3 Seashore readings

The road from sea baths to summerhouses in mid-twentieth century Izmir

Meltem Ö. Gürel

Every house has stories to tell. But sometimes the stories are not about the memories it holds for the residents, but about the meanings it portrays to those who have not experienced its intimacy or homey qualities. A summerhouse that I admired as a young child prompts such a story.¹

In the summers between 1969 and 1972, I would take the bus with my mother and family friends on day trips to a beach on the periphery of Izmir. I remember waiting with excitement to catch a glimpse of the house, trying very hard not to miss the opportunity for a quick look through the bus window as it passed by. The house stood out as different from any other around it, with a distinctive concrete slide landing into a curvilinear pool. Now, decades later, it is strange to see the structure grown old – surrounded by buildings that have proliferated in the area. Even stranger is to see it as a vestige of modern architecture; while I view it with the same nostalgia I feel looking at a local nineteenth-century house (Fig. 3.1). These emotions in part urged me to explore what made this house so special to me even as a very young child. Besides and beyond its architectural merits, what does (or did) this house and its environment embody socially, culturally, and even politically? What does it tell us about the architectural culture of the time as well as society as a whole?

The materiality of that house and the larger summerhouse complex to which it belongs, along with comparable summerhouses built during the 1950s and 1960s, represent a celebration of mid-century modern architecture. Beyond this representation, they arguably embody a historical moment exposing Western post-World War II influences, aspects of which include the discursive formation of an idealized domestic setting, the transformation of leisure activities, and the emergence of a vacation culture. These changes are rooted in an intriguing social history dating back to nineteenth-century Ottoman practices at the seashore. They are also intertwined with notions of modernity as well as the advent of industrialization, urban growth, and the politics of modernization.

Undoubtedly, the popularization of summerhouses has been a significant component in shaping shoreline development in Turkey since the mid-twentieth century. This occurrence can be connected to post-WWII

Figure 3.1 Aşkan summerhouse in 2010. Author's photograph

extensions of Western aid to periphery countries as a means of endorsing democratic capitalism; a significant outcome being the conceptual formation of the United States as the quintessence of modernity. Among the products of such aid were the availability of new materials and building methods, motor-road construction, imported automobiles, industrialization, and the mechanization of rural areas, leading to migration from the rural areas to the cities, and unregulated rapid urbanization. Consequences of these changes included a shift in transportation methods paralleling the reconstruction and expansion of urban landscapes, the proliferation of squatter settlements, and an increase in the construction of multi-story apartment buildings and urban renewal projects. Grounded in this context, and through the window of some seminal precedents around Izmir, this chapter examines how notions of leisure as related to the seashore and summerhouses were formed and transformed in Turkey and, in the process, how they became entangled with concepts of modernity, the politics of modernization, and transformations of the local landscape and beyond. Simultaneously, the chapter focuses on how architectural representations were a medium through which a sense of the modern and the novel were established and solidified, as well as how the forms and aesthetics of a number of summerhouses mediated Euro–American influences on Turkish architectural culture.

From sea baths to modern beaches: The transformation of seaside practices and the concept of docility

From sea baths to modern beaches and summerhouses, transformation of leisure practices around seawater is significant to the concept of modernity as well as to the politics of modernization in Turkey. The overlapping social and architectural history of this transformation provide an intriguing reading about how spatial instruments serve to control and manipulate social order and practices, and how they help to construct the social-cultural norms that operate in our lives.

With the Mediterranean, the Aegean, and the Black Seas bordering Turkey on three sides, and including the Sea of Marmara, the country's long shores and beaches are popular vacation spots for locals and foreigners alike. However, these geographical characteristics did not always entice crowds for swimming or related leisure activities. In part because of religious beliefs, and in part because of socio-cultural norms and practices that deemed sea- and sunbathing sinful, shameful, and even unhealthy, bodily interaction with salt water and the sun was alien to Ottoman society; the sea was mostly to be enjoyed as a scenic treasure from a distance or as a means to trade and travel. Such views began to subside in the nineteenth century, signaling further social and cultural transformations. *Sea bathing* (as distinct from *swimming*) became an important habit of the Ottoman sultan Abdülhamit II (1842–1918), following an accident at the age of twelve. From the writings of his daughter Ayşe Osmanoglu, we know that this habit was developed on the recommendation of an “Italian palace doctor” who treated Abdülhamit at the time.² Discussion on the benefits of sea bathing and the sea air, which had been recognized in Europe³ in the eighteenth century, can be followed in Ottoman media by the end of the nineteenth century, for example, in a July 1889 article by Dr. Andriyadis in the *Mürüvet Gazetesi*.⁴ Bodily interaction with seawater on a public level began with the construction of early sea baths (*deniz hamamı*), especially in cosmopolitan cities with a considerable non-Muslim population, such as Istanbul (the Ottoman capital) and Izmir, the second-largest port.⁵

Sea baths were enclosed wooden structures built on timber stilts in the sea. They were similar to indoor pools and could be reached from the shore by wooden bridges.⁶ Some large seaside houses had private sea baths; in Istanbul, foreign embassies had private baths on the Bosphorus.⁷ These were like small wooden rooms, and the people in them could not be seen from the outside. Public sea baths were larger, but somewhat rickety, constructed seasonally and usually dismantled to be stored in the off-season. Inside, sea baths, especially women's baths, usually had changing rooms. Some baths were built in pairs – men's and women's baths – to accommodate families. However, they were separated to prevent the genders from overhearing each other and to keep females away from male gaze. In fact, guards in charge of public order observed late-Ottoman sea baths to ensure no one violated these norms.⁸

While such segregated bathing practices were an extension of the Islamic use of space, they did, to an extent, exist in Christian Europe. In Britain, for example, resorts introduced gender-segregated bathing rules through the use of bathing machines, small wooden structures or carts with roofs and on wheels that could be rolled into the sea. These devices, used from the eighteenth to the twentieth centuries, allowed privacy for changing into “proper” swimwear and entering the water. Usage regulations, for example, prohibiting girls over the age of eight from bathing within fifty yards of males in the late-nineteenth century, suggested how the sea was to be consumed by “decent” British society.⁹ Similarly, the dimensions, depth, and practices of public Turkish sea baths were regulated by a code of rules (*nizamname*). Such codes reinforced safety measures, disciplined the seaside practices and defined gendered uses of spaces. As some users informed, once in the bath, men would sometimes swim under the wooden curtain, perhaps in an attempt to view the women, but women were too culturally restrained to do so.¹⁰

In addition to bathing, these structures were used for socializing and gossiping. I suggest that sea baths can be considered *heterotopias*, meaning “other spaces,” theorized by Michel Foucault as “a sort of place that lies outside all places and yet is actually localizable.”¹¹ That is, these are different from “utopias,” unreal spaces of idealized perfection, and different from real everyday spaces. Embodying both absolutely real and unreal, they occupy a space in-between everyday landscapes and their distant other. In doing so, they give the most severe insights to the social order.¹² Accordingly, sea baths as heterotopias offer a sharp angle from which we can critically view the social order that controlled everyday life at that time in Turkey.

Like the public space of neighborhood baths, the spatial designs of sea baths worked to regulate and discipline user practices. These practices and gender segregation were gradually altered after the founding of the Republic of Turkey as a secular state in 1923. Men’s and women’s bathing attires also changed from traditional to Western swimwear, parallel to the reforms adopting Western clothing in the 1920s.¹³ Sea baths remained intact until the mid-1950s. The popular ones included Salıpazarı, Beyazpark, Kumkapı, Samatya, Bakırköy, Fenerbahçe, Moda, Kalamış, Haydarpaşa, and Caddebostan in Istanbul, and Karşıyaka and Güzelyalı in İzmir.¹⁴ From the 1920s through to the 1950s, mixed-gender beaches, where women and men showing off fashionable swimsuits could swim and socialize together, replaced gender-segregated sea baths. The Westernization reforms of Atatürk, the founder of the Republic, led the way for these changes. Photographs from the 1930s of Atatürk swimming and connecting with people on Florya Beach (*Florya Plajı*) in Istanbul are illustrious statements of Republican modernity. Florya was a forerunner to many modern Istanbul beaches. The shore was enjoyed by occupying British soldiers as well as White Russians who had escaped the revolution.¹⁵ In the early 1920s,

Russian women's and men's swimwear exposing generous amounts of skin set a strong contrast to local customs, since showing the body was out of the question even in sea baths.

