the area (Ibid.: 93-4).

The GATGP was put into practice within the framework of a modern planning approach. With regard to the suggestions in the *Preinvestment Surveys of Antalya Region* (1966: 28-30), for the first time in Turkey, a Local Authority¹ (or ‘Regional Development Agencies’, RDA as its popular name today) was formed in Antalya to coordinate the activities of the investors for the GATGP in 1972. It is worth mentioning both because it is the first example of an ‘organized tourism industry’ and it is one of the first RDA as a semi-independent project with its headquarters in Antalya.

What is more important than the above mentioned comprehensive plan for tourism development in the Antalya region is the “Tourism Support Act” which is significant between 1982 and 2005 in terms of the encouragement and planning of tourism investments. This act not only allowed for 49-year leases of government lands by way of their declaration as tourism area and centers and the granting of zoning permits and approval, but also directed the qualifications of tourism facilities through classification and certification as well as allowing these facilities to pay for utilities at the lowered rates normally reserved for residences. According to İlkin and Dinçer (1991: 10), 1980-1990 was when the tourism in Turkey developed at the ‘fastest’ pace. In this period, bed capacity increased from 56,000 to 173,000, and the number of visiting tourists went up from 1.2 million to 5.3 million.

¹ “An organization called the Antalya Regional Tourism Project Implementation Directorate under the Culture and Tourism Ministry was established to implement the project, or, in other words, “to assist in the planning and coordination of the project, solve problems on the spot and develop a ‘business mode;’ in the project implementation field and minimize the effects of pressure groups” (MOAŞ, 1996: 109).

In the late 1970s, when the GATGP was put into practice and even in the mid-1980s when mass tourism was first encountered, mass tourism oriented hotels kept popping up to meet this demand. The demand in those years seemed endless, with the excitement generated by the numbers of international tourists. In summary, until the mid-1990s, tourism policies in Turkey were taken up only in their economic dimensions, diminished to a mass tourism policy without alternatives and nature and culture did not factor in any of the plans. The tourism policies implemented in Turkey, and especially, are based on the Sun, Sea, Sand (3S) trinity, which targets ‘mass tourism’.

Saying that the number of five star resorts only in the Antalya region is 230, R24 states that the construction of so many five star resorts is the main reason Turkey has lost value in the tourism market. He believes that Turkey has lost a category, its good reputation in the international market and that it is unfair that such top notch service is provided for such little money.

It is understood from informant R11’s statement that the tourism facility investments and operations differ from those in Marmaris, for instance, or Istanbul since the planning stage has resulted in the resorts clustering in small ‘islets’ relatively far from each other and the city center.

R11: *Tourism started here around a gathering in the Side, Alanya area. Then the government took a look from above and initiated central plans. They created this place from scratch. Then Titreyen Lake, and in the 1990s, Belek was lost over time. But the city remains unaware of what is happening around them. Therefore, you can not really expect any other kind of development here. Then there’s Kemer. Even the Kemer region covers a 80 km shoreline. There are physical and geographic islands (clusters) in this region. There are Beldibi, Göynük, Kemer Merkez, Kiriş Mahallesi, Çamyuva, and Tekirova. On the other side, the latest developments are around Lara, Kemer Ağzı, Kundu, Belek, Boğazkent, Gündoğdu, Çolaklı, Kumköy, Side, Titreyen Göl, Kızılot, all the way to Alanya. There are small islets.*

The ‘satellite holiday village clusters’ defined as ‘islets’ by informant R11 are presented as tourism products in different places on the Antalya coastline; however, the products offered are almost identical. In Antalya, where diversification in tourism products is the issue at hand, the ultimate product offered in the resorts, despite the number of stars and high service quality is not very clear. Informants R11 and R2 say the following on this matter:

R11: *We can not offer anything. This is the main problem. When people travel abroad or to a different country, they seek certain things. People are actually after the alternative. They want to taste something new and different, to experience the pleasure in this. Most of the pre-research on the people coming here also points to this; most want to meet a different culture. They want to get to know the locals. But unfortunately, this rapid growth [in the tourism industry] caused us to create an abyss between the areas with the facilities and those without. In the same vein, we weren’t able to ensure the same visual development. One side of the road is one world and the other side is a different world. And the mechanisms to establish communication between the people here and the ones there do not work properly. There are actually differences in standards. Here you offer people a very different set of services, a different life; but life outside of here is very different. The buildings, the individual life standards, we provide all of this to foreign people who have this kind of a life style where they come from. In fact, we usually offer them more than their regular life standards.*

R2: *The tourism concept needs to be saved from between the road and the sea. This is where tourism has usually gotten stuck in Antalya; where it was built. Wherever you look, it is not just true for Antalya. Pamukkale, Kapadokya, everywhere but Erzurum; tourism is stuck between the highway and the sea. What about the other side of the road? Nothing! Even golfing areas are built below the road. This kind of luxury doesn't exist anywhere else in the world. We are cutting down forests and making golf resorts. Even though spaces are offered by Manavgat, they still do it this way!*

According to R11, Akdeniz Turizm ve Otelciler Birliği (AKTOB, Mediterranean Touristic Hoteliers and Managers Union) President R11, there exist various possibilities for recreational tourism products. Regardless, the 'all inclusive' system, where it is always the same kind of tourists who demand it has made distinctions invisible. Almost all of the actors in the field of tourism criticize it on the one hand, but end up embracing it when their chances of competing in the international market decrease. As for the reasons of this situation, R11 says the following:

