1 Introduction

As the architectural modernism of the inter-war years spread well beyond its emergent locations after World War II, it was reproduced, transformed, and internationalized in the context of Cold War geopolitics and economics. Mediated through the flow of post-war aid and technical expertise, modernism became entangled with the politics of modernization, industrialization, urbanization, and the onset of decolonization. Distant and periphery lands – from Africa to Asia, from Latin America to the Middle East – became major experimentation sites for post-WWII modernism.

Recent scholarship of the 1950s' and 1960s' architectural culture has brought into focus the significant attribute of post-war modernism across the globe in the context of an intellectual formation that has shifted not only research methods, but also sites where historians carry out their research. Shifting the lens from the work of "masters" and the canonical story of modern architecture to issues such as gender, race, economy, domesticity, politics, post-colonial histories of decolonization, nation building, and modernization has made it possible to illuminate modern trajectories in all their complexity and plurality. Such critical approaches have challenged the exclusive mainstream historiography of modern architecture.

This book can be viewed as a contribution to contemporary studies that expand the confines of modernist production beyond what were viewed as its hubs, namely Western Europe and North America, by focusing on Turkey.[1] Following the global trajectory of modernism, this collection of essays ponders how architectural culture responded to ubiquitous post-war ideas and ideals, and how it became intertwined with the politics of modernization and urbanization, and with economics. Therefore, while providing a close reading of the era in the Turkish context, the book extends recent attempts to re-think and re-read post-war architectural culture and its global effects beyond simplistic, canonical, and ontological explanations,[2] while demonstrating the fluidity of architectural practices globally.

The post-WWII period was a time of major political transformations around the world, with the emergence of the United States and the Soviet Union as superpowers espousing a bipolar world order of capitalism and communism. In the US, President Harry S. Truman had succeeded

F. D. Roosevelt, who died before the end of the war. In the Soviet Union, Joseph Stalin remained in power as the "notorious leader" of communism. Describing the formation of two major political poles that ideologically divided Europe, British Prime Minister Winston Churchill used the term "Iron Curtain" for the first time in a speech given during his 1946 US visit. With the political influence of the Soviet Union strongly felt in Europe, the US viewed communism a major threat, not only to a peaceful world, but also to the country's security. Turkey was considered among countries vulnerable to the communist threat, given that communist parties had gained power in some central European countries. In this political context, Turkey was included in the US's Marshall Plan of 1947, structured to secure political stability in Europe while combating the perils of Soviet expansionism. The foreign aid by US governmental and private agencies provided funds for agricultural, industrial, military, and motor transportation development and modernization. It also brought with it a penchant for and idealization of post-war American culture, lifestyles, and democratic capitalism in all aspects of daily life – from trade to entertainment and from fashion to architecture.

Turkish foreign policy's firm alliance with the US – as manifested by NATO membership (1952) and participation in the Korean War (1950–1953) – accelerated the adoption of a multiparty system (1946) and paved the way for a liberal parliamentary democracy. This shift began in 1945 when Turkey became a member of the United Nations.[3] The consequent victory of the Democrat Party (DP), headed by Prime Minister Adnan Menderes, in the 1950 elections concluded the one-party rule of the early Republican People's Party (CHP), marking a turning point in Turkish political life. The DP (1950–1960) emphasized the role of the private sector in development and the importance of relaxing the CHP's earlier statist economic policies. The DP's liberal economic policies viewed Turkey as a "little America," whose echoes transmuted into daily life, home culture, and design practices. Distant from the reach of the average consumer, the American way of life, domestic space, and materiality came to be idealized as symbols of modernity, as discussed in Chapters 2, 3, 5, and 7 of this volume.

