

YILLIK

Annual of Istanbul Studies

2021

3



İSTANBUL
RESEARCH
INSTITUTE

YILLIK: Annual of Istanbul Studies

3 (2021)

YILLIK is a peer-reviewed annual journal, published simultaneously in print and online (via Dergipark).

Editorial Board

Editor: M. Baha Tanman, *Istanbul University (emeritus); Istanbul Research Institute*

Managing Editor: K. Mehmet Kentel, *Istanbul Research Institute*

Emir Alışık, *Istanbul Research Institute*

Brigitte Pitarakis, *Centre national de la recherche scientifique; Istanbul Research Institute*

Gülrü Tanman, *Istanbul Research Institute*

Advisory Board

Ashlhan Akışık, *Bahçeşehir University*

Engin Akyürek, *Koç University*

Serpil Bağcı, *Hacettepe University*

Sarah Bassett, *Indiana University*

Cem Behar

Sibel Bozdoğan, *Boston University*

Ayfer Bartu Candan, *Boğaziçi University*

Zeynep Çelik, *New Jersey Institute of Technology*

Koray Durak, *Boğaziçi University*

Ayşe Erek, *Kadir Has University*

Ahmet Ersoy, *Boğaziçi University*

Walter Feldman, *New York University, Abu Dhabi*

Emine Fetvacı, *Boston University*

Murat Güvenç, *Kadir Has University*

Shirine Hamadeh, *Koç University*

Ivana Jevtić, *Koç University*

Cemal Kafadar, *Harvard University*

Çiğdem Kafescioğlu, *Boğaziçi University*

Leyla Kayhan Elbirlık, *Özyeğin University*

Selim S. Kuru, *University of Washington*

Tuna Kuyucu, *Boğaziçi University*

Gülru Necipoğlu, *Harvard University*

Nevra Necipoğlu, *Boğaziçi University*

Tarkan Okçuoğlu, *Istanbul University*

Rana Özbal, *Koç University*

Mehmet Özdoğan, *Istanbul University*

Christine Philiou, *University of California, Berkeley*

Ünver Rüstem, *Johns Hopkins University*

Turgut Saner, *Istanbul Technical University*

Uğur Tanyeli, *İstinye University*

Ceylan Tözeren, *Boğaziçi University*

Uşun Tükel, *Istanbul University*

Title history

2012–2018 | İstanbul Araştırmaları Yıllığı / Annual of Istanbul Studies, 1–7

2019– | YILLIK: Annual of Istanbul Studies

Mode of publication: Worldwide periodical, published annually every December

Note to contributors: *YILLIK: Annual of Istanbul Studies* accepts submissions in English and Turkish. Articles should conform to the usage of The Chicago Manual of Style (CMOS), 17th edition, and to the style guides published on the journal's website. Articles in Turkish conform to a customized CMOS style available at the website. Research articles are subject to review by two anonymous reviewers and the editorial board. All other submissions are reviewed by the editorial board.

Istanbul Research Institute Publications 47

Periodicals 10

Istanbul, December 2021

ISSN: 2687-5012

Publisher: On behalf of the Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation, Necmettin Tosun

Graphic Design: Volkan Şenozan

Editorial Assistant: Miray Eroğlu

Copyediting: Emily Aaruz, Miray Eroğlu, Y. Güneş Yücel, Özge Ertem

Assistants: Osman Kocabal, Ryan Mitchell

Contact: istanbulstudies@iae.org.tr

Color Separation and Print: Onikinci Matbaa Basın Yayın San. ve Tic. Ltd. Şti. (Certificate no: 46618)

İbrahim Karaoğlanoğlu Cad. no: 35 Kat: 1 Kağıthane/Istanbul

Tel: 0212 281 25 80

© Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation Istanbul Research Institute

Meşrutiyet Caddesi no. 47, 34430, Tepebaşı - Beyoğlu/Istanbul

www.iae.org.tr

Certificate no: 12482

The views expressed in the articles published in the journal are the authors' own for which the Istanbul Research Institute may not be held accountable. The online edition is open access. Publishing in *YILLIK* is free of charge. Authors of articles published remain the copyright holders and grant third parties the right to use, reproduce, and share the article according to Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported (CC BY 3.0), upon proper citation and acknowledgment of the original publication.