Also in the 1920s, beaches with modern facilities, began appearing along the shores of Istanbul, reflecting the flourishing beach culture. Among these were Caddebostan, Fenerbahçe, Harem, Moda, Suadiye, and Süreyya beaches on the Anatolian side, Büyükdade Yörükali, Büyükdade Değirmen, and Kilyos beaches on the Princes' Islands, and Altinkum, Beyazpark, Küçüksu, Florya, and Ataköy beaches on the European side.¹⁶ Ataköy was designed in 1957, with its recreational facilities part of an iconic modern housing development. The London–Istanbul motorway bounding the development on the north and the Sirkeci–Florya drive bounding it on the south, servicing the 50-hectare strip of Ataköy's seashore,¹⁷ were major outcomes of the new policies in Istanbul and colossal examples of Prime Minister Adnan Menderes' (1950–1960) urban renewal and modernization projects.¹⁸

The transformation of seashore conventions from the enclosed and gender-segregated spaces of the sea baths to the open environments of mixed-gender beaches is an excellent example of the realm embodying the concept of docility and what Foucault called *biopower*, referring to the disciplinary power that manages our lives.¹⁹ The physical setting, design elements, and configurations of these built environments display the instrumentality of spatial design in regulating and controlling the masses in powerful ways.²⁰ Here, the transformation from sea baths to early modern beaches, I propose, crystallizes the shift in power and how this power worked in *managing and manipulating a society*. Control fed by customs based on religion was replaced by ideology that got its power from concepts of health, sanitation, development, progress, modernization, and Westernization. These concepts worked through the practices of architects, builders, clients, and users, all of whom contributed to the discursive formation of a contemporary culture.²¹

Architects were enthusiastic about educating the masses in Western cultural forms. Their architectural interventions at the seashore sought to modernize lifestyles. A notable example of this argument and a precedent to Izmir's early modern beaches is İnciraltı Beach (*İnciraltı Plajı*), on Izmir's outskirts west of the Güzelyalı sea baths. İnciraltı, was a popular destination, easy to get to by scheduled ferries.²² In the early 1950s, the municipality built a modern beach facility to meet rising demand as well as to embrace contemporary lifestyles in this area. The facility was designed by architect Rıza Aşkan, head of the municipality's building office at the time. The work was also triggered by the undesirable results of rapid urbanization and a lack of adequate sewage infrastructure, causing seawater pollution, which, in turn, led to the consecutive closure of private and public sea baths stretching from Karşıyaka to Güzelyalı throughout the 1950s. For example, after inspection of the popular Güzelyalı sea bath in 1956, the

water was found to be too contaminated for bathing, exceeding the safety standards for human health.²³

In a 1955 issue of *Arkitekt*, the primary architectural periodical at the time, the new facility was acknowledged as an important example of modern beach architecture around Izmir. Aşkan's design carried leitmotifs of influential architect Sedat Hakkı Eldem, his professor from Istanbul's Academy of Fine Arts, who, coincidentally, was put in charge of Florya Beach's renewal project in 1957. The facility included a big café/restaurant (*gazino*), children's playground, basketball courts, changing cabins for 1,000 people, and showers (Fig. 3.2a and 3.2b).²⁴ *Gazinos* were typical and lively aspects first of sea baths and later of beaches. A material objectification of the Republican culture, early *gazinos* were instrumental in destabilizing the tradition of gender segregation by bringing men and women in close proximity – sitting, dining, listening to music, and dancing together – in the public domain.²⁵ As I have argued elsewhere, a *gazino* was a spatial structure influencing popular attitudes, transforming socio-cultural norms, and mediating Western behavior, modern aesthetics, and contemporary practices, simultaneously serving as a medium through which people could perform and express their modernity.²⁶ Similarly, the early modern beaches worked as *gazinos* did in regulating and structuring practices and redefining gendered uses of spaces while producing new or transformed socio-cultural identities.

Summerhouses and early summerhouse culture

In addition to the beach facilities, the İnciraltı project included 66 summerhouses with four different plan types, shops, playgrounds, and a parking lot, embracing and promoting the growing importance of leisure practices and cars in the mid-century (Fig. 3.3). These small and modest houses were designed for the use of municipality personnel and rented by lottery.²⁷ The İnciraltı Beach and summerhouse complex was an important precedent around Izmir for *managing and manipulating seashore practices* and presenting how a contemporary seashore development “should” be. With respect to my argument of *biopower*, it embodied the prevalent concepts in the ensuing development of beaches, institutional, military, and private summer vacation camps, individual homes, cooperative summer housing developments, and *sites* – a Turkish term used to define housing complexes composed of a group of dwellings built together and usually of the same architectural design, sharing common green areas and service facilities.

In İnciraltı, the municipality also provided land for constructing tents and wooden barracks, with the conditions that these were to be built according to the plan types provided by the municipality's building office and that they included toilets and kitchens with water.²⁸ In this regulated environment, these structures had to be located 60 meters away from the sea and

Figure 3.2a and 3.2b İnciraltı Beach facility with a *gazino*, children's playground, basketball courts, changing cabins for 1,000 people, and showers. Author's archive. Photographs are also published in *Arkitekt* 279, 1955, pp. 8–11

Figure 3.3 Site plan of the İnciraltı Beach facility with summerhouses. Author's archive. Courtesy of Gülen (Aşkan) Derman. Plan is also published in *Arkitekt* 279, 1955, pp. 8–11

were to be dismantled at the end of the season.²⁹ An owner of such a wooden barrack explained:

In the beginning of the season, before our things were moved by a truck and our car, our carpenter, Ibrahim *usta*, would spend a few days building our barrack. The walls were made out of hardboard, but the sidewalls were woven straw mats (*hasır*) for ventilation purposes. Different from [and better built than] many other barracks, our roof had terracotta tiles for protection in case of rain. We had two large rooms with a kitchen and dining area in the back and a large veranda facing the sea in the front. We had a private lavatory and a shower with a concrete basin outside. We did not have electricity, so we used gas lamps. We had a non-electrical icebox with lead lining instead of a refrigerator. There were no water pipes, no running water, so we had a water container with a faucet for washing. We had great times there and hosted so many guests – all kinds of people, even distinguished guests . . . for a few years in the early 1950s. We would stay there for two to two-and-a-half months. Afterwards, the barrack would be dismantled and stored in our basement for the next year.³⁰

Such a vacation culture that involved a move to the seashore for the summer was beyond the reach of the middle class before the mid-twentieth century. As Koçu informs us in *Istanbul Ansiklopedisi*, this was a practice of the Ottoman elite, and the timing of the moves in and out of these homes was officially regulated.³¹ Boat service, with the establishment of Bosphorus (*Boğaz*), Marmara and Golden Horn (*Haliç*) lines starting from the mid-nineteenth century, arguably facilitated new leisure practices and encouraged seashore development around Istanbul.³² Summerhouses emerged in the nineteenth century, when they were considered a means of getting away from the industrialized city.³³ Globally, summerhouses were a product of urban growth, industrial revolution, and immigration. These developments had a profound effect on society and culture, and launched the notion of leisure time.

After the Republic was founded, emphasis on a contemporary family structure and domestic spatial arrangements paved the way for family vacations. Atatürk set the example, vacationing with his adopted daughter, Ülkü, on the Florya shores. His summerhouse (Florya Atatürk Marine Mansion), was designed by architect Seyfi Arkan in 1935. The structure was built on piles in the sea and connected to the shore with a long bridge, recalling the architecture of sea baths (Fig. 3.4). The house embodied a vacation culture that had been embedded in the shores of Istanbul from the Bosphorus to the Princes' Islands since the nineteenth century. Different from palatial Ottoman architecture and the seaside *yalis* or mansions of the Ottoman elite and foreign embassies, the austere modernist aesthetics of Atatürk's summerhouse and its environment were not only representations of the 1930s modern architecture,

Figure 3.4 Florya Atatürk Marine Mansion (1935), designed by architect Seyfi Arkan. The structure was built on piles in the sea and connected to the shore with a long bridge, recalling the architecture of sea baths. Author's photograph

but also of the young Republic as a modern and Western state. The home was used as the presidential summer residence until 1988.

A scan through *Arkitekt*, the only regular architectural periodical of the early Republic years, not only gives a good idea about the growth of the family vacation culture in the form of summerhouses, but also reveals the presence of summerhouses in architects' bodies of work: Summerhouse (1933) by Mimar Abidin (Abidin Mortaş); Summerhouse in Yakacık (1933) by Sedat Emin; Floating Home (1939) by Ahsen Yapanar; Summer Shore House in Caddebostan (1936) by Kemali Söylemezoğlu; A Villa in Suadiye, (1940) by Seyfi Arkan; A Summerhouse (1945) by Hidayet Gösterişli; House in Burgazada (1946) by İlya Ventura; House in Büyükkada (1946) by Emin Necip Uzman; A House Project in Heybeliada (1953) by Ömer Küpeli and Ahsen Yapanar Atelier at the Academy of Fine Arts; Summerhouse in Feneryolu (1953) by Rebii Gorbun.³⁴

The practice of seasonal moves to summerhouses broadened when people became willing to travel longer distances to live at the seaside. Many bureaucrats in Ankara moved to early summerhouses along the Marmara shores.³⁵ In the mid-twentieth century, seaside homes become available to the middle

classes. Seashore interventions exemplified by modern beaches, summerhouses, housing developments, building cooperatives, beach hotels, summer vacation camps and complexes, and tents and barracks proliferated as road conditions improved, motor transportation increased, and imported automobiles became available to a greater number of people, transforming leisure practices and the shoreline in the process. Notably, legislation on turning land into building lots facilitated this transformation and the consumption of the shores as we have come to know them. As early as the 1950s, vacation housing developments started to accompany individual homes through government incentives, which were driven by viewing the shores, especially the Aegean and Mediterranean shores, as tourist assets to be developed and commercialized.³⁶ After the 1970s, the practice of having a summerhouse, especially one in a *site*, became widespread and the seashores became urbanized. This demand increased real estate value as well as legislative pressure to turn the shoreline into lots on which to construct “build–sell” vacation housing developments and building cooperatives, which now blanket Turkey’s shores and stretch inland. The idea of a summerhouse as a counterpart to winter city life became pervasive.