The DP's politics of modernization put architecture and urbanism at center stage. In fact, PM Menderes himself worked with the architects, planners, and engineers building the "new Turkey," and was personally involved in road network, urban demolition, and urban reconstruction projects, some of which are covered in Chapters 3 and 4 of this volume. The rise of apartment buildings and the proliferation of squatter settlements, both of which came to blanket Turkish cities in the ensuing years, were two of the major outcomes of DP policies. The latter was a result of the mechanization of rural areas through foreign aid and the subsequent migration of the rural population to urban centers looking for new job opportunities.

The policies of the DP government and close alliance with US-led democratic capitalism had profound effects on 1950s Turkish architectural

culture. Economic dynamism created through foreign aid, the development of the private sector, and the proliferation of private clients provided new opportunities and a variety of commissions for design professionals. Early Republican architects had assumed the role of cultural leaders, educating the masses in contemporary lifestyles, and the state was the primary employer. Beginning in the 1950s, private enterprises, partnerships, and the Chamber of Architects (1954) emerged.[4] While architects and designers still assumed the roles of experts and intellectuals informing the public about modern lifestyles, they also experimented with new global concepts such as democracy, consumerism, development, technological progress, internationalization, and modernization, all of which give this period its historical distinction. Design professionals thus embraced a new sense of modern aesthetics reflecting these concepts; the optimism generated by post-war modernization theory, as discussed in Chapter 2, provided architects and designers with a new global awareness and opportunities for influencing social change.

Turkish architects were deeply interested in belonging to the international community, and their practices were influenced by the re-interpreted version of inter-war modernism that spread from the US following the relocation there of "masters" such as Mies van der Rohe and Walter Gropius.[5] They were also deeply influenced by concrete designs of their European and Brazilian counterparts, Le Corbusier and Oscar Niemeyer in particular, since concrete structures were more feasible in Turkey than American steel construction.[6] As famous Turkish architect and educator Sedad Hakkı Eldem wrote, "Between 1935 and 1950 [national architectural style] extended its influence over the whole country, until between 1950 and 1955 it was forced to give way to international, particularly American, styles and trends."[7] An example of these aesthetic inclinations par excellence is perhaps the Istanbul Hilton Hotel (1952–1955), which was designed by the American firm SOM, with Gordon Bunshaft as the head architect and Eldem as the local collaborator. Bunshaft was one of the foreign experts who came to Turkey to aid in the country's development: he prepared a report on housing, planning, and building construction for the government in 1951.[8] Chapters 2, 6, and 7 in this volume discuss such aesthetic inclinations, the Hilton in particular, and the technical expertise provided by foreign experts.

The prevalence of "International Style,"[9] disseminating from the US and implying the concepts of liberalism, democracy, and modernity, is also evident in Turkey's architectural competition projects of the 1950s. The habit of holding national and international competitions by 1940s governments gained momentum, making the 1950s, as Doğan Kuban puts, "the glorious years of national competitions."[10] Towards the end of the 1960s, public competitions were followed by the first private competitions, as discussed in Chapter 8. The 1960s contests also encompassed state social programs, an outcome of the growing interest in social issues and

responsibility that reflected the changes in political, social, intellectual, and architectural activity.[11] Towards the end of the 1950s, when the DP could not live up to its promise of forming a democratic society and a prosperous economy, the party's popularity declined, and accusations of a repressive regime increased. A decade of DP rule terminated dramatically with the military intervention of 27 May 1960. Democracy only resumed with the 1961 elections, which resulted in Turkey's first coalition government. With respect to criticisms of the DP's chaotic liberalist policies and the social problems caused by rapid urbanization and industrialization (such as the squatter developments), Turkish architectural culture eschewed earlier practices and leaned towards a leftist ideology. A major difference between Turkish architecture in the 1950s and in the mid-1960s–1970s was this ideologically charged socio-political context. The civil rights movement in the US also factored into this inclination. In this political and intellectual context, and with emerging global criticisms of scientific and functionalist design as well as of modernist architectural forms, design professionals sought new experiments. Among these explorations were fragmentation of the "international" prism; interest in plasticity; organic concepts; regional, cultural, historical, and traditional forms; and New Brutalism, particularly with reference to the work of Team Ten, Louis Khan, and Japanese Metabolism.[12] Yet, it would be an oversimplification to draw a line between Turkey's design culture of the 1950s and the 1960s because the aesthetic expression of modernism was fluid and many DP projects were completed in the 1960s.