R11: *This means that we have not been able to underline the differences. We have not been able to create packaging that would emphasize these differences or make products involving different concepts more visible. Therein lies the problem. All of this wealth exists here. But we have not been able to turn them all into products. Actually there are, in fact, difficulties in doing this. You can not just up and climb these mountains. The paths are not apparent, there are no plateaus. There are no guides to lead you up there. The channels from which to get help when necessary are not organized. There is the famous Köprülü Canyon (Creek) where rafting is done, but everybody there goes there. Even there, there are these kinds of problems. The place where they do rafting and the restaurants are hideous, but despite this, you get 300-400 thousand visitors there [per season].*

Beside its fame as a tourism destination, Antalya is also a city where "all branches of art have been respectfully accepted by its residents, who are known for their appreciation of and openness to art" (Demirtaş, 1996: 391), primarily because of the Golden Orange Film Festival held there annually since 1964, the Antalya International Piano Festival since 1999, 'the Faculty of Fine Arts,' founded as part of Akdeniz University in 1998, as well as other cultural and conventional activities on art and literature. On March 21, 2004, on "World Poetry Day," Güven Turan was awarded the first prize at "the 8th Annual Golden Orange Poetry Competition" in Antalya. During the ceremony, he claimed that "Antalya is the third 'city of culture' following Istanbul and Ankara" in Turkey (Portakal, 2004: 9).

Eagleton (2005: 25) once wrote that "by the 1960s and 70s, culture was coming to mean film, image, fashion, lifestyle, marketing, advertising, and the communications media." Supporting this argument, Bianchini (1993: 12) asserts that toward the end of the 1960s, the organization of festivals of art and other forms of cultural animation held in European cities helped to consolidate opportunities for participation in public life for people of different ages, social classes, genders, lifestyles and ethnic origins. The organization of the first Antalya Golden Orange Film Festival (AGOFF) in 1964 proved that Antalya was a follower of those European cities in the 1960s, particularly Cannes and Berlin. Since then Antalya has been hosting a sector

whose producers, directors, actors and other technical staff live in Istanbul through its own material assets and local agents and institutions.

2004-2009 Urban Restructuring for Global Fortune

Antalya, with its natural beauty and 650 km long coast line, has the potential to produce various products in the 230 five star resorts scattered along the shores; yet is selected by the mass tourists. Field research displays that the major crisis with which Antalya is faced is ‘the declining prices attached to Antalya’s tourism services and products in the global market’. ‘Cultural tourism’, ‘heritage tourism’ and ‘urban tourism’ are the new forms of tourism, i.e. of *niche tourism* in cities where the major strategy of political economy aims at capitalizing city’s cultural assets.

Looking at the process of restructuring Antalya into a ‘city of culture’ in four fields like art and culture, tourism and economy for the last five years, one can easily observe that almost all of the related institutions, foundations and establishments of art and culture have been administered or directed by outsiders, most notably by actors from Istanbul. Among these new actors the Türkiye Sinema ve Audio Visual Kültür Vakfı (TÜRSAK, The Turkish Foundation of Cinema and Audiovisual Culture) is noteworthy. Informant R4, the president of TÜRSAK, an organization founded by 215 people living in Istanbul working in the Turkish film industry in various capacities, believes that Antalya may be able to establish a name for the Turkish film industry not only in the national context but also in the international context. According to him with its wealth of natural and historical spaces, the density and quality of sunlight as well as its ancient cities like Aspendos, Termessos and Phaselis only forty minutes from the city center, and with five stars hotels with at least 200 rooms each to easily accommodate entire film production teams, Antalya is a prime location.

As Informant R2 claims “*even if the AGOFF is splendidly organized by an outsider institution, it is going to be transformed into an event working according to a market economy, where everything is calculated in relation to the laws of supply and demand.*” According to Informant R2, taking away the idea of the AGOFF, an idea conceived by Antalyalites would also imply the lack of sophistication and the incapacity of Antalyalites. Parallel to this view, Informant R3, an Antalyalite poet, criticizes the alienation of Antalya in the organization of AGOFF as follows:

R3: *Local factors, not to mention the local actors, as possible locomotives, have been withdrawn or been forced to withdraw from Antalya, especially in the fields of art and culture. They keep writers and painters as intellectuals outside of this [restructuring] process. Instead, he is following a different path, he is using the media well because he is also a journalist For many years, Antalya has been shaped in the Social Democratic Municipal Tradition. [...] Since they [Antalyalites] do not trust their own entity, their own intellectual potential, they have entrusted the AGOFF to a group of people from Istanbul. At least this is how I see it. Is there not one single person who could do the job [in Antalya]?*

Informant R3-1, a poet's wife who herself is a painter, is also critical of TÜRSAK organizing the AGOFF. She states, “*Antalyalites do not appreciate their own values. There is a common belief in Antalya that any outsider would know more, understand more [than Antalyalites].*” In a sense, while they talk about the cultural heritage dating back from Hellenistic, Byzantine, Seljukian and early Republican architecture as the physical evidence for nominating Antalya as a ‘city of culture’, they completely disregard their own intellectual, cultural, social, symbolic even creative capital.

