

SERİ  
SERIES  
SERIE  
SÉRIE

A

CİLT  
VOLUME  
BAND  
TOME

55

SAYI  
NUMBER  
HEFT  
FASCICULE

1

2005

İSTANBUL ÜNİVERSİTESİ  
ORMAN FAKÜLTESİ  
DERGİSİ

REVIEW OF THE FACULTY OF FORESTRY,  
UNIVERSITY OF ISTANBUL

ZEITSCHRIFT DER FORSTLICHEN FAKULTÄT  
DER UNIVERSITÄT ISTANBUL

REVUE DE LA FACULTÉ FORESTIÈRE  
DE L'UNIVERSITÉ D'ISTANBUL



## ART IN URBAN LANDSCAPE

Ar. Gör. Y. Çağatay SEÇKİN<sup>1)</sup>

### Abstract

The artistic objects in urban landscape are usually overlooked by people. Nevertheless, taking decisions on their environment is a humane necessity for people and it's also needed for public participation. Learning their approach for the concept and finding out their comments about the existing works are so important for discovering why public arts are overlooked. One of these artistic objects is Mediterranean Statue in Zincirlikuyu, Istanbul. In Autumn 1998, there was a discussion about the Mediterranean Statue among government, family of artist and journalists. In this paper, the dispute will be scrutinized to bring up the glance of people to the art in urban landscape, especially in Turkey.

**Keywords:** Public art, Mediterranean sculpture, Urban design

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Landscape Architecture encompasses much more than just the landscape. Landscape Architecture is a collaboration of the landscape and everything in it – buildings, open spaces, social spaces, functional spaces, people and the artistic objects which have usually been overlooked in urban landscape: public arts.

The main purpose of this paper is to explore the relationship between the public art and the urban landscape through the following questions:

- If the necessary artistic objects characterising its environment can not be found in the city we live, then is it possible to talk about an urban life ?
- When designing art in urban open spaces, should public opinion and taste be taken into consideration or is it the artist's personal attitude only ?
- Who decides on matters like removing or relocating artistic objects in urban space ?

### 2. WHAT'S PUBLIC ART ?

If art is considered as a phenomenon stimulating human senses, then naturally it should constitute beauty, fascination, historical and cultural meaning and that debatable and educational aspects. From such point of view, "art" and "public" can not be considered as irrelevant concepts from one another. As it was mentioned above, art is a production or a result of public activities,

---

<sup>1)</sup> İ.Ü.Orman Fakültesi Peyzaj Teknikleri Anabilim Dalı

therefore, the best places to exhibit and perform art are public open spaces (STERN 1986; BRAND 1992).

So, the art in urban landscape can be defined as objects bearing historical, aesthetical and functional aspects necessary to meet physical and emotional needs of people in environment. Within the scope of this definition, art in urban landscape can be found in the form of wall pictures, graffiti, signs, plates, billboards etc. as well as monuments and sculptures. For instance, a designer's automobile displaying his/her art in pictures, patterns and motifs is observed by people during its journey through the town affecting them one way or another; and therefore considered as an artistic product in the urban space.

In summary, public art is any form causes person to feel something which is built in public space or outside a gallery that is accessible to any person. So, beyond the two or three dimensional objects in urban space, it also includes events, performances, temporary installations, projected images, soundscapes and interactive street theaters.

### 3. THE VALUE OF ART IN URBAN LANDSCAPE

In urban landscapes, there are many forms of art that enhance the space and give its character. All kinds of 3-D works of art can be seen in almost any city either representing a historic figure or expressing a style, thought or culture. Murals are found on the sides of buildings, sometimes advertising a product or event, expressing something has cultural, historical or visual importance. Fountains celebrate with the reflections and coolness of water and add white noise, drowning out the sounds of traffic (CROWHURST LENNARD/ LENNARD 1997).