The politics of modernization: Asphalt roads, and automobiles

In the nineteenth century, developments in railroad transportation were important in connecting the Ottoman Empire to the rest of the world geographically and economically. However, the railroad system was neither evenly distributed nor well connected. During the early years of the Republic, much emphasis was placed on upgrading and constructing railroads. In Atatürk’s view, “the railroad [was] a torch that illuminated the country with civilization and prosperity.”³⁷ It was also a tool in unifying the new nation state by connecting different areas. In the 1950s, the focus of transportation policies shifted from railways to highways as a product of changes from post-WWII global dynamics. Upon becoming a member of the United Nations in 1945, Turkey took an important step towards liberal parliamentary democracy by establishing a multiparty system in 1946.³⁸ This change was followed by the pivotal 1950 elections that brought the Democrat Party to power, officially concluding the one-party era of the Republican People’s Party. The new government adhered to the policies of the capitalist West via the leadership of the US.³⁹ No doubt, participating in the Korean War (1950–1953) and joining NATO (1952) were two of the important markers of the Turkish government’s ambition to strengthen and solidify relationships with the US. This drive was also fueled by the neighboring Soviet Union’s territorial demands.⁴⁰ The US considered Turkey (and Greece) among countries vulnerable to the communist threat; it extended its Marshall Plan (1947), which was intended to help recovery and secure political stability in Europe, to Turkey to compensate for the country’s lack of

investment funds at the time. A major part of the aid was given for the development of agriculture, industries, military and road networks. As with other European locations, however, this aid also brought American cultural influence, denoting the politics of the Cold War era.⁴¹ This influence can be ably tracked through oral histories, popular music, and the media of the time (movies, local and national newspapers, radio programs, magazines such as *Hayat*, advertisements, etc.), all promoting the American way of life and simultaneously contributing to the discursive formation of the US as the epitome of modernity.⁴² It is in this context that road infrastructure and automobiles were recognized as signs of becoming modern. The Marshall Plan, in this respect, was a means of promoting the American outlook of mobility both in Western Europe and at the periphery.

When the Republic was founded, there were only 18,335 km of roads in Turkey. This figure reached 41,582 km by 1940 (not all paved, however).⁴³ Before 1948, roads were built by labor-intensive construction methods. This date marked the mechanization of road construction in Turkey. Proclaiming the advent of the Turkish road program, Prime Minister Menderes stated, “In this era of motorization, [with automobiles] providing speed, convenience, and an inexpensive means of transportation, we will especially prioritize road networks.”⁴⁴ As President Bayar put it, railroads were worn out and “their renewal require[d] a great sum of money.”⁴⁵ Since such funds were not available, the railroads began to decay. An “ambitious program of road improvement,” however, formalizing “the presence of the American highway mission in Turkey,” supported the road project.⁴⁶ Making the American presence official, an agreement was signed between the Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA) Projects Committee and the Ministry of Public Works in Ankara on 26 April 1948. The US support of road construction was largely based on its Hilts Report of 1948, which stated that Turkey was in need of new roads and that this could be achieved with technical and financial aid. The US gave US\$31.5 billion for the Turkish road project between 1950 and 1955, and another US\$2.8 billion between 1956 and 1960.⁴⁷ Between 1948 and 1957, the total distance of surfaced roads rose from 14,961 km to 21,266 km; state-highways-stabilized roads from 430 km to 15,698 km; and asphalt roads from 816 km to 4,123 km.⁴⁸ With US support, Turkey’s General Directorate of Highways (KGM) was established on 1 March 1950, with branches throughout the country.⁴⁹ The new highways policy also provided the construction and maintenance equipment required to execute the work and train personnel.

Although only a small number of well-to-do people owned automobiles at the beginning of the 1950s, ownership had increased by the 1960s.⁵⁰ American-made cars dominated the market before the establishment of the Turkish automotive industry, whose foundations were laid as early as 1959, with production starting in 1966 with Anadol, the first mass-produced passenger car with a fiberglass body in Turkey. Between 1950 and 1960, 86,961 motor vehicles of all kinds were imported.⁵¹ Besides connecting rural areas to urban

centers and agricultural production to markets, the greater availability of motor transportation and road improvements had social consequences. One significant consequence was moving larger masses to unspoiled seashores, which in turn, prompted higher demand for summerhouses. Vacation homes became more desirable as cities became industrialized, polluted, crowded, noisy, congested with traffic, and built up with multi-story concrete apartment buildings that replaced older houses with gardens.

The apartmentization of the urban landscape and a desire for summerhouses

The 1950s witnessed an increase in multi-story concrete apartment building construction and major undertakings of urban renewal projects, influenced by modernism in architecture and urbanism. In major centers, it was also characterized by the proliferation of squatter settlements (*gecekond*) with inadequate infrastructures. Formation of these settlements increased with a massive influx of the rural population migrating to big cities for new job opportunities as a result of the industrialization of cities and the mechanization of the rural areas (i.e., an increase in the number of tractors) funded by foreign aid. As this inexpensive form of housing accommodated migrants, who provided cheap labor, it posed great problems to the development of cities and ruralized them, transforming their physical and cultural texture. While squatter settlements multiplied as an undesirable consequence of rapid urbanization, the apartment was celebrated as a contemporary form of dwelling (Fig. 3.5).⁵²

Figure 3.5 An image for the project of Emlak Kredi Bank Apartment Blocks in Alsancak, Izmir. *Yeni Asır*, 15 July 1956

During this era, construction of apartment buildings, through government-initiated mass housing developments, building cooperatives, and privately constructed buildings, increased as a ramification of the housing demand.⁵³ Comfortable apartments in nice neighborhoods were looked upon as symbols of status and modernity. Their architectural design widely reflected prevalent modern design ideas: rectangular masses, roof terraces, unembellished façades with large glass openings, concrete canopies, free plans, and reinforced concrete load-bearing systems. Often equipped with comfort systems such as central heating, hot water, electricity, elevators, and bathrooms with contemporary fixtures, they incorporated modern living conditions and were promoted as “ideal homes.” Women, tasked with maintaining the home, preferred these apartments to the nineteenth-century houses without these comfort systems.⁵⁴

Apartment building construction amplified after Turkey’s Flat Property Legislation of 1965; its foundations were laid in the 1950s and early 1960s. Allowing individual ownership of apartments in a building, this legislation fostered the build–sell model and the consequent production of apartment buildings as anonymous objects. In this model, the contractor took property from the owner in exchange for flats. The expenses of construction were met by pre-selling the apartments. The possibility of construction with little capital, then, made this model prevalent in other locations as well. The number of apartments, and thus the height of the building, became critical to the profit margin. Municipalities were pressured into allowing higher apartments with more flats, a tendency that persists. Apartments were conceptualized as a means of maximizing profits while meeting the housing demand. A major downside of this model, however, was the tendency to use cheaper materials to increase profits, and the resulting output was potentially dangerous, considering that Turkey is a country with considerable seismic activity. Another downside of the apartment boom was the acceleration in the destruction of historical and/or traditional urban contexts. In Turkey, arrangements to preserve historical buildings were initiated in 1951 with the establishment of the High Council of Historical Monuments and Property, however, this action was not enough to prevent the destruction of the historical urban fabric overall. Even modern villas, small cooperative houses with gardens, and low-rise apartments were torn down to make room for more flats and large profits. Significantly, apartment buildings were *mechanism of modernization* in Turkey as much as they were *agents of modernity*. They embodied the concept of modernity as much as the ideas of technology, standardization, and affordability. They were economic means to replace older houses that lacked modern amenities.⁵⁵ The increase in their production enabled the development of the middle classes.

After the 1960s, however, many people held the proliferation of apartment buildings responsible for destruction of the traditional fabric of houses and viewed the vertical density of the urban landscape as visual pollution.