The architectural culture of mid-twentieth-century Turkey has become a point of interest in recent years with the emergence of doctoral studies in the USA, UK, and Turkey, mostly by the authors in this volume. Yet, so far, the subject has been discussed in only a very limited number of publications. There is neither a book nor an edited volume that consolidates the architectural historiography of the period in the context of contemporary scholarship. This volume aims to fill that gap by bringing together, for the first time, scholars who have carried out extensive research on the topic in a global context. Enframing Turkish modernism in the discursive field of the post-war architectural realm, this collection of essays opens up critical and global ways of thinking about the built environment of these years. Some of the distinctive themes addressed in this book include the politics of modernization and urbanization, internationalizing architectures, aesthetic expression, post-war American influence, consumerism, everyday modernity, and the transformation of home cultures.

In Chapter 2, Sibel Bozdoğan provides an overview of the mid-twentieth century in a national and global context. Drawing attention to DP's unfulfilled promises and many parallels and acute differences between the 1950s and recent times marked by the Justice and Development Party (AKP) in Turkey, she addresses the era's unrealized assurances and potential. Comparing the period to preceding and subsequent periods, her analysis

focuses on how Turkey's architectural and urban landscape was shaped by important shifts in national politics and in the trans-national culture of post-war modernism abroad. In doing so, she traces new developments in social theory, professional practice, and aesthetic sensibilities, all of which collectively give the 1950s its particular identity as a milestone in the historiography of modern Turkish architecture.

In Chapter 3, I address transformations of local landscapes as an output of homeland and international politics through a discussion of changes at the seashore, from city sea baths to summerhouses. With reference to Foucault's concepts of heterotopia, docility, and biopower, I trace the intriguing social history of seaside practices from early baths to modern beaches, the latter important sites of Republican modernity. Drawing on case studies, archival research, and oral histories, I discuss the transformation of leisure practices and vacation culture. The popularization of summerhouses at mid-century is connected to the politics of modernization and post-WWII extensions of Western aid to periphery countries as a means of endorsing democratic capitalism. The US financial and technical aid for the development of road networks and motor transportation made Turkey's seashores accessible. As cities became built up – a consequence of the advent of industrialization, urban growth, and the politics of modernization – the idea of a summerhouse as a counterpart to winter city life became pervasive. Occupying a space between the urban and the rural, summerhouses also reflected the idealized home culture of the post-war period. The chapter concludes by suggesting that, for the Turkish architect, summerhouses opened a space to experiment with prevalent architectural concepts and modern aesthetics in the context of developing architectural practices as private enterprises with a new sense of autonomy.

The consequences of post-war international currents, the American influence, national politics, and the ills of urbanization are further discussed in Chapter 4 in the context of Istanbul's urban renewal projects of the 1950s. Focusing on the transfer of symbolic power from Ankara to Istanbul during this decade, Ipek Akpınar addresses the radical transformation of Istanbul's landscape by massive urban demolitions as well as by the change in population from migrations in and out of the city, which turned the capital from a cosmopolitan center into a more homogenous and Turkish one. Based on newspaper articles, official municipal publications on urbanization, and a series of interviews with professionals who took a role in and/or witnessed the decade, she argues that Istanbul's transformation was a convergence of three factors: immigration–emigration processes and physical reconstruction and its representation, all of which reshaped the multi-faith and multi-linguistic cosmopolitan urban identity and brought about Istanbul's Turkification.

