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The dynamic life of the Tophane site in Istanbul is the case study that is analysed in this research. The Tophane site has been, and still is, a very controversial and multidimensional site with respect to its use and transformation. Due to its strategic location at the connection point of the Golden Horn and the Bosphorus, overlooking the historical peninsula. It has been used for a variety of functions in its history, such as artillery barracks, warehouses, exhibition spaces for the Istanbul Art Biennials, Museum of Modern and Contemporary Arts as well as cruise port. It has been subject to some of the most controversial urban transformation proposals in Istanbul, both regarding the use of the site as well as the bidding processes associated with these proposals. This PhD will cover the different phases of this site’s lifetime from the beginning of the 20th century until 2014 and investigates the crucial roles played by various actors in its transformation and in the resistance to its transformation.

The innovative aspect of the dissertation is that it crosses the boundaries of cultural geography and architectural theory. In addition, the original use of research methods such as thick description, actor network theory, controversy mapping and layering aspires to contribute to architectural studies. Furthermore, the focus on the Tophane site in Istanbul aims to expand the geographical scope of both waterfront redevelopment and cultural regeneration literature. The ultimate contribution of the dissertation is to demonstrate how a thorough analysis of the complexity and the versatile nature of a site, including its changing phases and layers, can lead to a better understanding of the macro scale processes that shape the urban environment.
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INTRODUCTION

By studying individual buildings as planned, designed, built, used, maintained, and even destroyed, I understand the processes that shape urban form, in its large sense. The big-picture generalizations that are often used to describe the dynamics of urban spatial organisation can be given a beams-and-bolts reality by working outward from the singular experience of particular buildings to the cross-city scale (Ford, 2001, p. 382).

What can be learnt by investigating an individual building or site? Its architectural features and its underlying design process, but also its historical trajectory, tells us about the socio-economic and political agendas of the time. When the constant changes occurring in building sites are observed through time, it can be argued that sites are alive in a way that is very similar to narrating the life of human beings. Sites and buildings are born, and subsequently grow, change, mature and even die through time. They are dynamic and changing entities. Even during the design process, buildings need to be constantly revised according to the customers' wishes or changing structural systems. The constant change does not end once the buildings are completed, after which the user's needs lead the way to transformation. Steward Brand summarises the process; “from the first drawings to the final demolition, buildings are shaped and reshaped by changing cultural currents, changing real estate value, and changing usage” (Brand, 1994). He claims that even though “architecture may strive to be permanent; a building is always building and rebuilding”. In line with Brand's understanding of architecture, in this research project, I will present a particular site as a dynamic and living entity.

More specifically, the aim of this research is to account for the life of an industrial site and to show the dynamism of the site by exploring what its trajectory in space and time can tell us about socio-economic and political tendencies occurring during its lifespan. This research will focus on the micro life of a particular industrial site in Istanbul, in order to grasp the rhythm of societal change including its cultural and political overtones and to explore the strategies of transformation of industrial sites in contemporary societies. In
addition, this research aims to contribute to a better understanding of the concepts of waterfront regeneration and urban transformation by investigating the role of actors in the life of an industrial site. The objectives of the research is firstly to understand the site life by investigating how the site has been transformed, redeveloped and reused through time. Secondly, to analyse the roles of various actors involved in the trajectory of the site; and lastly to understand how the rhythm of change of the examined industrial site reflects the wider political, economic and urban transformation processes, as well as the urban policy that flows from these processes.

The case study site, the Tophane site in Istanbul, is a very controversial, politically contested and multi-dimensional site in terms of its function and potential for transformation. It can be argued that this is because of its strategic location at the connection point of the Golden Horn and the Bosporus, overlooking the historical peninsula. When the life of the Tophane site is examined, it is possible to observe that the site has been used for a variety of functions, although mainly for military and industrial purposes such as artillery barracks, Ford Motor Company, and warehouses. More recently the warehouses have started to become used as costume and decor workshops of Ataturk Culture Centre (AKM) and exhibition spaces for the Istanbul Art Biennales and the Museum of Modern and Contemporary Arts as well as port facilities for cruise ships. The Tophane site has been subject to some of the most controversial urban transformation proposals in Istanbul, both in relation to the proposed function of the site as well as the political controversies and bidding processes associated with these proposals.