niyetini ayırıcı kılan özelliğin, tabiatta tahribat yaratmaması olduğunu belirtirken modern kenti, maddeci dünya görüşü üzerinde yükselen bir müzeye benzetir.¹¹ Karakoç'tan daha radikal bir çerçeve sunan İsmet Özel'e göre, İslamcı düşüncenin medeniyet arayışı büyük bir saplantı içermektedir. Tarihte İslam medeniyeti olarak sunulan kültürler şüpheyle yaklaşan Özel'de medeniyet kavramı, aklın egemenliğiyle özdeşleştirilerek her türlü yozlaşmanın kaynağı hâline getirilir.¹² Bu bakımdan AKP iktidarının kent ve kültür politikalarının İsmet Özel ve Sezai Karakoç'un Batı karşıtı söylemlerinden çok Yahya Kemal Beyatlı ve özellikle de Necip Fazıl Kısakürek'in sanayici modernleşme arayışlarından esinlendiğini söylemek gerekiyor. Batuman'ın kitabında kurduğu çerçeve, aynı zamanda Necip Fazıl'ın metropolisiyle AKP'nin kültürel politikalarını tekno muhafazakâr bir kent tahayyülü olarak okuyan Fırat Mollaer'in analizlerine önemli ölçüde örtüşmektedir.¹³ Batuman'ın ilk olarak Demokrat Parti iktidarıyla tarih sahnesine çıkan ama aslen AKP döneminde zirveyi bulan İslamcı kentleşme uygulamalarını in-

celeyen kitabı, mimari faaliyetlerin ulus inşasındaki rolüne dair aşikâr göstergeler sunuyor. Bu göstergeler, İslamcılığın yalnızca ahlaki değerleri önceleyen kültürel bir hareket olmadığını ama yine ahlaki değerler üzerinde yükselen siyasi bir teknoloji olduğunu vadediyor.

Hasan Turgut

Boğaziçi Üniversitesi
turguthsn@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-4685-5077

CC BY 3.0

<https://doi.org/10.53979/yillik.2021.15>

1 Jenny White, *Muslim Nationalism and the New Turks* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2013), 19.

2 Carl Schmitt, *Siyasal Kavramı*, çev. Ece Göztepe (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2018), 71.

3 1983 yılında İstanbul'da kurulan Hassa Mimarlık, internet sitesinde misyonunu Batılılaşma öncesi bozulmamış Türk-İslam geleneğini bugünün şartlarından yeniden üretmek olarak tanımlamaktadır. Günümüz teknolojisyle geleneğin zihniyet dünyasını ve ruh kökünü harmanlamaya dönük bir program tasarlama amacı güttüğünü söyleyen Hassa Mimarlık'ın, bu bakımdan Fırat Mollaer'in tekno muhafazakârlık olarak kavramlaştırdığı ideolojik çerçevenin mimari alandaki başlıca

aktörlerinden biri hâline geldiği görülmektedir. Hassa Mimarlık'ın kendisini tarif ederken tevarüs ve temellük kelimelerine özel vurgu yapması, Türkiye'deki AKP merkezli İslamcı hareketin tarihsel amaçlarına dair de önemli veriler sunar. *Hassa Mimarlık*, erişim 7 Eylül 2021, <https://hassa.com>.

4 Turgut Cansever, *İslâm'da Şehir ve Mimari* (İstanbul: İz Yayınları, 1997), 26.

5 Turgut Cansever'in sözünü ettiği tevhit ilkesi, tradisyonalist ekolün önemli simalarından biri olan Seyyid Hüseyin Nasr'ın okumasıyla diyalog hâlinindedir. Nasr, İslam mimarisindeki tevhit anlayışının hem Allah'ın ve kozmosun hem de toplumsal hayatın birliğine dayalı olduğunu söyler. Bu anlayış, kutsalla dünyevilik arasındaki ayrımı iptal ederken İslam mimarisini sosyal hayatın merkezi hâline getirir. Nasr, Batı mimarisindeki kompartıman düzeninin kendisine İslam mimarisinde bütünlükle karşılık bulduğunu savunmaktadır. Bkz. Seyyid Hüseyin Nasr, *İslâm Sanatı ve Maneviyatı*, çev. Ahmet Demirhan (İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 2019), 85.