During the unstructured interviews in 2006 and 2007, viewers from Antalya stated their observation that the AGOFF was gradually becoming an organization manipulated by agents from Istanbul—turning into an event less of Antalya and more and more of İstanbul. “In recent years, I am offended that these commercialized events held under the name of AGOFF as an Antalyalite,” writes journalist Birol Çağlayan and goes on, “This is not our festival. In our festival, famous stars would go to the coffeehouses in the slums and chat with the townfolk. All of the festival events were open to the public and the concerts and fairs were free of charge,” critical of the restructured AGOFF (*Milliyet-Akdeniz*, 18.09.2006).²

Based on what informant R5 has said about the organization of a film festival in Antalya being meaningless with an economy dependant on agriculture and tourism, in order for a film festival to be organized in Antalya, first and foremost, there needs to be a culture surrounding cinema and film making. In other words, organizing a film festival in Antalya would only make sense if the aim were to support the culture of film making and the film industry, and to promote this particular culture. Keeping in mind that we live in a world where global capitalism has crept into each and every crevice, non-industrial modes of production simply cannot survive. It follows from this that the film-sector still in its embryonic stage in İstanbul-Yeşilçam, is trying to become industrially reanimated in Antalya through the internationalization of the AGOFF and the establishment of the Eurasia Film Market.

Antalya certainly can not industrialize the Turkish film sector all by itself. However, the stake holders there are determined to transform Antalya into a film production center. The Eurasia Film Market was launched in 2006 in Antalya, beginning with the internationalization of the AGOFF by Eurasia Film Festival in 2005. The predominant reason underlying the organization of the Eurasia International Film Festival is to show the world Antalya's potential of becoming a fourth center of film industry in Antalya, right between Asia and Europe alongside other recognizable film industry centers in the world, namely Hollywood, Europe, and

² See the news by Birol Çağlayan “Bir festivalimiz vardı” [“We had a festival”] *Milliyet-Akdeniz*, 18.09.2006.

Bollywood. The main goal for holding the Eurasia Film Market in Antalya is to introduce an international co-production market offering film business facilities—sales offices, market screening, buyer and production services—in between Pusan in Asia and Cannes in Europe.

In terms of policy, the field research shows that Antalya has outlined clear goals to become a regional tourism hub for culture and convention, entertainment, events, and a tourism partner to complement Istanbul—and to some neighboring major cities in Turkic countries, but probably in the future. As a tourism hub, Antalya aspires to be more than just a travel destination. The common language of the stakeholders comprising the growth machine in Antalya shows that it will also be a center where international festivals and other cultural events can be held here, as a gateway in between Asia and Europe.

In addition to being a tourism service hub, for being a ‘city of culture’ in the region, another strategy in the field of art and culture is about the issue for nominating Antalya as an ECOC. In 1999 for the coming millennium European Parliament and the Council (European Council, 2007a) has decide to allow non-member country to participate in the action. Istanbul was nominated as ECOC and it was selected as the ECOC of the 2010 although Turkey is not a member of EU.

The findings of the field research show that the Mayor Menderes Türel and other key actors in Antalya were thinking about nominating Antalya as an ECOC as well. Informant R24, who was the president of ATAV for many years as well as a tourism business owner, believes that the Antique Greek and Roman heritage is not sufficiently appreciated. He says that if the right strategies were employed, Antalya could be the 2015 European Capital of Culture (ECOC):

R24: *I wrote that just as Istanbul set a goal for 2010 and made it happen – the goal of becoming a city of culture- so should Antalya have a similar goal. I think that Antalya needs to have set a target by 2015, or actually to reach that target [and be the European Capital of Culture] in 2015. In reality, Antalya is ready for this. It would only take an antique drama festival in the antique the world would be enthralled. There is an antique amphitheater here every 20km. Can you imagine? Organizing festivals one after another at these amphitheaters and since they are far apart, it would be accessible and would attract much to these cities as a location.*

In order to accelerate urban tourism, new fairs have been organized in Antalya following the BAGEV (Foundation for the Development of the Western Mediterranean Economy) fair which had taken place in 2004 in the Antalya Expo Center with the intention of helping the countrywide promotion of the companies and brands active in the Western Mediterranean Region; ensuring integration of the region’s economy into the Turkish and world economies, or in short, forming “a regional power”³. During the opening ceremony of the BAGEV Industry

³ 1-5 September 2004, IRF Fairs, Mother & Kid Fair, Antalya Glass Pyramid; 16-19 September 2004, Master Fairs, Glass and Glass Technologies, Antalya Expo Center; 23-26 September 2004, Master Fairs, Milk and Milk Technologies Fair, Antalya Expo Center; 13-15 October 2004, Antalya Agriculture City Directorate, Organik Agriculture Fair, Antalya Glass Pyramid; 22-28 November 2004, AFT Fairs, Food 2004 Fair, Antalya Glass Pyramid(ATSO, *Vişyon*, 2004, 18/203: 16).

and Trade fair in 2004,⁴ Özgen, speaking as the Chairman of the Antalya Ticaret ve Sanayi Odası (ATSO, the Antalya Chamber of Commerce and Industry), stated that their primary goal was to internationalize this fair and initiate the establishment of a ‘World Trade Center’ (WTC) in Antalya. Two years later, on 6 September 2006 Antalya was the third city to join the WTC network after İstanbul and Ankara as a branch of the İstanbul Center. Özgen spoke during the opening ceremony of the İstanbul World Trade Center (WTC) Antalya Branch organized at the Antalya Expo Center, and said that the WTC Antalya would contribute to developing fairs in Antalya, support the city’s promotion to international communities (ATSO, 2006, *Vizyon*, 19/224: 11). During the opening ceremony, the most important speaker, the İstanbul Greater City Municipality (from the political party Justice and Development Party, AKP) Mayor Kadir Topbaş stated that “with this center, Antalya would become the center for twenty cities, from Aydın to Eskişehir, and from Muğla to Denizli; and that it would have the backing of all of these cities and contact millions of businessmen in the WTCs, which have 300 branches in total.” Topbaş, mentioning that the world has become a global village, continues:

While competition in trade takes place only at the national level in the fields that companies are active in, today, sectors have to compete with similar sectors on the other side of the world. We must also take our place in the midst of this competition. In a world where everything changing and developing at an immense rate, where there is global competition, we are compelled to join in. In the past, individual companies carried weight, but today there are multi-national corporations. Trade has grown so much that being in contact with other companies in the world and partnering with them has become a necessity. In an environment where there is international competition, capitals have started to merge (ATSO, 2006, *Vizyon*, 19/224: 11).