The Tophane site has been shaped and reshaped several times through its lifetime; it has been subject to dramatic transformation as well as resistance to transformation. The accumulation of different changes of use constitutes the contextual complexity of the site. The potential transformation of the Tophane site has been supported or rejected by several different actors who have played significant roles in its trajectory. The site is a controversial, heterogeneous, socio-natural entity, being made and re-made continuously by a diversity of actors that discuss it and contest it. This research will show the historical trajectories and the social life of the Tophane site including the actors involved in its trajectory. Moreover, it will also discuss the design process behind the transformations that
has changed the site. This analysis will help to understand the political, socio-economical agendas and urban policies of different periods. Architects, planners and developers, not only in Istanbul, would be better equipped for design challenges if the complex actors and actorial dynamics that shape sites and buildings are analysed. Neither buildings nor sites are static entities. Instead, they are both dynamic and complex, thus the challenge that architectural practice faces is finding ways of synchronising these two complex entities with the dynamics and rhythms of transformation.

The originality of this PhD research derives from its analysis of a site as a dynamic entity, and the crucial role played by various actors in its transformation. In order to be able to analyse thoroughly the multi-dimensional, multi-actorial and controversial character of the site, different research methods are utilised. Using one particular methodological strategy could not adequately capture all the different aspects of the site entirely. To reveal the contextual complexity of the site “thick description” (Geertz, 1975) is used as a methodological strategy. The contested nature, multi-dimensional and multi-actorial aspect of the site could not be fully revealed solely by this method though. That is why “Actor Network Theory” (Latour, 1997) and “controversy mapping” (Yaneva, 2012) are required to fully grasp the contested and multi-actorial aspect of the site. In order to decipher the multi-dimensional aspect of the site, layering as a methodological tool of analysis is introduced. These four different research methods complement each other with the aim of fully understanding the complex nature of the Tophane site, therefore the requirement comes from conducting an analysis of a rich, controversial, multi-dimensional, and multi-actorial site.

It is anticipated that this research will make a useful contribution to architectural studies through its use of research methods that are inspired by other disciplines such as “thick description” and layering, “actor network theory” and “controversy mapping”. In addition to its methodological contribution, this research makes a contribution to the Turkish historiography and the scholarship on Turkish modernisation. This research will also contribute to architectural theory by using a site as the unit of analysis, rather than analysing a building or a project.
In addition to the use of complementary research methods, this research aims to benefit from inter-disciplinary literature studies in order to fully grasp the complexity of the site. Three main bodies of literature will be put forward, namely waterfront redevelopment, cultural geography, and architectural theory. Waterfront redevelopment literature, whilst focusing extensively on conditions, purposes of regeneration and reuse of the regenerated areas, seems to dedicate far less attention to the role and position of the actors. The emphasis on the specificity of the actors in the process of urban regeneration can be considered to be another major contribution of this research. In the introduction, an overview of the literature in cultural geography and architectural theory literature through the discussion of the work of some of the key authors including Albena Yaneva, Bruno Latour, Jane Jacobs, Peter Merriman, Ash Amin and Nigel Thrift will be provided. This literature argues that buildings are dynamic entities not simply mirrors, reflecting socio-political economic life.

In this chapter, three perspectives for understanding the production of urban environments will be present. Firstly, I will discuss sites as living, dynamic entities which have social lives and biographies, and whose dynamism is derived from time. The second part of the chapter will distinguish reductivist from irreductivist approaches to research, as well as highlighting the importance of researching on the micro scale. Some irreductivist approaches to studying micro scale objects will be revisited. The third perspective that will be highlighted is concerned with architectural practises and networks, and focuses on the involvement of human and non-human actors in the making of a building, a site, and even a city and lastly the methodological approaches utilised during the research will be explained in the last section.