6 Turgut Cansever, *Ev ve Şehir* (İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 1994), 219.

7 Nilüfer Göle, *Mühendisler ve İdeoloji: Öncü Devrimcilerden Yenilikçi Seçkinlere* (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2016), 14.

8 Sibel Bozdoğan, *Modernizm ve Ulusun İnşası: Erken Cumhuriyet Türkiye'sinde Mimari Kültür* (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2012), 264.

9 Yahya Kemal Beyatlı, *Aziz İstanbul* (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2002), 52.

10 Necip Fazıl Kısakürek, *İdeolojya Örgüsü* (İstanbul: Büyük Doğu Yayınları, 1998), 243-246.

11 Sezai Karakoç, *Diriliş Muştusu* (İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları, 1990), 99.

12 İsmet Özel, *Üç Mesele* (İstanbul: Düşünce Yayınları, 1978), 110.

13 Fırat Mollaer, *Tekno Muhafazakârlığın Eleştirisi* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2016), 137-153.

Esra Akcan, *Open Architecture: Migration, Citizenship, and the Urban Renewal of Berlin-Kreuzberg by IBA-1984/87*. Basel: Birkhäuser, 2018.

416 pages, 267 figures.
ISBN: 9783035613742

In her pathbreaking book *Open Architecture: Migration, Citizenship, and the Urban Renewal of Berlin-Kreuzberg by IBA-1984/87*, Esra Akcan achieves three quite different things, each of them enormously important. First, she provides the best account we have of the International Building Exhibition (IBA) held in Berlin in the 1980s. Second, she makes a major contribution to the literature on Turkish guest workers in Germany. Third and finally, she proposes a new approach to the production of

architecture that she terms "open architecture." The ambitious interweaving of these themes cuts across the usual borders between architectural history, urban sociology, and architectural theory. Thus, it provides what is bound to be an influential template for how the history and practice of architecture can be transformed by being more respectful of those whose perspectives have too often been ignored by both scholars and practitioners.

Akcan, the Michael A. McCarthy Professor of Architectural Theory at Cornell University in the United States, brings to the table her position as a feminist, Turkish-trained architect, whose previous book *Architecture in Translation: Germany, Turkey and the Modern House* (Duke University Press, 2012) demonstrated a nuanced understanding of the interactions between the architectural cultures of the two countries. In *Open Archi-*

ecture, which is often written in the first person, she is acutely conscious of the various types of expertise informing her analysis. She moves almost seamlessly between interviewing women from Turkey—most of them working class—who have lived for decades in Berlin's Kreuzberg neighborhood, to speaking with the architects who designed the apartments they inhabit, to digging deep into archival records, as well as a wide range of published primary and secondary sources. She tells the comprehensive story of one of the most influential housing schemes of the last century in unprecedented detail, but instead of placing the prize-winning architects and planners—almost all of them men—whose careers it helped launch at its center, she uses the platform of the scholarly monograph to privilege the voices, tastes, and design talent of the women who inhabit the buildings they designed.

218 Akcan weaves together two important stories that previously appeared to have coincidentally occurred in the same place, showing how tightly they are interlinked. She concludes by calling for an approach to architecture very different from the one that most historians have previously documented. The result challenges historians and architects alike to look for and listen to those who have very seldom moved from the edges to the center of the stories we tell and our understanding of the buildings we design.

More than thirty years after it was completed, the IBA housing exhibition in Berlin continues to shape urban development in many parts of the world. Conducted in West Berlin in the last years before the fall of the Berlin Wall, this housing exhibition turned large swathes of what its organizers understood as the marginal neighborhood of Kreuzberg over to an international team of architects hungry to challenge modernist paradigms and to local grassroots community organizers. The first group erected new buildings while the second refurbished existing housing stock. Although the postmodern return to a fundamentally classical approach to design championed by some members of the first group has long since ceased to be fashionable, the idea that housing should meet the street rather than be set back from it in towers, and that it should be roughly the same height as what had been built a century earlier has continued to prove popular with both developers and residents, although market pressures have often pushed heights up well beyond the modest IBA limits.