Elsewhere, in a broadcast panel discussion on TV (Haber Turk, *Bilgi Odası*, 05.02.2008), the Mayor of İstanbul Greater City Municipality (or the older brother of Antalya Greater City Municipality), expressed that “urban elites, and governmental elites, do their best to attract the global capital to the region” Cities, better to say ‘local units’ with their popular names, no longer see themselves as a constituting part of the nation-state; rather, they see themselves as local arena developing flagship projects in order to attract the globally circulating capital into their local units. The most dramatical outcome of this alteration is the change in the comprehension of local government that they formerly had recognized themselves as the provider of the services for collective consumption now have been sensitive to the demands of the capital as they are becoming more growth-oriented institutions.

During the 2004-2009 neoliberal governance, central government had intervened urban restructuring process for several times to overcome bureaucratic problems. When we look at

⁴ The İstanbul World Trade Center Antalya Branch opening ceremony was attended by the İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality Mayor, İstanbul Trade Center Chairman of the Board, Antalya Governor, AGM Mayor, President of the İstanbul Chamber of Commerce, industrialists and businessmen (ATSO, 2006, *Vizyon*, 19/224: 11).

other cities in Turkey under the administration of mayors from AKP—Ankara, İstanbul, Denizli—we see that more or less the similar projects were implemented for spatial restructuring such as underground passes and intersections exist in Antalya as well. Informant R19 says the following on this matter:

R19: *So Ankara, then Istanbul, and now Antalya. The projects, you know about those; things like building underpasses, overpasses and bridged junctions. Then you see that the contractor that built the construction in Ankara is the same as the one that built them in Antalya or Denizli. I think we can conclude that the metropolitan mayors in cities like Ankara, Antalya and Istanbul have no function. They get orders from higher up to write up projects that so and so companies can take on, and the mayors from the AKP party approve such projects, the company that will win the contract is set anyway. I think that local governments need to regain their local authority. Today, especially AKP's municipalities are the local spokespeople for the central government and they function as the mechanisms that lift the obstructions in front of the bureaucratic hindrances.*

The structure of the field of tourism which is one of the most vital sub-fields in Antalya's field of economy broadens with a series of intertwined sub- and perhaps super-fields such as transportation, information, travel agencies, banking, promotion, accommodation, hospitality, culinary arts, entertainment, sports, culture, art and city spaces. Hence, the process of 'urban restructuring' in Antalya to resolve the crises in the field of tourism has spread toward other fields, namely the field of urban planning and design, the field of art and culture, and finally to the field of economy with the hope of becoming a 'world city'. In actuality, the visible acceleration in the 'urban restructuring' process, which aims to develop 'urban tourism' in Antalya and encompasses the fields mentioned above, could be explained with the fact that the municipal government and the central government are composed of the same political party (AKP) as pointed out by some informants.

R11: *I believe that Antalya has always been a city observed carefully by central governments due to its leading position in tourism. There may be problems stemming from the local administrators and the central government having different political views, but Antalya has always had a special position in the eyes of central governments.*

R24: *Let's talk a bit about its past. Until today, there was always a different party's, CHP's contributions on a social democratic path along this whole coast line where tourism is strong. But there is a changing trend in all touristy areas and that is towards AKP, the party in power. This change and these different expectations might be due to Turkey's structure. Because if you are a municipality at odds with the central government, this means you profit less from this. Of course, the increase in the investments in Antalya especially during this period, this air of change, in other words this transition from town to city was only possible with support from Ankara, as well. But this would not be happening solely through Ankara's assistance. There were locals who wanted this change who contributed to this. That's why we see so many large investments in Antalya, also in the culture field, not to mention major changes even in the AGOFF, which has been held for over 40 years in this period. These are not all Ankara's doing, regional will also plays an important role.*

R20: *Yesterday there was this thing. A promotional reception in honor of the fourth year of the municipality, or something. I mean, has anyone ever heard of such a thing? Instead of explaining what they have been up to for four years, they talked about how the prime minister visited 20 times. Every day some minister visits, the prime minister visits, the president visits. They care a great deal. Maybe this is a policy geared toward destroying CHP's last bastion. It's as if should they get Baykal out of the picture here, they will rule all over Turkey. I think this is why Antalya is important.*

R23: *Now the central government and Antalya. Antalya. Everyone keeps saying how important this is! Antalya has always received a part of the funds. This has increased in the last couple of years. The investment amount from the central budget per capita has increased in Antalya. And that is a public hospital, a new courthouse building and the like. A few roads, etcetera. [...] Don't be fooled. Most of our taxes are in Istanbul. Most of Antalya's tourism yields are taxed outside of Antalya. If that would change, the tax revenues in Antalya would increase drastically.*

R23: *Our local administrators get a share from the central government because of our taxes. But we are shortchanged. Because the taxes are paid there [Istanbul or Ankara]; they look at how much tax is paid and provide funds accordingly. This is wrong. Antalya should be granted special status. Because nine million people come here. The population increases in the summer and decreases in the winter. How many people is the municipality going to build sewage and purification systems? That's why Antalya deserves more. And you can't make Antalya shine with the typical investments made in typical cities.*

As observed, central government had played a key role in the process of restructuring Antalya as a 'city of culture' but at the same time sees Antalya as an instrument to 'represent Turkey' in the global market. For example, Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan⁵, who was in Spain to attend the Alliance of Civilizations Forum on 17 January 2008 in Madrid, speaks of Antalya and the AGM Mayor Menderes Türel with accolades. As seen in this example, the 'representation of Antalya' becomes a crucial issue since it also means the 'representation of Turkey' in social, economic, cultural and political terms.