Public art identifies the space, displaying persons and events in history by use of historic monuments. This form of art can educate the public about these historically important events. They cause people to think about the history, remember the events and people, and even to relive them (LYNCH, 1981). And people generally remember an urban space with a work of art in that place. Certainly, the urban open spaces are the best places for using plastic in an effectual way, and also a successful public art can become a symbol for an urban space.

Beyond identifying the space, public art promotes social gathering and interaction. The piece of art usually attracts people closer to the object, and often offers a place to sit, or meet others. The art automatically becomes an identifiable point in the urban environment. It is in this sense that most works of public art are found in public plaza or parks where the site is more suited for such gathering (PIERCEY 1997).

Briefly, the public art should make a positive contribution to the city life, and to the well being of its inhabitants. Public art should generously give the public some positive benefit – delight, amenity, fantasy, joyfulness, sociability – in a word, a sense of well-being (CROWHURST LENNARD/ LENNARD 1997).

Although the funds in Turkey appropriated for urban space have been providing for artistic products since the 1990s, when compared to the European countries which have five percent of their budgets appropriated for artistic products, it is not sufficient quantity-wise.

Furthermore, many factors like sculptures wholesale ordered, therefore not really designed for the space they are to be placed in, the attitude of political powers towards such sculptures and the general immunity of the public have their due effects on art in urban spaces in Turkey.

In order to provide answers to the questions above for Turkey, a famous example will be discussed in the following chapter: the Mediterranean Statue (Figure 1). The opinions of Koman's family, artists, intellectuals and the statements of the government have been collected from media about the Mediterranean Statue and its place will help to understand the place of public art in Turkey and the thoughts of people about the answers of questions in the first chapter.



Figure 1: Mediterranean Statue in Zincirlikuyu, Istanbul

Şekil 1: Zincirlikuyu'daki Akdeniz Heykeli, İstanbul

#### 4. THE MEDITERRANIAN STATUE AND THE DISPUTE

In Autumn 1998, there was a discussion about the Mediterranean Statue among government, family of artist and journalists like Çetin Altan, Doğan Hızlan, Yalçın Bayer and Zülfü Livaneli.

Çetin Altan allowed to begin the discussion with the lines below, which were quoted from his article in the newspaper called Sabah, on the 1st of November 1998:

*"In Zincirlikuyu in front of the Halk Bank there is the Mediterranean statue by İlhan Koman standing in a congested area.... It would probably look much better on a majestic base at the end of the historic natural canal where the Köyceğiz Lake meets the Mediterranean, I think.... I wonder if such a wish would be shared by İstemihan Talay, the Minister of Culture, or Bülent Ecevit, the deputy prime minister, or Mesut Yılmaz, the prime minister?"*

His idea was responded immediately and announced with headlines such as "Koman's Sculpture in İztuzu" and "Koman's Sculpture Meets the Sea" also informing that the Deputy Prime Minister ordered the Minister of Culture to transfer the statue to the İztuzu Beach which is famous for its Carettas. Following that, there had been much debate among columnists, artists and the Koman family on the tranference of the sculpture.

Actually this was not the first time that such discussions aroused on such a matter in Turkey as various other sculptures for different reasons were removed/transferred from their places causing each time similar discussions.

However, this one appeared to be a different case because the subject matter this time was the **Mediterranean statue** by **İlhan Koman**, the famous sculptor, that was unanimously considered to be one of the few very fine examples of the Republican period of art and of the modern urban space monuments in Istanbul. Also the starting point of the debate marvellously had nothing to do with politics but referring to the concepts like spatial harmony and perceptibility when discussing about whether and where to move the sculpture. Whatever the out comings of such a debate, it was important that a discussion was started at last on artistic concepts of urban open spaces which was an important issue that was very little referred to when working on urban open spaces.