The ubiquity of the model embraced by the architects who constructed the new housing, and the degree to which involvement in IBA furthered their careers in post-reconstruction Berlin as well as internationally has not hitherto produced scholarship that challenges the view of the housing exhibition produced by its own extraordinary publicity efforts.¹ Akcan's book is the most comprehensive history available in English, but it is far from an uncritical celebration of its achievements. Instead, she takes what was supposed to be a Cold War showcase to demonstrate how

Western capitalism supported artistic innovation while providing social democratic infrastructure to ask new questions that challenge what somewhat paradoxically turned out to be a template for neoliberal urban development.

The pre-history of IBA began in 1967, when O. M. Ungers resigned his professorship at the Technical University in Berlin, where he had participated in the design of the Märkisches-Viertel, a high-rise housing district of the kind that was rapidly being discredited in the eyes of his rebellious students. He fled to Cornell, where Akcan now teaches, but returned a decade later with Rem Koolhaas, among others, in tow. Their collaborative scheme, Archipelago Berlin, now attributed largely to Koolhaas, understood West Berlin as a series of islands of architectural excellence in a sea of parkland. Central to the scheme was the idea of the enclave's increasing marginality when viewed from Western Europe or the United States. Both Ungers and Koolhaas would contribute to IBA, although Josef Paul Kleihues, Rob Krier, and Aldo Rossi did more to set the tone for the construction of its new housing. While there was some room for stylistic experimentation, with Koolhaas and Zaha Hadid pushing hardest against the boundaries, architecture and urban design were largely understood to be about form rather than political engagement. Although those involved in the refurbishment of existing housing were often grassroots activists who saw things very differently, their contributions attracted relatively scant international attention at the time, and this situation has changed little since.

Akcan, however, is concerned with exactly what the IBA publicity purposely left out. She points out that West Berlin's population was actually growing in the late 1970s. What Ungers and Koolhaas saw as emptiness was in fact a city increasing occupied by "guest workers" from Turkey, most of whom at the time that IBA took place had no path to German citizenship (the legal situation changed in 2000, but many German residents of Turkish descent continue to hold Turkish rather than German passports). Despite the ef-

forts of the West Berlin government to distribute non-citizens across the city, many gravitated to Kreuzberg, the same territory that IBA would rework.

Kreuzberg's availability to both groups was hardly accidental; as the easternmost district of West Berlin, it also contained some of the enclave's oldest and densest housing stock. Well-served by public transportation but with the wall defining its northern, southern, and eastern borders, it had little appeal to those West Berliners who could afford to live elsewhere. By the 1970s, older, poorer long-time locals increasingly lived beside anarchist youth, many of whom were students attracted to West Berlin due to the absence of compulsory military service, and Turks who took the factory and low-paying service jobs that, following the erection of the wall, were no longer filled by a steady supply of German migrants from the east. The area had character but few amenities. The housing stock, largely dating to the last decades of the nineteenth century, often lacked modern plumbing. Empty lots, the result of Allied bombing raids, and pockmarked facades, damaged by Soviet machine gun fire in 1945, were as central to the neighborhood's character as far-out cafés and Turkish grocery shops. City officials, flush with the money that made West Berlin, supposedly an outpost of capitalism, in fact one of the world's most heavily subsidized cities, sought through the IBA to improve housing standards for those already there, but also to attract what they viewed as more suitable tenants at a time when the city's housing provision was not yet market-driven. Of those who built new housing, only Krier apparently addressed what culturally specific features tenants from Turkey might particularly appreciate.

Akcan has little interest in the so-called yuppies the IBA attempted to lure to Kreuzberg. Instead, she interviews Turkish women who have lived in the district for decades, much of this time in IBA-built flats. Two things are particularly remarkable here. First, is the degree to which she takes their experiences and judgments as seriously as she does those of some of

the world's most famous architects. Equally important, however, is the variety of the stories they tell. While almost all remember their pre-IBA housing in Berlin with disgust and most have gone to great lengths to furnish their units to their own taste, their stories diverge in memorable ways. Some inhabit units they love and want Akcan to communicate their appreciation to the architects. Others lament the location of bathrooms in relation to living rooms or the degree to which neighbors can see in across courtyards that are too narrow. Attitudes towards living in Germany also differ, with most complaining that their children received segregated second-class educations.