While Antalya seeks ways to represent itself in the global market to become a tourism destination center, it is also regarded as a 'window' representing Turkey (Varlı Görk, 2010: 383). This view of Antalya as a 'window' representing Turkey is not very new. For example, another political personality, the head of the Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi (CHP, the Republic People's Party) Deniz Baykal, spoke at the ATSO Assembly Meeting on 21 June 2002 during Menderes Türel's ATSO presidency: "Antalya is a world brand city It is Turkey's 'window'. It is a dynamic center that has presented itself to the world in the best way possible and possesses an image" (ATSO, 2002, *ATSO Dergisi*, 16/176: 7). Informant R17, interviewed during the field research also uses this analogy to describe Antalya:

R17: *This is a good location, it is like a shop window. That organization is an Istanbul organization anyway. That ceremony [The Aydın Doğan Foundation Caricature Competition Award Ceremony] is by invitation only, so only certain people get invitations and most of those don't even go. That's right, the award ceremonies take place here.*

⁵ See also the news "Başbakan Erdoğan'dan İspanya'da Antalya'ya övgü." 17 Ocak 2008

http://www.antalya.bel.tr/tr/bel_guncel/haber_detay.cfm?sayfa=5733, accessed on 14.05.2010

"Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, who was in Spain to participate in the first Forum of the Alliance of Civilizations praised Antalya and its Metropolitan Municipality Mayor Menderes Türel in Madrid in front of the whole world. Saying they wanted to make Antalya a convention center, Erdoğan stated, 'Under Menderes Türel's Mayorship, Antalya has become a modern and city in every way'. Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan spoke at the Nueva Economía Forum in Spain's capital, Madrid, and answered questions during the second part of the forum organized by The Wall Street Journal. When a foreign journalist asked about tourism, Erdoğan talked about Antalya and Mayor Menderes Türel. Prime Minister Erdoğan said that they are going to make Antalya a convention center, and praised Metropolitan Municipality Mayor Menderes Türel, whom he had taken to Spain with him. Prime Minister Erdoğan said, 'Metropolitan Municipality Mayor Menderes Türel is also present. After Mr. Türel took on the position of Metropolitan Municipality Mayor, Antalya truly became a very different city. It has become a modern city in every way. Antalya has begun to flourish not only because it is a Mediterranean city, but also with its infrastructure, its superstructure and historical and natural wealth.'"

The Aydın Doğan Foundation Caricature Competition that informant R17 mentions is actually an Istanbul based organization, although the Award Ceremony is held in Antalya every June. This project organized by a foundation based in İstanbul is complemented by Antalya, which results in representing the culture field in Turkey through Antalya. From this perspective, while still not completely industrialized, the first competition of the Turkish film sector which exists in İstanbul, the AGOFF has been held in Antalya since 1964; thus, it is not recently that Antalya has become a ‘complementary city’ to Istanbul.

Despite its importance in the eyes of central government and İstanbul, the city share holders complain about the fact that Antalya is not getting the funds it deserves from the budget because the Turkish and international companies investing in Antalya are listed under Ankara or Istanbul tax offices, except for companies founded in Antalya⁶:

R23: *I think that the tax collected in Antalya is about 3.3% of all the taxes paid in Turkey According to 2006 results. But don't forget that the Antalya tourism sector doesn't pay taxes in Antalya. The headquarters of most of these hotels are in Ankara or İstanbul. Mostly in these two cities. And they pay their taxes there. [...] Antalya produces 3.3 percent of the GNP. Over 13-14 billion dollars. It uses that much of its electricity as well. But it collects less tax. It doesn't collect the same proportion of the taxes. The reason for this is the incredible dominance of İstanbul but also that the taxes for Antalya's tourism taxes are collected in İstanbul and Ankara. Don't be fooled; most of our taxes are in İstanbul. The taxes for the tourism revenues in Antalya are paid outside Antalya. If that changed, Antalya's tax income would really increase. Local administrations get a share from the central government because of our taxes. But we don't get as much as we should. Because the taxes are paid there [Istanbul or Ankara]; they look at the Antalya municipalities' taxes and pay accordingly. This is wrong. Antalya should be given special status because 9 million people come here. The population increases in the summer and drops in the winter. The municipality has to work accordingly, build a sewage system [according to these numbers] and purification system. This is why I think Antalya is entitled to more. And you can't make Antalya shine with the typical investments made in different cities.*

R2: *1/3 of Turkey's tourism revenue is generated in Antalya but the tax base is not in Antalya. All of the [companies'] tax departments are in İstanbul or Ankara. The money goes to the İstanbul revenue office and is reflected onto the budget of the İstanbul municipality. But our municipality collects the trash of the business here, we pave the roads, our coasts get contaminated, and the taxes go to İstanbul. I once did a calculation for this. If some of the money that goes to İstanbul would stay here, if you channeled half of that into culture, you could do amazing things.*

R14: *Now here, they are right about that, because the headquarters of the companies, the companies in most of Turkey are usually either in İstanbul or Ankara. Therefore their tax departments are always in İstanbul or Ankara, mostly in İstanbul though. So taxes always go İstanbul. Part of the work or actually most of it happens in Antalya, so he's right. But this law could be changed by the central government. The government can make the change and have them pay taxes here.*