Historians along with architects became the most ardent critics of apartmentization.⁵⁶ Such opinions and criticisms are comparable to the well-known critiques of modernization with respect to the negative effects of standardizing the domestic space and urban environment of everyday experiences.⁵⁷ They also reflect a nostalgia for the past, which existed even in the 1930s. For example, the editorials of Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın, published in *Yedigün* magazine, criticized the 1930s apartments, with their cubic forms, rounded corners, use of reinforced concrete, unadorned surfaces, flat roofs, terraces, cantilevers, and their material culture, and lamented the loss of the traditional Turkish home.⁵⁸ In 1936, Peyami Safa, a nationalist intellectual, wrote:

In Turkey, cubic is the name of the squat, flat, formless apartment building with tiny rooms and low ceilings, constructed with cheap mortar, its wooden parts damaged by an uncontrolled and uncalculated amount of excess sunlight.⁵⁹

The sentiments in comparing traditional houses to modern concrete apartment buildings resonate with French philosopher Gaston Bachelard's conception of the oneiric house (1948), first introduced in *La Terre et les rêveries du repos*.⁶⁰ Blending resentment of the apartment as a "superimposed box" and a suggestive nostalgia for the French provincial house, with a sentimentality for its interior spaces and its close relationship to nature, Bachelard developed the idea of a house as "a nest for dreaming," a place that sheltered memories and enabled a "return to earth."⁶¹ For Bachelard, a house was a rooted space providing a meaningful relationship for people, especially children, to their environment and the world around them. Its cellars and attics embodied the essential element of verticality. In contrast, the horizontal space of the apartment, detached from the earth and hanging in air, obliterated this conception of home. Moreover, its operation in replacing old houses and gardens (and similarly sea baths) implied the eradication of memories, the past, the familiar, and the intrinsic. At the same time, however, the apartment – a product of a complex web of economic, political, and social constraints – introduced the present, the modern, and the extrinsic. In other words, the apartment manifested the ambiguity of the modern condition, as Marshall Berman put it, as a contradiction between disintegration and renewal.⁶² Projecting this modern condition, the apartment carved a space in the density of urban landscapes by erasing what belonged to the past.

Modern apartments not only replaced old houses and gardens but also changed neighborhood networks, everyday practices, and lifestyles.⁶³ On the urban waterfront, with apartments erected in place of the *yahı* with private sea baths, a lifestyle on the docks vanished, which, besides bathing and swimming, involved boating, fishing, and socializing.⁶⁴ The process of apartmentization, accompanied by the challenges of rapid urbanization and

inadequate infrastructure and sewage facilities, brought about the pollution of city waterfronts. Together with developments in motor transportation starting in the 1950s, the undesirable products of urbanization were major reasons that moved people to rural areas to explore the then-unspoiled shores, simultaneously invoking a desire for vacation homes with gardens and being rooted to the ground as means of escaping the output of urbanization to, as Bachelard put it, “return to earth.”

Idealized domestic settings occupying a space between the urban and the rural: The case of *Mimarlar Sitesi*

A desire to occupy the space between the built-up city and the provincial seashore triggered the rise of summerhouses in the 1950s and 1960s. And motor transportation brought this desire closer to reality. This in-between space arguably matched the discursive formation of an idealized house with a yard, reached by a car, knitting the urban and the rural. The architectural representation of this house, offering visual clues as to how a modern family should live, embodied contemporary lifestyles imposed by American cultural influence – an outcome of Cold War geopolitics. An example of this embodiment and an early example of a privately developed summerhouse complex (*yazlık ev sitesi*) was *Mimarlar Sitesi* (translated as “architects’ housing complex,” as it was first called), on the Aegean Sea near Izmir, in the Liman Reis region.

This complex was also designed and built by Rıza Aşkan, the architect of İnciraltı Beach and summerhouses, in collaboration with Suat Erdeniz, with whom he formed a partnership after resigning from the municipality. Both architects owned summerhouses in the complex,⁶⁵ and Aşkan’s house happened to be the subject of my childhood fascination. The other owners included a mixed group of professionals, including tradesmen, merchants, industrialists, lawyers, and doctors. The cooperative was founded so its members could be near the city in the summer to commute to work.⁶⁶ The construction of the *site* was made possible by the asphaltting of the Izmir-Çeşme road under the regional divisions of the KGM. These improvements came hand in hand with developing the area for vacation homes.

About 90 km west of Izmir, Çeşme was an emerging summer resort with sandy beaches, especially popular with the city’s non-Muslim population.⁶⁷ Some owned vacation homes there and local hotels were major points of seaside accommodation, but it took many hours to travel to Çeşme because of the poor road condition. Building the Çeşme Cooperative Beach Houses in 1956 furthered the development of the town as a summer resort and prompted the need for improving the road.⁶⁸ Starting from Izmir’s Üçkuyular district, the road not only connected the city to Çeşme, but also serviced the area in between, starting with the Narlıdere, Liman Reis, and Kilizman shores, a short distance from the city, and continuing to Urla, about 40 km from Izmir. Up to 58 km west of the city, the Izmir-Çeşme corridor was

slated to be finished in 1957.⁶⁹ Improvements included widening the road to eight meters until it reached Urla, repairing or rebuilding (wooden) bridges, and asphaltting.⁷⁰ These improvements, combined with the increased availability of bus transportation and automobiles (for those who could afford them), led to the development of the seashore along this segment of the road. During the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, some preferred building summerhouses in this area to Çeşme because of its closer proximity to the city and thus the ability to commute during the summer.⁷¹

Mimarlar Sitesi was a cooperative project composed of 21 detached summerhouses facing the sea. All the houses could be reached from the main asphalt road, which stood between the sea and the homes. Off this road, the houses were arranged around a common green area encircled by an internal driveway covered with local crushed stone, the presence of which was an indication of the changes privately owned automobiles had inflicted on daily life: originally, the architects had planned to build a pool in this common space. Instead, they built a 20-meter wooden dock on iron pilings in the sea, which recalled the old sea baths, and developed the common central area as a park, with grass, shrubs, trees, concrete benches, and a basketball court. The latter reflected, as on İnciraltı Beach, the prevalent ideas and shared values of youth, health, and novelty associated with post-war American culture.⁷² The suburban quality of this landscape design arguably implies a sense of the modern, visualized in and consumed as an idealized domestic setting at mid-century. A picture of the houses with an American-made Chevrolet parked in the foreground encapsulates this historical moment.

The design of the buildings, with a few different house plan types, incorporated the precepts of modern architecture. Sizeable openings and verandas endorsed a flow between indoors and out. Large windows capitalized on the view. Built in concrete, the rectilinear mass of houses was slightly raised from the road level on floating slabs. Originally, the architects' design proposed flat roofs, concrete canopies, and *brise soleils* to accompany the modern design language. However, with the exception of the architects' own houses, the single-story structures were topped by sloping roofs of local terracotta tiles. As Aşkan's daughter informs us, homeowners preferred this roof form because it recalled the cliché of an American suburban house.⁷³ Images of such a house traveled through Hollywood films, popular magazines, newspapers, advertisements of model or prize homes portrayed in line drawings characteristic of this era, and international fairs, such as the model home displayed at the Izmir International Fair in 1957 and 1958.⁷⁴ In *Mimarlar Sitesi*, an idealized image of the post-war suburban house occupying a space between the urban and the rural with modern architectural forms was picked up, worked upon with local constraints, translated into a new formation, and consumed as an example of contemporary vacation culture.

Distant from their counterparts, however, these modern-looking houses lacked even the basic amenities of electricity and water, as these services

were still a luxury in provincial areas. Initially, people used wick lamps for light, and eventually a water tank was built and a generator acquired for the complex to produce its own limited-use electricity.⁷⁵ Nevertheless, as a resident stated, when the summerhouse complex flourished on the once-empty fields of the Liman Reis shore in 1963, it was as a seminal example of *site* planning, characterized by a group of homes built and managed together. Imbedded in this operation was a sense of community by bringing together unrelated people in a built environment with common green areas of shared maintenance and security. Concurrently, embodied in this early *site* architecture is the archetype of controlled and exclusionary housing environments, encapsulating the idea of distinction or difference as a member of a group and epitomizing a certain socio-economic status.⁷⁶ That is, it manifests the conceptualization of architectural design as means of expressing shared values, cultural formation, taste, distinction, contemporariness, and local concerns. Notably, these developments (*sitelер*) are not limited to vacation home complexes, but also include (sub)urban mass housing projects for all income levels, as well as the gated communities, on rise after the 1980s, for upper income levels, all of which are prevalent in Turkey.⁷⁷ Arguably, their pervasiveness signifies socio-cultural attitudes revealing an interest in living with others who share similar lifestyles, cultural formations, and income levels, as much as they signify political responses towards planning and housing in Turkey.

Summerhouses: A playground for mid-century modern architecture

Strikingly different from an expression of belonging to *Mimarlar Sitesi* were the architects' own houses, articulating *individuality* as opposed to sameness and communality. The visibility of Aşkan's house from the main road underscored the stark contrast of its butterfly roof form with the complex's tile-roofed houses (See Fig. 3.1). Standing out as an architectural showcase of Euro-American modernism, the house clearly represents a body of work produced during the 1950s and 1960s by architects prominent on the local and international scenes. This work celebrates the poetic expression of modernist aesthetics.