#### 4.1 Mediterranean Statue and Its Sculptor

The Mediterranean Statue completed in 1978-1981 was initially designed as seven meters high and constituting of 17 different tones of blue. However, it was reduced half the size according to the wishes of the architect of the Halk Sigorta building who said that the sculpture would be blocking the facade of the building and that concerns such as it would be too large in proportion to the area it was to be located. Colour-wise Koman had planned 17 different tones of blue starting from white-blue to turquoise, cobalt blue and so on finishing with a black-blue which was in whole to have a moving effect on a white background. Also a special kind of paint used on ships was needed in order to colour such a sculpture of four tons welded at more than 1100 points of 12 mm thick 112 metal plates. Unfortunately, it was decided finally for the sculpture to be in white and white only since such a spectrum of colours could not be found in spite of all the efforts made (NEYZİ 1993).

The sculptor of the Mediterranean Statue, İlhan Koman was born in Edirne in 1921. He started at the painting department of the Academy of Fine Arts in 1941 and following his graduation from the department of sculpture in 1946, he passed the European exam and went to Paris. After three years of residence in Paris, he returned to Turkey in 1950 to be an assistant at his university. He taught until 1958 and made a great contribution to setting up the metal studio at the department of sculpture. After that he moved to Sweden where he lived and worked in a barge called "Hulda" in Stockholm until he died in December 30, 1986 (Figure 2).

Koman was appointed as a tutor at the Stockholm Applied Arts School in 1967. He as not a citizen of Sweden was the first time given the title of professorship by a special decision of the Swedish Senate (BERK/GEZER 1973).



**Figure 2: One of Koman's works in Sweden: 'Whirlpool' in Ekerö Square, Stockholm**  
 Şekil 2: Koman'ın İsveç'deki çalışmalarından biri: 'Girdap', Ekerö Meydanı, Stockholm

Koman during his time in Sweden created a great many number of art works including the relief he carved at the entrance of the Swedish Parliament. The most famous one is the first prize winner monumental sculpture called "Salute to Leonardo" designed in collaboration with Çetin Kamra to be placed in front of the Örebro Municipality Building (Figure 3). Later it was bought by the Swedish government and placed in front of the Stockholm School of Architecture (RONA, 1997).

Koman's important works other than the Mediterranean Statue are the two sculptures in front of the Metropolitan Municipality Building and Harbiye Divan Hotel in İstanbul, the reliefs at the eastern wing of the main stairs at Anıtkabir in Ankara and the bronze sculpture which was selected amongst a number of ceramics figures made in 1970s and casted at a larger scale in 1992 in Seymenler Park (SEÇKİN/TÜRKOĞLU 2003).

Koman states his thoughts about the Mediterranean Statue in his interview to his close friend Arslan Mengüç as follows :

*"... I, how shall I put it, there is a populist part of me. When a statue is to be located in a public place, I should like it to be for the people. Nevertheless, artistic qualities are to be there even if it is a populist piece. I utilized a kinetic illusion in that statue taking a goddess, an idol as a symbol made of waves. Actually it is somehow a tough statue. She kind of stares at people. Meaning like what the heck are you going to do to me. You know, the pollution and destruction of the Mediterranean. A woman standing dignified and intimidating at the same time."*



Figure 3: 'Salute to Leonardo' and İlhan Koman, Stockholm  
 Şekil 3: 'Leonardo'ya Selam' ve İlhan Koman, Stockholm

#### 4.1 The Dispute

Many people joined in the dispute started by Çetin Altan who argued that the Mediterranean Statue should be relocated for it was packed in an indifferent crowded area in front of the Halk Sigorta Building. Zülfü Livaneli and Doğan Hızlan suggested in their newspaper articles that relocating the statue in a place at the Mediterranean coasts to release it from all that disordered and suffocating environment would be more appropriate to its cause of existence. It was most interestingly to be marked what Doğan Hızlan said in his article in *Hürriyet* on the fourth of December in 1998 as "*The Mediterranean of İlhan Koman is to be there. Let us do what Çetin Altan asks for. At least for once shall we see the government oblige to one of his writers.*"