R1: *This is true. It's not the [companies] that are responsible for this. This is because of the government. I would do the same if I were a hotel owner. You have to look at this from both perspectives. If I were a hotel owner, I wouldn't keep my books here. Because when your annual revenue is one million dollars, you are put in the large company category. For example, [an airline company] is visited every day by inspectors Why? Because there are very few large companies and this is one of the bigger ones. If their books were in İstanbul, there would be many more other large companies. If they were inspected this year, they wouldn't get inspected next year. You could be a*

⁶ See also ATSO (2007) “Antalya 2 veriyor 1 Alıyor” *Vizyon*, (20) 229: 28-29.

portfolio selected randomly, or one that is one out of five that are visited regularly. This is because of the government. Here they care about revenue of one million dollars, but that same government doesn't care about the same amount in İstanbul'.

Stating that 75% of the companies engaged in the tourism sector in Antalya have headquarters outside the city, mainly in İstanbul, ATSO Board of Directors Chairman Kemal Özgen goes on to say, “because these companies pay taxes in other cities, Antalya municipalities suffer great losses in terms of the funds granted through the Bank of Provinces according to the taxes collected”.

Most of the informants' responses refer to İstanbul. Additionally, the urban elite who give quotes to local magazines such as *ATSO Dergisi*, *Vizyon*, *Portakal*, and *Tourism Today* usually compare Antalya to İstanbul. What is more, the active and influential nature of the İstanbul companies that do business in Antalya but pay taxes in İstanbul broaden the scope of informant R3's comment, “İstanbul has power over all of the culture and art activities in Antalya”. The affluence of İstanbul is apparent not only in the art and culture field, but in the fields of economy, municipal governance, even in the development of Urban Propaganda Projects (UPPs).

Antalya, in the eyes of the city share holders, is a city that is compared to İstanbul and that has to mimic İstanbul if it is to become a world city. This argument is supported by the fact that the administration of the UPPs developed within the last five years has been handed over to agencies from İstanbul. The views of the informants on the influence of İstanbul over Antalya, the perception of İstanbul and the meaning of İstanbul are as follows:

R23: *Oh, there was a [seed] company I worked for before called İstanbul Tohumculuk. Later we got together and founded İstanbul Tarım A.Ş. We had made a name for our company before as İstanbul Tohumculuk. We thought we could express ourselves better with the name İstanbul Tarım in this region. Because the name İstanbul is always popular in Anatolia.*

R18: *Actually, Antalya is exactly the same as İstanbul right now. We have [people from] all 81 cities. But there's a distinction; İstanbul is also the center of finance. I mean the financial center of Turkey's and this region's. Antalya is no finance center. Antalya is primarily a holiday destination and an inhabitable place; it gets migrants, usually over a certain age. So mostly retired pensioners come here to rest to vacation, well, for tourism. Some come due to agriculture. We get migration in agriculture and tourism. We don't get any for finance or financial investments.*

R17: *The İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality is like an older brother to the Antalya Metropolitan Municipality. But if you go on the street and ask people, “who organizes the AGOFF?” you probably won't find anyone who knows it's an organization group from İstanbul. I mean, they would say, “Isn't there anyone in this town that could do this that they have to have İstanbul do it?” This is not a point of interest for the people living here. They only care about at whether their garbage is collected, the mosquitoes and the traffic and so on.*

R20: *In the media they talk about the AGM like they are doing projects that will benefit the public immensely, and I think these are all an incredible ad campaign. Just six months after [Menderes Türel] was elected, I went to İstanbul on a trip. I went into a stationery store around Sultan Ahmet and the man said: “Menderes Türel is going really good, they are doing good work.” Really! I thought, wait a minute, it's only been ix months since the man was elected, there's nothing to see yet. How did you know? I think this news is imposed from İstanbul and that Antalya is being manipulated from İstanbul.*

A glance at the participants of the WTC Antalya Branch opening ceremony, provides a context for R17's comments above, saying "*İstanbul is like an older brother to the Antalya Greater City Municipality*" and to informant R20's comments "*Antalya is being manipulated from İstanbul*".⁷ The Antalya city elite are not only aware of this situation, but they also seem to eagerly look forward to collaborating with the agencies in İstanbul. From ATSO President Özgen's words, we understand that Antalya is grateful to İstanbul:

Today we are a model of cooperation between İstanbul and Antalya. This cooperation is worth dwelling on. Today, the two cities that promote Turkey the most are İstanbul and Antalya. The unity and solidarity that İstanbul displays, within itself and with other cities like us, brings about most beneficial results. The center we are opening is one of these results. [...] The opening of the Antalya Branch of the İstanbul World Trade Center, has been made possible with the great support of Mr. Kadir Topbaş [İstanbul Metropolitan Mayor], Mr. Murat Yalçıntaş [İstanbul Chamber of Commerce President] and the TOBB [Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey] administration. It is my duty to express my appreciation to them (Özgen, *Vizyon/234*, 2007).

Although the urban elite in Antalya—whether at the individual or institutional level—hope that Antalya will become a global center, at least in the eastern Mediterranean Region, with the result being that Antalya will become the satellite city or the backyard of İstanbul. In reality, the power elites from İstanbul or from the transnational capitalist class have been manipulating the decisions on Antalya.