The architectural vocabulary of Aşkan's house – large glazed openings balanced by solid walls of stone and whitewashed concrete, open-rise entrance stairs, waffle ceilings, metal railings, floating concrete veranda floor slabs, and concrete formwork, canopies, and ramp – reflects modernist influences, for example, of Le Corbusier, whom Aşkan met and worked with when the influential architect visited Izmir to work on an urban scheme for the city in 1948.⁷⁸ Aşkan was also influenced by Richard Neutra, whom he invited to Izmir in 1955 during Aşkan's tenure as head of Izmir's building division. The prominent architect was well-known for his modernist home designs in California. Yet, most of all, the landscape elements, including

native palm trees, cactuses, and local gravel; the plastic use of concrete in the pool design, the slide, and the ramp; the concrete canopies; the *brise soleils*; and the butterfly and flat roofs reflected Brazilian architect Oscar Niemeyer's influence. (Similar design elements can be seen in Izmir's Island Restaurant (*Ada Gazinosu*), which Aşkan designed for the municipality in 1957.)⁷⁹

Inside the house, the architect's design included a fireplace, which was rarely used, but which was nevertheless a status symbol resonating with American home designs during the 1950s and 1960s. His articulation of the fireplace as a freestanding element defining the combined living and dining areas was typical of modern home plans at the time (Fig. 3.6). Clad with Çeşme stone, the fireplace recalled designs typical of Frank Lloyd Wright's prairie architecture.⁸⁰ Like the modern "masters" who influenced him, Aşkan designed the total environment, from wall panels to furniture, according to modern aesthetic precepts. The material culture of the interior – stylized Formica furniture, built-in shelves and closets, lacquered finishes, cove lighting, the compact bathroom with bathtub and water closet, and the Westinghouse (American-made) refrigerator – embodied modern home culture at the time. The stone on the fireplace and wall sections as well as the surface treatment of the suspended ceiling design with local wild cane

Figure 3.6 Sketch plan of Aşkan Summerhouse drawn for the renovation of the terrace into a study. Author's archive. Courtesy of Gülen (Aşkan) Derman. Articulation of the fireplace as a freestanding element defining the combined living and dining areas was typical of modern home plans at the time

are skillful examples of reconciling modern design elements and materials with local ones. Modern aesthetics in dialogue with regional and cultural specificities manifested in the design of Aşkan's house (as well as in the complex in general) exemplifies a divergence from the rigid and rationalist manifestation of modernism in the form of so-called International Style, which dominated architectural developments in Turkey in the 1950s.⁸¹

This divergence can readily be seen in the design of many villas and summerhouses built for the upper-middle and upper classes by a number of modern Turkish architects. As published in architectural journals *Arkitekt* and *Mimarlık*, some examples of summerhouses are: Arif Saltuk's Villa, by Eril Mimarlık (*Arkitekt*, 1958); Three Villas in Kumburgaz, by Yılmaz Sanlı, Yılmaz Tuncer, and Güner Acar (*Arkitekt*, 1964); A Summer House in Maltepe, by Firuzan Baytop (*Arkitekt*, 1964); Four Vacation Houses in Gebze by Ali Kızıltan and Abdullah Sarı (*Mimarlık*, 1964); a Summer House in Orhantepe, by Ercüment Bigat and Alpay Aşkun (*Arkitekt*, 1966); and A Summer House in Kumburgaz, by Osep Sarafoğlu (*Arkitekt*, 1969).⁸² Rıza Derviş' House (1956–57) in Büyükkada, designed by S. H. Eldem, Aşkan's mentor from the Academy, is an outstanding example of how mid-century modernism flourished in summerhouse design in the 1950s and 1960s. A divergence from Eldem's interpretations of the "Turkish house," this villa displayed simplicity and austere visual qualities. Its open plan, floating forms, large openings, glazed walls, built-in furniture, and an emphasis on the indoor–outdoor relationship, all match the iconic home designs of, for example, the *Case Study Houses* program between 1945 and 1966, sponsored by *Arts and Architecture* magazine in the US.⁸³ Through this program, prominent architects such as Richard Neutra, Charles and Ray Eames, Eero Saarinen, and Pierre Koenig were commissioned to design inexpensive model homes, which were mostly built in Los Angeles.

Another vivid example celebrating this architecture is Mikalef House (1963) in the İlica region of Çeşme. The summerhouse was designed for the Mikalef family by architect Faruk San, a prominent Izmir architect who also trained at the Academy of Fine Arts.⁸⁴ The house was commissioned for the then eighteen-year-old daughter of the family, who liked vacationing in Çeşme. The family asked San for three schemes and the daughter herself chose the final design.⁸⁵ The reasons for the young woman's selection may be related to how the distinctive forms of Aşkan House captured my (and others') attention; likings, tastes, values, judgements, beliefs, views, and norms, or what might be considered cultural formation, are arguably discursively formed. A photograph of San with a model of Mikalef House in the front and a piece of abstract art in the back captures this discursive field and displays the building's simple design, a basic white box on a regular lot.⁸⁶ The simplicity is achieved through spaciousness and an indoor–outdoor flow, and is evident in the functional plan. The lower level houses the service and servant spaces. The upper floor has spacious living areas, bedrooms, and baths. Flow is further achieved by articulating the front and back

Figure 3.7 Mikalef House in Çeşme by Faruk San. *Mimarlık* 16:2, 1965, p. 16

balconies with glazed walls. The box is raised on a small rectangular mass on one side and has four V-shaped pilotis aligned on the other, providing a shaded and spacious veranda (Fig. 3.7). The idea of raising the building on pilotis is perhaps an influence of Le Corbusier, and can be seen in San's other designs. The V-shaped concrete pilotis, however, are a direct reference to Niemeyer, which, together with Aşkan's design, reveal the architect's impact on Turkish architectural culture at the time. Such pilotis are seen in Niemeyer's famous buildings; for example, in Lagoa Hospital (1952, with Athos Bulcao) in Rio de Janeiro or in the Palacio da Agricultura (1954) in Sao Paulo. The design approach at the ground level, which involves emptying the ground and using pilotis in plastic shapes, as well as adding geometric decorations on the walls, resonates with the low-rise apartment blocks B and D of Ataköy Housing Development's Phase I, an icon of architectural modernism in Turkey.⁸⁷ The idea of raising the mass of the house to provide for outdoor verandas resembles the 1950s villa designs of another Izmir architect, Ziya Nebioğlu.⁸⁸ Educated in the US, Nebioğlu's buildings displayed an influence of Frank Lloyd Wright – his concept of organic architecture, emphasis on horizontality, use of overhangs, planning of the fireplace, and use of natural materials – as much as an interest in regionalization or the rendition and reconciliation of modern precepts with local materials and flavors.

The houses discussed here not only exemplify the cross-cultural influences of mid-century modernism on Turkish architectural culture, but also translation and adaptation of these influences with local specificities. Embodied

in their forms are architects' desires to belong to the post-WWII Euro-American architectural culture and the changes in the profession from the preceding early Republican era. In the 1950s, architectural practice shifted from being a one-person operation with ideological (rather than economic) rigor to being a business enterprise. Development of the private sector provided a greater variety of commissions for architects; consequently, the first private architectural firms and partnerships in Turkey were established during the 1950s. These developments distinguish mid-century architectural practices, on the one hand, from 1930s modern architecture and state sponsored missionary approaches where architects took the role of cultural leaders shaping the new nation, and on the other hand, from the 1940s search for a national expression through cultural and historical references. Summerhouses discussed here portray this distinction, and the national interest and delight in being a part of the international community.

In the context of rapid urbanization, a desire to return to nature, and a shift in the notions of leisure shaped by the increase in motor transportation, the architects saw summerhouses as a medium for adapting modernist design precepts and aesthetics. For them, the summerhouse was a playground to test and express mid-century modernism.

Final remarks

The 1950s and 1960s were the decades when two domestic building types – *multistory apartment buildings* and *squatter houses* – multiplied as outputs of the population growth, industrialization, and immigration to city centers as a result of rural mechanization, a major outcome of post-WWII extensions of Western aid to periphery countries as a means of endorsing democratic capitalism. These building types grew together and turned into phenomena in the following years, transforming the built environment of major cities. Much has been said and written about *apartmanlaşma* and *gecekondulaşma*; how apartment buildings and squatter houses transformed the domestic environment and how they built-up major cities and towns, changing their landscape. This chapter drew attention to summerhouses and summerhouse developments as another important player in this era, characterizing these years not only in terms of transforming the ideas of home and the built environment, but also the provincial seashore in the context of the politics of modernization and the architectural culture. The trio of the *apartment*, the *squatter house*, and the *summerhouse* worked conjunctively in different ways, altering Turkey's built environment ever since. While the apartments *urbanized* and the squatters *ruralized* the cities, summerhouses *urbanized* the rural areas.