In spite of the consensus of opinion among the respected authors about the relocation of the statue, Koman family was against the idea. Gönül Dilan Koman, sister of İlhan Koman, believed that statues belonged to the squares in towns and that they should remain in open places where people can relate to them continuously. Nevertheless she did remember İlhan Koman used to say that if he knew she was to be put in that congested area he wouldn't have made it at all and therefore if she was to be relocated, she should be moved to a place in İstanbul such as Sarayburnu which overlooks the Marmara Sea or his hometown Edirne.

Meanwhile, Gönül Dilan Koman pronounced in her radio interview at the Radio Cumhuriyet as follows :

*"I, his sister, did declare in the telegram I sent to İstemihan Talay, the Minister of Culture, that as his legal heiress it was I who was entitled to make a decision on this matter and that a third person can have nothing whatsoever to say about it. Çetin Altan is causing a stir for nothing. Such thing can not be done without asking to the artists."*

İlhan Koman was in Sweden during the period in which the statue was made and Hüşber Akyürek who was the assistant of Koman in Turkey then, although finding Altan's proposition enchanting, he does not approve of moving the statue itself :

*"...Removing one of the few modern sculptures in Istanbul would leave the town even more naked. If they are to place a sculpture at the İztuzu Beach, a new sculpture can be made from its initial design, seven or eight meters high and made of tones of blue colour arranged in sequence just like Koman had planned it...."*

At the time the dispute was at its highest, Ali Teoman Germaner, Head of the Department of Sculpture at Mimar Sinan University, Faculty of Fine Arts when Koman graduated, said that :

*"... For a start, a sculpture in such a size exists with its space. İlhan Koman was alive when it was located there. He worked on it knowing and observing every bit of information as such. He saw its distance from the road, its relation with people and all that, he knew and designed accordingly. For instance, it has a kinetic property. People passing by in their car illusioned as though it was moving. You cannot make changes in spite of İlhan Koman. If there is a need for a sculpture a new competition should be organized and a new sculpture should be selected. There is no cause to repeat Koman's sculpture."*

During the same period Nilüfer Ergin, the chairman of the International Plastic Arts Association, declared the view of the association to the newspapers as follows :

*"We, artists are greatly concerned that the methods of replacing or demolishing such architectural or plastic values that have a place in the lives of urban people in such a city like Istanbul in which the urban texture and memory are terribly damaged, are defined according to the orders of political or local authorities and personal wishes."*

*Such appalling applications often take place in Turkey and it is time that the intellectuals of this country started to be more vigilantly conducting on such matters that they should better know where to draw borderlines and ask for an expertise opinion before guiding public opinion. We the International Plastic Arts Society declare that we will resist to the replacement of the Mediterranean statue and invite our columnists to make efforts in encouraging political authorities to invest in the field in order to increase the number of sculptures in open areas and to organize competitions so that young Komans would come along."*

*Since we are aware that if İlhan Koman the great artist himself were alive he would use his superior knowledge on form and technology in much different way for a sculpture in İztuzu Beach, we are determined not to leave the metallic sculpture which is designed in an urban texture and scale and has been checked for every three years for maintenance to corrode in a kilometers long desolate beach exposed to the effects of salty sea. The responsibility of leaving such a cultural item to be destroyed gradually and inevitably under such conditions will be laid upon who suggested the idea and who did it if pursued."*

Other than the views summarised above, the following contributions were made in the matter that if the sculpture has to be moved somewhere in Mediterranean, instead of isolating it on some lonely beach, it should be located in a populated area such as Alanya Castle which also a landmark in the region and that in the process, an advising committee including sculpturers, historians, town planners and the administrative head of the region should be formed.

At the end, as the owner the Mediterranean Statue, the Halk Insurance Administrative Committee finally declared that they decided there was no reason for it to be relocated anywhere that it was fine where it was which legally ended the debate.