Concluding Remarks

As discussed above, the term 'restructuring,' which means the system's attempt to resolve the crises has shifted from economic to 'urban restructuring'. With this shift at the global level, local governments have been promoted as major actors of urban, social and economic change. As observed in Antalya, these interest groups comprising a "growth coalition" under AGM as the leading agency seek to mobilize the powers of the local government in order to structure an environment conducive to growth. From an entrepreneurial standpoint, the stake holders in the field of tourism, through their common interest in absolute growth and the enhanced profitability of properties, are united overall with the intent of restructuring Antalya so that it allows for 'urban tourism'. Thus, cities have pursued growth not because they had to, but because those who controlled their politics used them for this purpose. As understood from the

⁷ See also the news "Mayor Türel goes to Dubai: Antalya's Greater City Municipality Mayor Menderes Türel, is going to Dubai as the guest of the UAE President and Dubai Emir, Sheikh Muhammed bin Rashid Al Maktum. The only Turkish guests invited to the European-Arab Cities Forum held on 10-11 February 2008 in Dubai with the theme "New Dialogs for Development" were Antalya Greater City Municipality Mayor Menderes Türel, Ankara Greater City Municipality Mayor Melih Gokcek and Antalya Greater City Municipality Mayor Kadir Topbas." (http://www.antalya.bel.tr/tr/bel_guncel/haber_detay.cfm?sayfa=5785, 8 February 2008.)

quotations of the interviews, one can argue that in addition to the ‘urban elite’ comprising the ‘growth machine’ in Antalya, the central government has become the most important player in all fields during the process of restructuring Antalya.

The empirical data illustrate that the strategies developed by the growth machine is not to transform Antalya into a ‘world city’ or ‘global city’ rather the strategies are to transform Antalya into a *city of culture* via restructuring various fields that are at the same time more applicable strategies to broaden the resource and market hinterland of Antalya on the way of being at least a *city region*. Antalya seeks ways to represent itself in the global market to become especially a tourism destination, and the central government sees Antalya as an instrument to ‘represent Turkey’ in the global market.

With the new focus on the culture industry’s film business mentioned above, it is expected by the members of the growth machine that a related strategy will encourage new investments from both the public and private sector, and even at the international level. In order to achieve its goals, Antalya has been collaborating with İstanbul as a tourism partner in some cultural events and festivals. As defined by Costa and Martinotti (2003), the term ‘collaboration’ is a process of joint decision-making among relatively autonomous, key stakeholders of inter-organizational community tourism. Rather than concerning itself only with ‘competition’ among cities, *collaboration theory* can be considered as a regulatory system with local institutions and firms that are the constitutive agents of the ‘growth machine’ in cities as the governing coalitions for crisis aim at socio-spatial restructuring the city center or revalorizing the inner cities beside urbanization based on the tourism controlling the land economy.

While *capitalizing culture* as one of the *Wannabe World Cities*, Antalya follows a complementary strategy to attract the global capital. For the purpose is to broaden the resource and market hinterland of Antalya on the way of being at least a *competitive city-region* while complementing Istanbul to compete with others. The concept of “complementary city” introduced by de Roo (2007) by which he suggests a collaboration of agencies in the specific fields of two cities to reverse the money flow from the periphery to the center. With this concept, de Roo proposes a planning model for cities at the peripheries to complement the global projects developed by cities occupying positions of higher rank within the hierarchy of world cities. However, it should be noted that investment alone does not guarantee the continuation of money flow from the center to the complementary cities because even little entrepreneurial investment envisages for the turnover of the capital as quicker as possible.

The city stakeholders in Antalya who have been restructuring the subfields such as agriculture, industry, trade and tourism to attract more domestic and foreign investors also

complain about not being able to benefit from the budget proportionate to their contribution to it. One of the most important reasons for this is that the large companies engaged in business in the tourism and industry fields in Antalya have headquarters in İstanbul. In other words, Antalya's tourism and industry fields are operated from İstanbul. The influence of Istanbul palpable in the economy subfields in Antalya predominated culture, art and even municipal administration. In short, Antalya draws measures itself by the Istanbul yardstick, takes Istanbul as a model, imitates Istanbul but is not a competitive city; rather it is a *complementary city* to Istanbul.

References

AKSAV (2004) *Portakal*, Nisan.

ATSO (2002) "Yeni Bir Antalya Vizyonu ve Yeni Bir Yapılanma" *ATSO Dergisi*, 16 (175), pp. 22-26.

ATSO (2002) "CHP Genel Başkanı Odamızda" *ATSO Dergisi*, 16 (176), p. 7.

ATSO (2004) "2004 Böyle Geçti" *Vizyon*, 18 (203), p. 9.

ATSO (2006) "Dünya Ticaret Merkezi Antalya Şubesi Açıldı" *Vizyon*, 19 (224), pp. 10-11.

ATSO (2007) "Antalya 2 veriyor 1 Alıyor" *Vizyon*, (20) 229: 28-29.

ATSO (2007) Özgen, K. "ATSO Başkanı Kemal Özgen: Gelişmede anahtar faktör kamu ve özel sektör partnerliğidir" *Vizyon*, (20) 234, pp. 24.

ATSO (2007) Özgen, K. "Her ekonomik modelin kazananları ve kaybedenleri vardır" *Vizyon*, 20 (237), pp. 2-3.

Bianchini, F., and Parkinson, M. (1993) *Cultural Policy and Urban Regeneration*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Biröl Çağlayan "Bir festivalimiz vardı" ["We had a festival"] *Milliyet-Akdeniz*, 18.09.2006.