Shores became accessible to the middle classes through the increase in availability of motor transportation, and road repair and construction – other outcomes of post-WWII aid. A desire to escape from the industrialized, crowded, polluted, and built-up city transformed leisurely seaside

practices and augmented a demand to occupy a space by pristine shores. This demand, together with legislative decisions to turn beachside land into building lots, paved the way for the mass production of affordable vacation homes. As this land became consumed with building activity, vacationing in a summerhouse during one to three months of the summer had become the counterpart to living in an apartment or a city home in the winter. Summerhouses were at once an expression of contemporary lifestyles, of the transformation of leisure practices and vacation culture, and of modern architectural expression. Imbedded in their presence was a reaction to the shift in the urban condition. Yet, as a product of this shift, they too caused a shift, transforming the provincial condition by urbanizing the seashore. Both these shifts were outcomes of the politics of modernization. In this respect, I suggest the mid-twentieth century witnessed the dawn of another phenomenon in Turkey: *yazlıklaşma*, that is, the building up and transforming of the seashore through the invasion of summerhouses.

This chapter also argued that summerhouses developed into a significant testing ground for new ideas. The 1950s political climate facilitated the development of architectural practices as private enterprises and provided greater variety of commissions for architects. Summerhouses opened a space for architects to experiment with prevalent architectural concepts as well as concepts of idealized homes that occupied a space between the urban and the rural. Summerhouses worked as a playground where international and mainstream architectural precepts and aesthetics were picked up, mimicked, worked with, appropriated and adapted. During the 1950s and 1960s, architects' experiments exhibited expressions of individuality, the poetics of modernist forms, and Euro-American influences. My childhood memory, mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, thus reflects a body of work that not only enriches Turkey's architectural inventory but also our readings of buildings as social objects.

Notes

- 1 An earlier version of this study, "Asphalt Roads, Summerhouses, and Mid-20th Century Architecture in Izmir, Turkey," was presented in the "Modernization of the Eastern Mediterranean" session at the First International Meeting of the European Architectural History Network, Guimarães, Portugal, 17–20 June 2010. Another version was presented at a panel discussion, "Modernizmin Türkiye'deki Açılımı Olarak Yazlık Ev" [The summerhouse as an agent of modernism in Turkey], *Ev Konuşmaları* [Home talks] as part of the exhibition *Summer Homes: Claiming the Coast*, SALT Beyoğlu, Istanbul, 20 September 2014. I would like to thank Meriç Öner for following up on my research and inviting me to this event as a speaker. I am grateful to Gülen Aşkan Derman, Selim San, Timur Ömürgönülşen, and many users of earlier sea baths and summerhouses for sharing their memories and archives. I would also like to thank Rana Nelson for her interest and enthusiasm in editing this chapter.
- 2 A. Osmanoglu, *Babam Sultan Abdülhamid (Hatıralarım)* [My father, Sultan Abdülhamid], Ankara: Selçuk, 1984, pp. 34–35, 37.

- 3 W. Buchan, *Domestic Medicine: Or, A Treatise on the Prevention and Cure of Diseases by Regimen and Simple Medicines*, London: printed for A. Strahan, T. Cadell jr. and W. Davies (successors to Mr. Cadell,); and J. Balfour and W. Creech, Edinburgh, 1798. Online. Available at www.library.uiuc.edu/proxy/go.php?url=http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/ECCO?c=1&stp=Author&ste=11&af=BN&ae=T112316&tiPG=1&dd=0&dc=flc&docNum=CW107525027&vrsn=1.0&srchtp=a&d4=0.33&n=10&SU=0LRM&locID=cham72085 (accessed 30 November 2010); A. Corbin, *The Lure of the Sea: The Discovery of the Seaside in the Western World, 1750–1840*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994. R. Russell, *A Dissertation on the Use of Sea-water in the Diseases of the Glands. Particularly the Scurvy, Jaundice, King's-evil, Leprosy, and the Glandular Consumption*, London: printed for W. Owen; and R. Goadby, 1753. Online. Available at www.library.uiuc.edu/proxy/go.php?url=http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/ECCO?c=1&stp=Author&ste=11&af=BN&ae=N008878&tiPG=1&dd=0&dc=flc&docNum=CW108592551&vrsn=1.0&srchtp=a&d4=0.33&n=10&SU=0LRM&locID=cham72085 (accessed 21 November 2010); W. J. Thyson, “Discussion on the Benefits of Sea Bathing,” *The British Medical Journal* 2:2748, 1913, pp. 540–542. Online. Available at www.jstor.org/stable/25302674 (accessed 21 November 2010).
- 4 G. Akçura, *Gramofon Çağı İvir Zıvır Tarihi – 2* [The age of the gramophone: history of knickknacks], Istanbul: OM Yayınevi, 2002, pp. 223–224; B. Evren, *İstanbul’un Deniz Hamamları ve Plajları* [Istanbul’s sea baths and beaches], Istanbul: İnkilap Kitabevi, 2000, pp. 16–18. The discussion on the health benefits of sea bathing continued after the foundation of the Republic; see, for example, R. E. Koçu, *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi* [Istanbul encyclopedia] 8, Istanbul: Koçu Yayınları, 1966, pp. 4412–4414.
- 5 Some sources report that some Ottomans were swimming as early as the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Descriptions from the famous Ottoman traveler Evliya Çelebi suggest that some people were bathing in the sea in seventeenth-century Istanbul. See Evren, pp. 11, 23. On the inception of the first sea baths, see also Akçura, pp. 223–224. R. E. Koçu, *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi* [Istanbul encyclopedia], Istanbul, 1958.
- 6 Detailed accounts of these spaces can be found in documents as well as in the writings of well-known journalists, poets, travelers, and novelists of the time, such as Reşat Ekrem Koçu, Sermet Muhtar, Hikmet Feridun Es, Ziya Osman Saba, Gökhan Akçura, Refik Halid Karay, and Willy Sperco. Between 2005 and 2010, I conducted twelve informal interviews (in storytelling format) and conversations with users of late sea baths and/or early beaches in Izmir and Istanbul.
- 7 Evren, p. 37.
- 8 Akçura, p. 217; Evren, p. 50, 59–60.
- 9 F. Gray, *Designing the Seaside: Architecture, Society and Nature*, London: Reaktion, 2006, p. 156; N. J. Morgan and A. Pritchard, *Power and Politics at the Seaside*, Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2000, pp. 149–150; J. K. Walton, *The British Seaside: Holidays and Resorts in the Twentieth Century*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.
- 10 F. Adil, “Deniz Hamamından Plaja” [From sea bath to the beach], *Tan*, 9 June 1941; Koçu, cited in Evren, p. 38. This was also mentioned in the oral histories that I conducted.
- 11 M. Foucault, “Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias,” in N. Leach (ed.) *Rethinking Architecture*, London and New York: Routledge, 1997, p. 352.
- 12 M. Mcleod, “Everyday and ‘Other’ Spaces,” in J. Rendell, B. Penner and I. Borden (eds.) *Gender Space Architecture*, London and New York: Routledge, 2000, p. 184. The chapter is first published in D. Coleman, E. Danze and C. Henderson (eds.) *Architecture and Feminism*, Princeton Architectural Press, 1996.