## 5. CONCLUSION

According to the dispute above, if there are consistent reasons and enough justifications for transporting a public art object, mostly the elite part of society can easily join the discussions about the object has to be removed from its place or not. This shows that, the people is considering 'the public art' important for their life. So first of all, if the necessary artistic object characterising its environment isn't found in the city we live, it's not easy to talk about an urban life. But is this feeling same for the rest of the public who doesn't care about it? And is the public art likely to speak to a large proportion of the public, rather than an elite few?

Another result of the dispute about the Mediterranean Statue, the works of public art must have a strong contact with the other whole city elements. A work of public art can be a great work by itself and like most of the participants of this debate, people can think that the public art which is planned for a special place doesn't have to need a discussion about transporting. But nevertheless, it must be thought that if it isn't well-adjusted with its environment, it becomes an object which is under debate. So when designing art in urban open spaces, the artist's personal attitude is the most important thing, but if it's not suitable for public opinion or taste, this endangers its existence in that place.

Lastly, most public art is owned and maintained by either a municipality or privately. So, the owner of public art object decides on matters like removing or relocating it in urban space. But, if the owner of public art doesn't care about it or isn't sure of its necessity for that space, public opinion can become the first criterion about the destiny of the public art in urban landscape.

## KENTSEL PEYZAJ İÇİNDE SANAT

Ar.Gör.Y.Çağatay SEÇKİN

### Kısa Özet

Kentsel peyzaj içerisinde yer alan sanatsal objeler, genellikle kullanıcıları tarafından görmezden gelinmektedir. Bununla birlikte, çevreleriyle ilgili kararlar almak, insani bir gereksinim ve kamusal paylaşım için bir zorunluluktur. Kamusal sanatın neden görmezden geldiğini keşfetmek için, kullanıcıların kavrama yaklaşımlarını ve mevcut çalışmalar hakkındaki yorumlarını öğrenmek çok önemlidir. Kentsel peyzaj içerisindeki sanatsal objelerden biri de, İstanbul Zincirlikuyu'daki Akdeniz Heykeli'dir. 1998 sonbaharında, hükümet, sanatçının ailesi ve gazeteciler arasında, Heykel hakkında çok boyutlu bir tartışma yaşanmıştır. Bu tartışma, özellikle Türkiye'de, kentsel peyzaj içerisindeki sanata bakışı belirlemek amacıyla incelenecektir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Kamusal sanat, Akdeniz heykeli, Kentsel tasarım

### 1. GİRİŞ

Bu makalenin ana amacı, kamusal sanat ve kentsel peyzaj arasındaki ilişkiyi, aşağıdaki sorular çerçevesinde incelemektir:

- İçinde yaşadığımız kentte, o çevreye özellik katacak gerekli sanat öğeleri bulunmuyorsa, sağlıklı bir kent yaşamından söz etmek ne derece mümkündür?
- Kentsel açık alanlardaki sanat objeleri tasarlanırken, tek başına sanatçının kişisel tavrı yeterli midir, yoksa halkın istekleri ve beğenilerine yönelik çalışmaların yapılması da gerekli midir?
- Kentsel mekanda yer alan bir sanatsal objenin taşınması, yerinin değiştirilmesi veya kaldırılması gibi konularda söz sahibi olan kimlerdir?

### 2. KAMUSAL SANAT NEDİR ?

Sanat, insanın duygularını harekete geçiren ve heyecan uyandıran bir olgu olarak kabul edilirse, bu olgunun doğal olarak, güzellik, ilginçlik, üzerinde tartışılabilirlik, eğitsellik, tarihsel veya kültürel anlam taşıma gibi özellikleri bünyesinde barındırması gerekmektedir. "Sanat" olgusuna bu çerçeveden bakıldığında ise, "Sanat" ve "Halk" birbirinden çok farklı kavramlar olarak düşünülmemektedir. "Sanat" yukarıda da belirtildiği gibi halka ait faaliyetlerin bir ürünü veya sonucudur, dolayısıyla, doğal olarak sanatın, en iyi sergileme ve icra alanı da halka ait açık alanlardır.