Costa, N., and Martinotti, G. (2003) "Sociological Theories of Tourism and Regulation Theory" in Hoffman, L. M., Fainstein, S. S., and Judd, D. R. (eds.) *Cities and Visitors*, Malden, Oxford, Victoria: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 53-71.

de Roo, G. (Ed.), (2007) *Fuzzy Planning: The Role of Actors in a Fuzzy Governance Environment* Porter Aldershot, Burlington: Ashgate Publishing.

Demirtaş, Metin. (1996), "Conference Text" February 27, 1996" in Cengizkan, A. (ed.), *Sanatçı Tanıklığı: Kent, Yaşam, Kültür—Artists on the City: City, Life Culture*, [compiles the texts of conferences given each Tuesday from December 5, 1995 to April 16, 1996 organized by the Association of Writers and the Chamber of Architects of Turkey under the Title "towards Habitat II—ARTISTS ON THE CITY—City/Life/Culture"] Ankara: Edebiyatçılar Derneği Yayınları, pp. 191-211.

Eagleton, T. (2005) *After Theory*, New York: Basic Books.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, (1966) *Preinvestment Surveys of Antalya Region*, Volume I. General Report, Rome: FAO-UNDP.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, (1966) *Preinvestment Surveys of Antalya Region*, Volume II. Special Papers on Agriculture, Forestry, and Water Resources, Rome: FAO-UNDP.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, (1966) *Preinvestment Surveys of Antalya Region*, Volume III. Special Papers on Industry, Tourism, Transport, and Trade and Commerce, Rome: FAO-UNDP.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, (1966) *Preinvestment Surveys of Antalya Region*, Volume IV. Special Papers on Methods and Experience, Government and economic Development, The basis of the Population Projections, Regional Income and rate of Growth, Employment and Labor Conditions, Social Adjustment Problems, and Public Health Aspects, Rome: FAO-UNDP.

Güçlü (Özen) S. (2002) *Kentleşme ve Göç Sürecinde Antalya'da Kent Kültürü ve Kentlilik Bilinci*, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2002.

Harvey, D. (2006) *Spaces of Global Capitalism: Towards a Theory of Uneven Geographical Development*, London and New York: Verso.

İlkin, A., and Dinçer, M. Z. (1991); *Turizm Kesimi'nin Türk Ekonomisindeki Yeri ve Önemi*, Ankara: TOBB.

Kıvrın, F. and Uysal, M. (1992); *Antalya: Bir Kentin Portresi, A Portrait of a Province, Bilder einer Stadt und ihrer Umgebung*, Antalya: Fırat Yayıncılık.

Logan, J. R., and Molotch, H. (1987) *Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Molotch, H. (1976) "The City as a Growth Machine: Toward a Political Economy of Place" *The American Journal of Sociology*, 82, pp. 309-18 (Copyright © 1976 The University of Chicago) accessed on 03.01.2007 at <http://nw-ar.com/face/molotch.html#1>

Molotch, H. (1993); "The Political Economy of Growth Machines" *Journal of Urban Affairs* 15, pp. 29-53.

Va'nu, Va la Nureddin, (1944); *Antalya İkinci Dünya Harbinde Nasıl Güzelleşebildi*, İstanbul: Kenan Matbaası.

Varlı-Görk, R. (2010) "The making of a 'city of culture': Restructuring Antalya", YUnpublished PhD, Ankara: Middle East Technical University.

List of Interviewees

R1: President of the Antalya Golden Orange Culture and Art Foundation (AKSAV, Antalya Kültür Sanat Vakfı) between 2004-2009; Date of Interview: 27/07/2006, Antalya

R2: President of the Antalya Golden Orange Culture and Art Foundation (AKSAV, Antalya Kültür Sanat Vakfı) between (1999-2004); Date of Interview: 26/07/2006, Antalya

R3: Antalya Artists Society (ANSAN, Antalya Sanatçılar Derneği); Date of Interview: 25/07/2006, Antalya

R4: President of The Turkish Foundation of Cinema and Audiovisual Culture (TURSAK ,Türkiye Sinema ve Audio Visual Kültür Vakfı); Date of Interview: 08/04/2008, Beyoğlu-İstanbul

R6: Suna & İnan Kırac Akdeniz Medeniyetleri Enstitüsü – Vehbi Koç Foundation, (AKMED, Suna & İnan Kırac Vakfı, Akdeniz Medeniyetleri Enstitüsü); Date of Interview: 21/06/2006, Kaleiçi-Antalya

R11: Mediterranean Tourism & Hoteliers Association (AKTOB, Akdeniz Turizm Otelciler Birliği); Date of Interview: 20 Aralık 2006, Kemer-Antalya

- R14:** Investor company operating the Antalya Airport International Terminal 2; Date of Interview: 20/12/2006, Antalya Airport-Antalya
- R17:** Municipality of Muratpaşa District, Date of Interview: 08/08/2006, Muratpaşa-Antalya
- R18:** Municipality of Kepez District, Date of Interview: 05/06/2008, Kepez-Antalya
08/08/2006, Muratpaşa-Antalya
- R19:** Chamber of Architects Antalya Branch (MOAŞ, Mimarlar Odası Antalya Şubesi); Date of Interview: 20/09/2006 Çarşamba Saat 11:00, Antalya
- R20:** Chamber of City Planners (ŞPO, Şehir Plancıları Odası); Date of Interview: 05/06/2008, Antalya
- R23:** Antalya Industrialist and Businessmen's Association (ANSIAD, Antalya Sanayici ve İşadamları Derneği); Date of Interview: 13. 10. 2008, Antalya
- R24:** Antalya Promotion Foundation (ATAV, Antalya Tanıtım Vakfı); Date of Interview: 05/06/2008, Antalya