- 13 I have argued elsewhere that a woman's appearance is an important aspect of civic identity in Turkey. Women's clothing has signified societal changes and a certain civic stance. Fashion has played a significant role in framing the contemporary woman in Turkey. See M. Ö. Gürel, "The Modern Home, Western Fashion and Feminine Identities in Mid-Twentieth Century Turkey," in F. Fisher, T. Keeble, P. Lara-Betancourt and B. Martin (eds.) *Performance, Fashion and the Modern Interior: From the Victorians to Today*, Oxford: Berg, 2011, pp. 145–158.
- 14 For descriptions and accounts of sea baths and early beaches, see R. E. Koçu, *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi* [Istanbul encyclopedia] 5, Istanbul, 1961, pp. 2623–2626, 2882–2884. S. Muhtar, "Bir Varmış Bir Yokmuş . . . Eski Deniz Hamamları" [Once upon a time . . . sea baths], *Yedigün* 80, 19 September 1934, p. 12. See also Evren, pp. 52–87.
- 15 W. Sperco, *Yüzyılın Başında İstanbul* [Istanbul at the turn of the century], Istanbul: İstanbul Kütüphanesi, 1989, pp. 79–81. See also Koçu, *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, 1961, pp. 2624–2626. Evren, pp. 91–109. Y. Aksoy, *Karşıyaka ve Kaf Sin Kaf Tarihi* [History of Karşıyaka and kaf sin kaf], İzmir: Hisdaş Ltd, 1988, p. 37.
- 16 See note 14.
- 17 "Ataköy Sahil Şehri" [Ataköy Seashore City], *Mimarlık* 15, 1965, p. 16. See also E. Menteşe, "Ataköy Sitesi Hakkında Rapor" [Report on the Ataköy Settlement], *Arkitekt* 26:291, 1958, pp. 79–82.
- 18 M. Ö. Gürel, "Domestic Arrangements: The Maid's Room in the Ataköy Apartment Blocks, İstanbul, Turkey," *Journal of Architectural Education* 66:1, 2012, pp. 115–126.
- 19 M. Foucault, "Docile Bodies," in P. Rabinow (ed.) *The Foucault Reader*, New York: Pantheon, 1984, pp. 179–187.
- 20 For this idea in relation to the concept of biopower, see M. Ö. Gürel, "Bathroom as a Modern Space," *Journal of Architecture* 13:3, 2008, pp. 215–233.
- 21 Ibid., p. 230.
- 22 Conversations with members of my family.
- 23 "Güzelyalı Banyoları Kapanıyor" [Güzelyalı baths are closing], *Yeni Asır*, 23 September 1956.
- 24 R. Aşkan, "İnciraltı Plajı İzmir," *Arkitekt* 279, 1955, pp. 8–11.
- 25 M. Ö. Gürel, "Architectural Mimicry, Spaces of Modernity: The Island Casino, İzmir, Turkey," *Journal of Architecture* 16:2, 2011, p. 168.
- 26 Ibid., p. 167.
- 27 An interview with a family who lived in one of these houses, İzmir, 21 July 2009. See also "İnciraltı Evlerine ait Kur'a Dün Çekildi" [The lottery for İnciraltı homes was drawn yesterday], *Yeni Asır*, 16 June 1956, p. 2.
- 28 "İnciraltı Barakaları" [İnciraltı barracks], *Yeni Asır*, 24 May 1956, p. 2.
- 29 "İnciraltı Baraka ve Çadır İnşası İçin Şartlar" [Terms for the construction of İnciraltı barracks and tents], *Yeni Asır*, 19 June 1956, p. 2. Family memories. I also held interviews with four tenants who had vacationed in the wooden barracks, İzmir, 15 July 2009.
- 30 Interview with S. Ömürgönülşen, İzmir, 10 December 2008.
- 31 R. E. Koçu, *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi* [Istanbul encyclopedia] 11:173, Istanbul: Koçu Yayınları, 1974, p. 7061. See also M. Ö. Alkan, "Osmanlı'da Sayfiyenin İcadı" [Invention of the summerhouse in the Ottoman], in T. Bora (ed.) *Sayfiye Hafiflik Hayali* [Summerhouse lightness dream], Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2014, pp. 17–22.
- 32 In 1844 *Hazine-i Hassa Vapurları İdaresi* started service from Sirkeci to the islands, Pendik, and Yeşilköy. This service constitutes the basis for the Marmara line. Şirket-i Hayriye, which provided service in the Bosphorus was established in 1851, and the

- Haliç line had service since 1858. These merged in the 1940s forming the city lines. For a brief history of *Şirket-i Hayriye* (today's city lines) see www.tdi.gov.tr/Tarih%C3%A7e.php (accessed 10 September 2014). See also, E. Tutel, *Şirket-i Hayriye*, İstanbul: İletişim, 2008; and Koçu, *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, 5, p. 2884.
- 33 J. E. Schulte, "Summer Homes: A History of Family Summer Vacation Communities in Northern New England, 1880–1940," Ph.D. dissertation, Brandeis University, 1994.
 - 34 A. Mortaş (Mimar Abidin), "Yazlık Ev" [Summerhouse], *Arkitekt* 6, 1933, p. 175; S. Emin, "Yazlık Ev" [Summerhouse], *Arkitekt* 12, 1933, p. 384; A. Yapanar, "Yüzen Ev" [Floating home], *Arkitekt* 1–2, 1939, pp. 18–19; K. Söylemezoglu, "Yazlık Sahil Evi" [Seaside summerhouse], *Arkitekt* 2, 1936, p. 45; S. Arkan, "Suadiye'de Bir Villa" [A villa at Suadiye], *Arkitekt* 5–6, 1940, pp. 101–104; H. Gösterişli, "Bir Yaz Evi" [A summerhouse], *Arkitekt* 11–12, 1945, p. 260; İ. Ventura, "Burgaz Adasında Bir Ev" [A house in Burgaz Island], *Arkitekt* 3–4, 1951, p. 58–59; E. N. Uzman, "Büyükada'da Bir Ev" [A house in Büyükada], *Arkitekt* 7–8:175–176, 1946, p. 151–155; Ö. Küpeli, A. Yapanar Atölyesi Devlet Güzel Sanatlar Akademisi, "Heybeli Ada'da Bir Ev Projesi" [Project for a house in Heybeliada], *Arkitekt* 7–8:261–262, 1953, p. 134; R. Gorbon, "Feneryolunda Bir Sayfiye Evi" [A house in Feneryolu], *Arkitekt* 1–4, 1953, pp. 23–25.
 - 35 An exhibition by SALT research group (M. Öner, A. Kurbak, B. Akgün, D. Aladağ, A. Can, M. D. Gülbaba, B. Hamzaoglu, V. Kortun, and L. T. Baruh) explored Turkish summer homes from the 1700s through to the 2000s, *Summer Homes: Claiming the Coast*, 5 September–16 November 2014, SALT, İstanbul.
 - 36 Ibid. Tourist development, commercialization, and building-up of the land around the seashore, discussions of which are beyond the scope of this study, accelerated in the 1980s. Some of the architecturally significant *site* projects include Ar-Tur Vacation Homes, Burhaniye, 1969, by Altuğ Çinici, Behruz Çinici, and Servet Kılıç; Aktur Datça Vacation Homes, 1976, by EPA Mimarlık; Demir Vacation Village, Bodrum, 1990, Turgut Cansever, Emine Ögün, Mehmet Ögün ve Feyza Cansever.
 - 37 Atatürk's speech on 1 November 1937 in K. Öztürk (ed.), *Cumhurbaşkanları'nın T. Büyük Millet Meclisini Açış Nutukları* [The inauguration speeches of presidents in Turkish National Assembly], İstanbul: Ak Yayınları, 1969, p. 265.
 - 38 B. Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2002, p. 304.
 - 39 L. L. Roos and N. P. Roos, *Managers of Modernization: Organizations and Elites in Turkey (1950–1969)*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971; A. Feroz, *The Making of Modern Turkey*, London: Routledge, 2000; W. M. Hale, *Turkish Foreign Policy, 1774–2000*, London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2000.
 - 40 These involved the eastern provinces of Kars and Ardahan. The Soviets also demanded that part of Thrace be relinquished to Bulgaria and insisted on a revision of the Montreux Convention to secure their access to the Straits at all times, as well as the right to build military bases along the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles. S. Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1976–1977, p. 399–400.
 - 41 S. J. Whitfield, *The Culture of the Cold War*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996; W. L. Hixson, *Parting the Curtain: Propaganda, Culture, and the Cold War, 1945–1961*, New York: Macmillan, 1997.
 - 42 M. Ö. Gürel, "Defining and Living Out the Interior: The 'Modern' Apartment and the 'Urban' Housewife in Turkey during the 1950s and 1960s," *Gender, Place and Culture* 16:6, 2009, pp. 703–722.
 - 43 İ. Tekeli and S. Ilkin, "Türkiye'de Demiryolu Öncelikli Ulaşım Politikasından Karayolları Öncelikli Ulaşım Politikasına Geçiş, (1923–1957)" [Move from a