Bu açıdan konuya yaklaşıldığında, kentsel mekanda sanat, yaşanılan çevrede, halkın fiziksel ve duygusal ihtiyaçlarının karşılanması için gerekli olan, tarihsel, estetik ve fonksiyonel özellikler taşıyan objeler olarak tanımlanabilir. Bu tanım kapsamında kentsel mekanda sanat, yalnızca anıtların ve heykellerin değil, duvar resimlerinin, duvar yazılarının, tabelaların, reklam panolarının ve benzeri birçok elemanın formunda da kendini bulabilmektedir. Örneğin sanatını, çizdiği resimlerle, farklı motiflerle veya karosere yaptığı eklemelerle kendi otomobili üzerinde sergileyen bir tasarımcının otomobili, kent içindeki yolculuğu sırasında halk tarafından izleniyor, kişiler üzerinde bir takım hisler uyandırıyor olması nedeniyle kentsel mekan için bir sanat ürünü olarak kabul edilebilmektedir.

Özette, kamusal sanat, kamusal mekan içerisinde gerçekleştirilen ve kişide bir takım hisler uyandıran her türlü forma verilen adıdır. Bu açıdan bakıldığında, iki ya da üç boyutlu objelerin dışında, her türlü performans, geçici düzenlemeler, film gösterileri, müzik dinletileri ve interaktif sokak tiyatrolar da kamusal sanat kapsamı içinde yer almaktadır.

### 3. KENTSEL PEYZAJDA SANATIN DEĞERİ

Kentsel peyzaj alanlarında, mekana çeşitlilik katan ve ona karakter kazandıran bir çok form görülmektedir. Bir tarihi figürü temsil eden, bir üslubu, düşüncüyü ya da kültürü vurgulayan heykellere; bir ürünü veya olayı anlatan duvar resimlerine; trafik gürültüsünü akan suyun sesiyle bastıran, suyun serinliğini ve yansımalarını mekana katan çeşmelere rastlamak mümkündür.

Kamusal sanat, bir kentin kimliğini, tarihi kişi ve olaylarını, anıtlarda canlandırıp göstererek tanıtabilmektedir. Sanatın bu formu, halkı önemli tarihi olaylar hakkında bilgilendirebilmekte; kentlilerin, tarihleri hakkında düşünmelerine, olayları ve insanları hatırlamalarına, hatta onlarla gurur duymalarına ya da onlara hakkettikleri değeri vermelerine neden olmaktadır. İnsanlar, bir meydanı veya parkı, genellikle o mekandaki bir sanat objesiyle hatırlamaktadır. Başarılı bir kamusal sanat objesi, o mekanın sembolü haline gelmektedir.

Kamusal sanat, iletişimi kuvvetlendirip, sosyal birlikteliği temin etmektedir. Sanat, cezbedici özelliğiyle, insanları kendine çekmektedir. Bu çekim sonucunda, örneğin oturulacak bir yer aranmakta ve dostluklar başlamaktadır. Böylece sanat, önemli bir tanışma ve buluşma noktası özelliği kazanmaktadır. Zaten, sanat objelerinin bir çoğu, bu ve benzeri nedenlerle, toplanmaya uygun yerlerde, meydanlarda ve parklarda bulunmaktadır.

Özette, kamusal sanat, kent ve kentlinin hayatına, olumlu katkıda bulunmalı; mutluluk hissi uyandırmalı, hayal gücünü harekete geçirmeli, iletişimi ve sosyalliği ilerletebilecek bir yapıda olmalıdır.