Emre Gönlügür, in Chapter 5, discusses the American influence and the Cold War geopolitical struggle in the context of the Izmir International Trade Fair, which was conceived in the early days of the Turkish Republic

as a showcase of the country's industrial progress. The Izmir Fair became a staging platform for the two competing visions of economic development in the post-war years. At Izmir, knowing it would be in competition with Russia, the US exhibited its consumer goods and model homes, much to the pleasure of the fairgoers. Drawing extensively on archival correspondence and contemporary accounts of the fair, Gönlügür argues that the Izmir Fair offered a unique socio-cultural opportunity, where American design and new models of domesticity were made accessible to the wider Turkish public.

In Chapter 6, Burak Erdim brings into focus another facet of post-war American influence and technical expertise, this time in the form of establishing a university. His chapter examines the making of the Middle East Technical University (METU) campus as a product of legitimacy battles among transnational networks of architecture and development. He analyzes how these competing actors negotiated and spatialized the link between architecture and development in the organization of a new post-war university while also reformulating their own identities to maintain professional legitimacy during this period. As a result, METU emerged as a contested space that numerous educational, governmental, professional, and international agencies fought to shape and occupy. It was a space where multiple modernisms rivalled each other, and the resulting dynamic reflected the political and cultural geography of the Cold War more closely than previously recognized. His analysis reveals how a transnational planning project was conceived, implemented, and then nationalized within the multiple and overlapping political and professional contexts of the post-war period, as it problematized conceptions of the national, the international, and the regional, exposing similarities and differences, even among members of these seemingly well-established spatial and political identities.

Annabel Wharton explores a landmark project in Chapter 7, manifesting the post-war American influence as well as the Cold War geopolitical struggle. The Istanbul Hilton was the flagship of Conrad Hilton's post-WWII campaign to fight communism, to patriotically represent the US, and to make a profit in Europe and the Middle East. Opened in 1955, it was the earliest of the enormously successful first generation of Hilton International Hotels and set the standard for the program of the modern hotel. As Wharton informs us, in addition to ice-water spigots in each room, air conditioning, and private balconies satiating the colonial gaze, the hotel offered the experience of sophisticated modernity in the form of whiteness, transparency, and luxurious efficiency. Long before McDonalds, Hilton was the first major American franchise to establish a monumental presence abroad, an early harbinger of the American-dominated globalization of the end of the twentieth century. Wharton contrasts the youthful 1955 Istanbul Hilton with its older self, not long after its fiftieth anniversary. She then considers how this hotel, once a structure that helped convert a nation to the

new aesthetic of modernity, has been curiously modified in an attempt to conform to the current embrace of the elegant eclecticism characteristic of the elite "private" spaces of globalization.

Finally, Ipek Tureli, in Chapter 8, examines an iconic example of modern Turkish architecture from the late 1960s, and a result of the first private architectural competition in Turkey. The story of the building reflects new approaches in architectural practice. The first purpose-built advertising agency in Turkey, the Istanbul Reklam Building (1974), was conceived and commissioned by the agency's founder and director, following a highly publicized open competition in 1968. The competition was not merely an effort to acquire the best design, it was one of several phases of the building process that was effectively used to promote the agency. The process sought to raise the profile of Istanbul Reklam, an agency that specialized in the domain of motion pictures. As Tureli discusses, the building is a unique example of crossover advertising, where one of the products advertised is modern architecture.

It is my hope that all the essays in this book, each one highlighting an imperative Turkish case depicting the era and scrutinizing and mapping it in a global context, make the volume appealing for a larger international audience interested in the built environment of mid-twentieth-century modern architecture and its connection to our time.

Notes

1 For example, the theme of the ninth international Docomomo (Documentation and Conservation of Buildings, Sites and Neighborhoods of the Modern Movement) conference, "Other Modernisms," was an indicator of the presence and growing interest in this area of research. The conference was held in Istanbul and Ankara in 2006.