- policy of transportation prioritizing railroads to a policy of transportation prioritizing motor roads in Turkey], in *Cumhuriyetin Harcı* 3 [Republic's mortar], İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005, p. 382.
- 44 The Program of the First Democrat Party Government on 29 May 1950 in N. Dağlı and B. Aktürk, *Hükümetler ve Programları 1920–1960* [Governments and their programs] 1, Ankara: T.B.M.M. Basımevi, 1988, p. 161. See also I. Akpınar's contribution on Menderes's urban renewal projects in this book.
- 45 1 November 1950 speech, in Öztürk, p. 432.
- 46 V. Diker, "Highway Development in Turkey," *Road International* 3 (winter), 1951, p. 59; F. Schipper, "Changing the Face of Europe: European Road Mobility during the Marshall Plan Years," *The Journal of Transportation History* 28:2, 2007, pp. 216–217.
- 47 N. Coşar and S. Demirci, "Incorporation into the World Economy: From Railways to Highways (1850–1950)," *Middle Eastern Studies* 45:1, 2009, p. 26.
- 48 Ibid., p. 31.
- 49 *General Directorate of Highways*, Online. Available at www.kgm.gov.tr (accessed 6 January 2010).
- 50 Luxury cars entered the country in different ways. For example, more than 50 cars were imported from the US in 1959 for the İzmir International Fair, an important economic, social, cultural, and recreational event from 20 August through 20 September of that year. See "Ne Suretle Satılacağı Henüz Belli Değil" [Uncertain how will be sold], *Yeni Asır*, 9 October 1959, p. 1.
- 51 Coşar and Demirci, p. 27.
- 52 M. Ö. Gürel, "Domestic Space, Modernity, and Identity: The Apartment in Mid-20th Century Turkey," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2007.
- 53 Ibid. Also see A. Cengizkan, "Discursive Formations in Turkish Residential Architecture Ankara, 1948–1962," Ph.D. dissertation, METU, 2000. The urban growth rate had jumped from three percent per annum since 1927 to nine percent in the 1950s. See İ. Cem, *Türkiye'de Geri Kalmışlığın Tarihi* [History of underdevelopment in Turkey], İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1979, p. 334. See also M. Tapan, "International Style," in R. Holod and A. Evin (eds.) *Modern Turkish Architecture*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984, p. 106. According to Tekeli, different from other Turkish cities, Ankara grew at an annual rate of six percent until the 1950s. After the 1950s, all cities grew at a rate of six percent. See İ. Tekeli, "The Social Context of the Development of Architecture in Turkey," in *Modern Turkish Architecture*, p. 23. Keleş noted that the aggregate urban population growth had jumped from 20.1 percent in the 1940s to 80.2 percent in the 1950s. See R. Keleş, "Konut Sorunları ve Politikası" [Housing problems and policies], *Şehircilik*, Ankara, 1978, p. 26, quoted in Y. Sey, "To House the New Citizens: Housing Policies and Mass Housing," in *Modern Turkish Architecture*, p. 165.
- 54 Gürel, "Defining and Living Out the Interior," p. 714.
- 55 Ibid. For a more extensive discussion on the apartments see Gürel, "Domestic Space, Modernity, and Identity."
- 56 For an earlier and influential criticism, see S. H. Eldem, "Elli Yıllık Cumhuriyet Mimarlığı" [Fifty years of republication architecture], *Mimarlık* 11–12, 1973, p. 8.
- 57 For a seminal criticism on the experience of the city characterized by simplicity and sameness in the context of modernism in architecture and urban design, see J. Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, New York: Vintage Books, 1961.
- 58 H. C. Yalçın, "Ev Sevgisi" [Love of home], *Yedigün* 5:119, 1935, p. 5; H. C. Yalçın, "Eski İstanbul" [Old İstanbul], *Yedigün*, 9:219, 1937, p. 5; H. C. Yalçın, "Ev ve Apartman" [House and apartment], *Yedigün*, 9:265, 1938, p. 5.

- 59 Safa, quoted in S. Bozdoğan, *Modernism and Nation Building: Turkish Architectural Culture in the Early Republic*, Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2001, p. 237. See P. Safa, "Bizde ve Avrupada Kübik" [Cubic here and in Europe], *Yedigün* 8:1888, 1936, p. 6–7.
- 60 G. Bachelard, "The Oneiric House," in J. Ockman and E. Eigen (eds.) *Architecture Culture 1943–1968: A Documentary Anthology*, New York: Rizzoli, 1996, pp. 110. For the later development of the concept see G. Bachelard, *The Poetics of Space*, trans. M. Jolas, Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.
- 61 Ibid.
- 62 M. Berman, *All That is Solid Melts into Air*, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1982, p. 15.
- 63 Jacobs is the first one to problematize destruction of neighborhood networks; see Jacobs.
- 64 Oral histories; see note 6.
- 65 Aşkan started a private office with Erdeniz after working for seventeen years for the municipality. Aşkan's archive. Interview with G. Aşkan Derman and E. Derman, Çeşme, 5 August 2009.
- 66 Ibid. Some of the houses, including Aşkan's own, were completed in the early 1960s. A number of houses remained under construction and were finished at later dates, depending on the owners' levels of initiative and financial situations.
- 67 Before the War of Independence in 1922, Izmir, Turkey's second-largest port, had a cosmopolitan character composed of Turks, Levantines, Jews, Greeks, and Armenians. Its demographics changed after the war, but, similar to Istanbul, the city has maintained a more diverse population than other Turkish cities. Owners of summer homes in Çeşme reflect this diversity.
- 68 "Çeşme Plaj Evleri Yarın Sahiplerini Bulacak" [Çeşme beach houses will find their owners tomorrow], *Yeni Asır*, 4 July 1956, p. 2.
- 69 "İzmir-Çeşme," *Yeni Asır*, 20 September 1956, p. 2.
- 70 "İzmir-Çeşme Yoluna Dair" [About Izmir Çeşme road], *Yeni Asır*, 9 August 1956, p. 2; "İzmir-Manisa, İzmir-Çeşme, Eşrefpaşa-Üçkuyular Yolları," *Yeni Asır*, 29 July 1959, p. 2.
- 71 Interviews by the author, Izmir, July–August 2009.
- 72 Starting in the 1950s, basketball became the second most popular sport in Turkey, after soccer. For popular reception of basketball in Turkey, see P. Thamel, "Turkey Channeled 'White Shadow' as Basketball Caught On," *New York Times*, 9 September 2010. Online. Available at www.nytimes.com/2010/09/10/sports/basketball/10whiteshadow.html?_r=1&emc=eta1 (accessed 21 November 2010). For a history of basketball in Izmir, see Aksoy.
- 73 Interview with G. A. Derman.
- 74 See E. Gönlügür's contributions in this volume.
- 75 Interview with G. A. Derman.
- 76 P. Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984. See M. Ö. Gürel, "Consumption of Modern Furniture as a Strategy of Distinction in Turkey," *Journal of Design History* 22:1, 2009, pp. 47–67.
- 77 Beyond the scope of this study, these developments have been subject to a great number of scholarly studies including master and doctorate theses in Turkish universities. Attracting the upper and middle classes, gated communities in suburban areas have been critically viewed for epitomizing ideas of security, exclusion, socio-spatial segregation and status. These "fortified enclaves" were first initiated in the United States and have been spreading throughout the world from Brazil to South Africa. See T. Caldeira, "Fortified Enclaves: The New Urban Segregation," *Public Culture* 8:2, 1996, pp. 303–328; E. J. Blakely and M. G.

- Snyder, *Fortress America: Gated Communities in the United States*, Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1997; P. Marcuse, "The Ghetto of Exclusion and the Fortified Enclave New Patterns in the United States," *American Behavioral Scientist* 41:3, pp. 311–326; S. M. Low, "The Edge and the Center: Gated Communities and the Discourse of Urban Fear," *American Anthropologist* 103:1, 2001, pp. 45–58; M. Durrington, "Suburban Fear, Media and Gated Communities in Durban, South Africa," *Home Cultures* 6:1, 2009, pp. 71–88.
- 78 See *Yeni Asır*, 2, 4, 6–9, 12, 13 October 1948. See Gürel, "Architectural Mimicry, Spaces of Modernity," p. 180.
- 79 Gürel, "Architectural Mimicry, Spaces of Modernity."
- 80 Ibid., p. 182.
- 81 For this prevalence see *Arkitekt*, 1948–1965. See Tapan, pp. 105–118.
- 82 Eril Mimarlık, E. Bigat and I. Bilgesü, "Mühendis Arif Saltuk Villası" [Engineer Arif Saltuk's Villa], *Arkitekt* 2, 1958, pp. 55–60; E. Bigat, "Yazlık bir ev (Pendik)" [A summerhouse], *Arkitekt* 2, 1958, pp. 68–69; Y. Sanlı, Y. Tuncer and G. Acar, Kumburgaz'da Üç Villa [Three villas in Kumburgaz], *Arkitekt* 1, 1964, pp. 6–7; Baytop, "Maltepe'de Bir Yaz Evi" [A summer house in Maltepe], *Arkitekt* 1, 1964, pp. 4–5; A. Kızıltan and A. Sarı, Gebze'de Dört Tatil Evi [Four vacation homes in Gebze], *Mimarlık*, 1964, pp. 30–33; E. Bigat and A. Aşkun, "Orhantepe'de bir yazlık ev (Kartal)" [A summerhouse in Orhantepe], *Arkitekt* 4, 1966, pp. 169–172; O. Sarafoğlu, "Bir Yaz Evi – Kumburgaz" [A summerhouse – Kumburgaz], *Arkitekt* 4, 1969, pp. 154–155.
- 83 E. McCoy, *Case Study Houses: 1945–1962*, Hennessey & Ingalls, 1977; E. A. T. Smith, *Blueprints for Modern Living: History and Legacy of the Case Study Houses*, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989; E. Smith and P. Goessel, *Case Study Houses*, New York: Taschen, 2009.
- 84 Interview with Selim San, Izmir, 24 March 2014.
- 85 Memories of Christopher Dologh, phone conversation, Izmir, 16 September 2014.
- 86 This photograph is courtesy of Selim San, Faruk San's son.
- 87 Gürel, "Domestic Arrangements," p. 117–118.
- 88 Nebioğlu also employed V-shaped pilotis in his designs.