Akcan does not gloss over problems within the Turkish community, paying particular attention to violence against women, and she uses the information she gains from these interviews to argue for what she calls an open architecture. This, she writes,

“is predicated on the welcoming of a distinctly other mind or group of minds into the process of architectural design” (p. 10). Acutely conscious of a new wave of immigrants, this time from Syria, arriving as she conducted her research, she emphasizes the concept of hospitality as a means of providing a way forward for a more inclusive approach to architecture. Published in 2018, this call now appears particularly prescient. The architectural profession, and particularly the slice of it dominated by the figures who shot to stardom in part through IBA's efficient publicity machine, can no longer presume that the function of their buildings—in this case state-subsidized housing—is clearly subordinate to aesthetic concerns. The current social situation includes the predicament of migrants, so clearly captured by Akcan, but also climate change, itself the trigger for much migration. Buildings need now to focus on a common good defined not by the goals and tastes of the small sliver of

society likely to directly engage such architects but one that is welcomed by everyone who walks past or into their buildings.

Kathleen James-Chakraborty

University College Dublin

kathleen.jameschakraborty@ucd.ie

ORCID: 0000-0001-5520-4690

CC BY 3.0

<https://doi.org/10.53979/yillik.2021.16>

1 Noteworthy subsequent publications are Thomas Koehler and Ursula Mueller, eds., *Anything Goes: Berlin Architecture in the 1980s* (Bielefeld: Kerber, 2021), and Andreas Salgo, *Neue Blöcke für die Innenstadt: Die IBA '87 in Berlin und der Wiederaufbau der südlichen Friedrichstadt* (Berlin: Gebrüder Mann Verlag, 2021). Perhaps the most influential of the original publications was Josef Paul Kleihues and Heinrich Klotz, eds., *International Building Exhibition Berlin 1987: Examples of New Architecture* (New York: Rizzoli, 1986).

Zeynep Çelik, *Europe Knows Nothing about the Orient: A Critical Discourse from the East (1872–1932)*. Istanbul: Koç University Press, 2021. 280 pages, 55 figures. ISBN: 9786057685353

Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1979) was one of the most influential—and most popular—scholarly works of the past century. Said was, by no means, the first scholar who discussed various orientalist discourses. After the publication of Said's work, however, orientalism began to be widely discussed as a Eurocentric view of the Orient and a political device of European imperial and colonial interests. Even after more than forty years since its first publication, Said's *Orientalism* continues to carry a substantial impact on each sub-field of Middle East studies, including Ottoman and Turkish studies. Said's critical work, however, did not cover

how the “Orientals” responded to this European monopolization of knowledge; instead, it mostly presented the Orientals as passive recipients of the European knowledge production.

Renowned for her scholarship on architectural history and visual culture during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Zeynep Çelik, in her latest work, *Europe Knows Nothing about the Orient*, reignites the scholarly discussions on orientalism. Focusing on Ottoman and Turkish responses to a variety of orientalist (mis) representations between the 1870s and 1930s, Çelik's book contributes greatly to the growing literature on how the “Orientals” themselves perceived orientalism that has recently been examined by, among others, Susannah Heschel, Umar Ryad, Ian Coller, Nile Green and Saree Makdisi.¹ She also provides a substantial critique of Western orientalist discourses and thus, engages with post-Saidian discussions on orientalism.

In accordance with the multiplicity of Ottoman and Turkish voices raised

against the European misrepresentations of the Orient, Çelik's book compiles a wide variety of texts belonging to many different literary genres, including scholarly articles, journal and newspaper articles, travelers' accounts, novels, short stories, satires, and poetry. Likewise, the texts included in the book focus on a wide range of political, social, and cultural issues, ranging from representations of everyday life in the Orient to art and architecture, gender, social norms, and religion.

Ottoman and Turkish intellectuals whose texts were collected in this book belong to multiple ideological camps from Islamism to secularism, Turkish nationalism, and pan-Turkism, and from communism to capitalism. One can find texts from opposite poles of the ideological spectrum, such as the ones belonging to Mehmed Akif Ersoy (d. 1936) and Tevfik Fikret (d. 1915). The shared sentiment against orientalism coming from both the late Ottoman and early republican intellectuals also underlines the continuities between