Türkiye'de kentsel mekana ayrılan harcamaların bir kısmı, 1990'lı yıllardan itibaren sanat ürünleri için ayrılmaya başlamıştır. Kentsel mekana ayrılan bütçenin yüzde beş gibi bir oranının sanat ürünleri için ayrıldığı Avrupa ülkeleri ile kıyaslandığında ise, Türkiye'nin bu yönden nicelik olarak yetersiz olduğu görülmektedir. Bunun ötesinde, çeşitli meydan ve açık alanlara yerleştirilmek üzere topluca sipariş edilen, dolayısıyla içinde bulunacağı mekana göre tasarlanmayan heykeller, mevcut heykellere karşı siyasi iktidarların sergilemiş olduğu tutum ve davranışlar ile halkın bu objelere olan ilgisizliği gibi nedenler, kentsel mekanda sanatın Türkiye'deki durumunu olumsuz yönde etkilemektedir.

### 4. AKDENİZ HEYKELİ VE TARTIŞMA

Çetin Altan'ın, 1998 sonbaharında, Akdeniz heykelinin Zincirlikuyu'daki Halk Sigorta Binasının önünde tuhaf bir sıkışıklığın ve ilgisizliğin içinde olduğunu savunarak, taşınması

gerektiğini ileri sürmesiyle başlayan tartışmaya o dönemde pek çok kişi katılmıştır. Zülfü Livaneli ve Doğan Hızlan gibi gazeteciler kendi köşelerinde, Altan'a destek vermişler, heykelin kentin boğuculuğundan kurtarılıp, büyük anlam çağrışımlarına yol açacağını düşündükleri Akdeniz sahiline yerleştirilmesinin, yaratılış amacına da uygun düşeceğini savunmuşlardır. Bu görüşe, Koman'ın ailesi ile bazı sanatçılar ve köşe yazarları karşı gelmişler, bunun sonucunda, sanatçının ailesi, gazeteciler ve hükümet arasında, Akdeniz Heykeli hakkında çok boyutlu bir tartışma yaşanmıştır.

Aslında bu tartışma konusu, Türkiye için yeni bir konu değildir. Daha önce de, Türkiye'de, tüm dünyada olduğu gibi, çeşitli nedenlerle taşınan heykeller olmuş, o heykeller konusunda da yazılar yazılmış, tartışmalar yapılmıştır. Ama bu kez durum, diğerlerinden biraz farklı gözükmektedir. Çünkü söz konusu olan, herkesin, Cumhuriyetin en güzel sanat pırlantalarından ve İstanbul'daki birkaç modern kentsel mekan anıtlarından birisi olduğu konusunda görüş birliğine vardığı, ünlü heykeltıraş İlhan Koman'ın Akdeniz heykelidir ve tartışmaların çıkış noktası hiçbir siyasi görüşe dayanmamış, heykelin taşınması ile ilgili görüşler belirtilirken tamamen heykelin algılanabilirliği, mekansal uyumu gibi kavramlarından hareket edilmiştir. Sonucu ne olursa olsun, ifade edilen görüşlerin doğruluğu veya yanlışlığı ne kadar konuşulursa konuşulsun, aydınlar, sanatçılar ve devlet arasında, Akdeniz heykeli aracılığıyla, kentsel açık alanlarla ilgili çalışmalarda yeterli önemin verilmediği kamusal sanat kavramı üzerinde bir tartışma başlatılmıştır.

## 5. SONUÇ

Yukarıdaki tartışmaya göre, bir kamusal sanat objesinin taşınması için tutarlı ve yeterli nedenler bulunması halinde, toplumun elit kesimi konu üzerinde kolay ve hızlı biçimde düşünmeye başlamaktadır. Bu, kamusal sanatın, kullanıcıların hayatındaki önemini göstermektedir. Herşeyden önce, içinde yaşanılan kentlerde, o çevreye özellik katacak gerekli sanat öğeleri bulunmuyorsa, sağlıklı bir kent yaşamından söz etmek pek mümkün değildir. Fakat, bu düşünce, halkın tüm kesimleri için geçerli midir? Ve kamusal sanatın, küçük bir elit gruptan daha geniş halk tabakalarına seslenmesi mümkün ya da gerekli değil midir?