2 M. Ö. Gürel, "Domestic Arrangements: The Maid's Room in the Ataköy Apartment Blocks, Istanbul, Turkey," *Journal of Architectural Education* 66:1, 2012, pp. 115–126.

3 B. Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2002, p. 304.

4 On this point, see U. Tanyeli, "Haluk Baysal, Melih Birsel," *Arredemento Mimarlık*, 100+2, 1998, pp.72–79.

5 For early examples suggesting the dissemination of post-war modernism from the US, see H. R. Hitchcock and A. Drexler (eds.), *Built in USA: Post-war Architecture*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1952, p. 10; "US Architecture Abroad," *Architectural Forum* 98, 1953, pp. 101–115. For examples of this influence in Turkey, see Richard Neutra, "Mimari Mekan ve Zaman" [Architectural space and time], *Arkitekt* 24:281, 1955, pp. 121–122; Fuat Şevki Vanlı, "Frank Lloyd Wright," *Arkitekt* 237–238, 1951, pp. 194–199; "Mimar Richard Wagner'ın Türkiye'deki Çalışmaları" [Works of architect Richard Wagner in Turkey], *Arkitekt* 25:284, 1956, pp. 76–92, 94; "Frank Lloyd Wright'ın İlk Gökdeleni" [Frank Lloyd Wright's first skyscraper], *Arkitekt* 26:288, 1957, pp. 117–119; Faruk Sırmalı, "San Francisco Bay ve Frank Lloyd Wright Tarafından Teklif Edilen Köprüye Dair" [About the bridge proposal for the San Francisco Bay by Frank Lloyd Wright], *Arkitekt* 263–266, 1953,

pp. 183–185; Abdullah Kuran, "Mies van Der Rohe," *Arikitekt* 26:293, 1958, pp. 156–162.

6 For a discussion on the pervasiveness of concrete as the local/international medium of modernization see M. Ö. Gürel, "Architectural Mimicry, Spaces of Modernity: The Island Casino, Izmir, Turkey," *Journal of Architecture* 16:2, 2011, p. 168.

7 S. H. Eldem, "Verso un Linguaggio Contestuale: Breve Storia dell'Architettura Turca Contemporanea = Toward a Local Idiom: A Brief History of Contemporary Architecture in Turkey," *Zodiac* 10, September 1993–February 1994, p. 39. For earlier documentation of the 1950s and 1960s Turkish architecture see E. Kortan, *Türkiye'de Mimarlık Hareketleri ve Eleştirisi (1950–1960)* [Architectural movements and critiques in Turkey 1950–1960], Ankara: Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, 1974; M. Tapan, "International Style: Liberalism in Architecture," in R. Holod and A. Evin (eds.) *Modern Turkish Architecture*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984, pp. 105–118; M. Sözen and M. Tapan, *50 Yılın Türk Mimarisi* [Fifty years of Turkish architecture], Istanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 1973; A. Batur, M. Tapan, and Y. Sey, "Mimarlık" [Architecture], in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi 5*, Istanbul: Iletişim Yayınları, 1983, pp. 1379–1426.

8 For technical experts in housing, see I. Tekeli, *Turkiye'de Yaşamda ve Yazında Konut Sorununun Gelişimi* [Housing problems in life and in printed matter in Turkey], Ankara: Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığı, 1996, pp. 98–105.

9 The term "International Style" was introduced in 1932 by Henry-Russell Hitchcock and Philip C. Johnson with a book and an exhibition at the New York City's Museum of Modern Art (MoMA). They intended to introduce European modernism in a unified image to a larger American audience.

10 D. Kuban, "A Survey of Modern Turkish Architecture," in S. Cantacuzino (ed.) *Architecture in Continuity Building in the Islamic World*, Aperture Islamic Publications Ltd., 1985, p. 68. Competition projects were amply published in issues of *Arikitekt*.

11 A. Yücel, "Pluralism Takes Command: The Turkish Architectural Scene Today," 1984, pp. 119–152.

12 Ibid.