Akdeniz Heykeli hakkındaki tartışmadan çıkan diğer bir sonuç, kamusal sanat çalışmalarının, kentin diğer elemanlarıyla kuvvetli bir ilişkiye sahip olma zorunluluğudur. Bir kamusal sanat çalışması, tek başına bir şaheser olabilir ve bu tartışma katılımcılarının çoğunun düşündüğü gibi, eğer bir kamusal sanat objesi, baştan özel bir alan için tasarlandıysa, onun yerinin değiştirilmesi üzerine görüş belirtmeye gerek olmayabilir. Fakat aynı zamanda, çevresine iyi uyum sağlayamayan bir kamusal sanat objesinin de devamlı olarak tartışma konusu olacağı açıktır.

Son olarak, çoğu kamusal sanat objesinin sahibi, ya bir belediye ya da bir özel kuruluş olmaktadır ve taşınıp taşınmaması konusunda da kararın onlara ait olduğu açıktır. Fakat bu belediye ya da özel kuruluşlar, obje hakkında yeterli kararlılığa sahip değillerse, kullanıcıların görüşü, kamusal sanatın kaderi için birinci sırayı almaktadır.

## KAYNAKLAR

- ALTAN, Ç., 1998: Gelin Dertleşelim Biraz da..., Sabah Gazetesi, 01.11.1998.
- ALTAN, Ç., 1998: Ecevit'e, Talay'a, Özkan'a Teşekkürlerle..., Sabah Gazetesi, 04.11.1998.
- BAYER, Y., 1998: Koman'ın Heykeli Edirne'ye Yakışır, Hürriyet Gazetesi, 06.11.1998.
- BAYER, Y., 1998: Koman'ın Heykeli Paylaşılamıyor, Hürriyet Gazetesi, 08.11.1998.
- BERK, N.; GEZER H., 1973: Elli Yılın Türk Resim ve Heykeli, İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, İstanbul.
- BRAND, J. 1992: Art for A Natural and Artificial Environment, Foundation World Horticultural Exhibition Floriade, Zoetermeer.
- CROWHURST LENNARD, S.H.; LENNARD, H.L., 1997: Making Cities Livable, International Making Cities Livable Conferences, Carmel, California.
- HIZLAN, D., 1998: Çetin Altan'ın Ricasını Yerine Getirin, Hürriyet Gazetesi, 04.11.1998.
- KOMAN, İ. RIBEYROLLES, F., 1979: On My Approach to Making Non-Figurative Static and Kinetic Sculpture, Leonardo, Vol. 12, pp. 1-4, The Leonardo Association, Paris.
- LİVANELİ, Z., 1998: Karakafa, Sabah Gazetesi, 04.11.1998.
- LYNCH, K., 1981: Good City Form, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- NEYZİ, A., 1993: Bir Heykelin Öyküsü, İstanbul Dergisi, Vol. 4, pp. 115-118, ISSN 1300-7033, Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, İstanbul.
- PIERCEY, D., 1997: The Place of Public Art in the Contemporary Landscape, <http://www.geog.ox.ac.uk/research/piercev.html>
- RONA, Z., 1997: İlhan Koman, Eczacıbaşı Sanat Ansiklopedisi, Vol. 2, pp. 1036-1037, YEM, İstanbul.
- SEÇKİN, Y.Ç.; TÜRKOĞLU, H.D., 2003: İlhan Koman ve Akdeniz Heykeli, Yapı, Vol. 263, pp. 92-95, YEM, İstanbul.
- STERN, R.A.M., 1986: Pride of Place: Building the American Dream, The Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, Massachusetts.