Life of Sites through Time

Through time sites alter, are transformed or abandoned, revive and sometimes are demolished. This dissertation argues that the dynamism of sites comes from the fourth dimension; that is time. Inspired from cultural geography literature, which argues that buildings are living entities, this dissertation argues that sites are dynamic and that, similar
to human beings, sites also possess “biographies” and “social lives”. This “social life” of sites can only be traced by studying them carefully and trying to understand the mechanisms and actors involved in their transformation. Albena Yaneva argues that time is a dynamic factor, the “cradle for the complex movements of buildings”. It is possible to reinforce this argument only when we start to follow, analyse and map the controversies that influence the design and construction process of a building. Then it will appear not as a “static object but a moving project” (Yaneva, 2012, p. 22). Such an analysis can only be done by tracing the changes in the actors’ moves and dynamics, the shifting relations between politicians and architects, as well as the variations of budgets and material alterations. It then becomes possible to grab these movements as a series of transformations. For Yaneva buildings are more complex than just embodiments of regimes due to the involvement of different actors, and their different disagreements and concerns. Learning from Yaneva’s approach, this research assumes a site as a “moving project, flow of trajectories” (Yaneva, 2012, p. 20) consisting of different actors and concerns. Bruno Latour and Albena Yaneva support the idea that a building is not a static object but a moving project. They state:

Everybody knows -and especially architects, of course- that a building is not a static object but a moving project, and that even once it is has been built, it ages, it is transformed by its users, modified by all of what happens inside and outside, and that it will pass or be renovated, adulterated and transformed beyond recognition…To consider a building only as a static object would be like gazing endlessly at a gull, high in the sky, without being able ever to capture how it moves (Latour & Yaneva, 2008, pp. 80-82).

As suggested by Stewart Brand, and based on this interpretation of buildings as dynamic objects, architecture should be redefined as “the design science of the life of buildings”, which means the establishment of a framework for long term management of buildings and their constant adaptations, in other words “the sequential studies of buildings” (Brand, 1994). Brand makes a distinction between different ways buildings change. He states that three types of buildings can be distinguished; commercial, domestic, and institutional. These different types of buildings change in quite different ways. According to him, commercial buildings change most rapidly, since keeping in pace with technological and
fashionable trends is an important concern. They have to adapt quickly, often radically, because of intense competitive pressure to perform, and they are subject to rapid improvements that take place in any industry. Domestic buildings are the steadiest changers, responding directly to the family’s ideas and annoyances, growth and prospects. The house and its occupants’ preferences mould with each other twenty-four hours a day and the building accumulates the record of that intimacy. Institutional buildings, on the other hand, do not change very often since they are mostly publicly owned and therefore less susceptible to trends. They act as if they were designed specifically to resist change for its occupants and to convey timeless reliability to the passer-by. When forced to change, they do so with expensive reluctance and all possible delay, making them appear to be ashamed of change (Brand, 1994, p. 7). Brand’s approach to categorisation of change in buildings is based mainly on the ownership pattern and available budget.

An architectural analysis of change in buildings is another aspect of dynamism that has been conducted by Brand. He makes a definition of six S’s: site, structure, skin, services, space plan, and stuff which are the shearing layers of change. Site is defined as the geographical setting, the urban location, whose boundaries and context last longer than generations of short-lived buildings, it is characterised to be eternal. Structure is defined as the foundation and load bearing elements which are perilous and expensive to change. The structural life of a building can range from thirty to three hundred years. Skin is the exterior surfaces, namely the facade, which changes approximately every twenty years to keep up with fashion or technology or for wholesale repair. For example, recent focus on the reduction of energy costs has led to re-engineered skins that are air tight and better insulated. Services are the working guts of a building: communication wiring, electrical wiring, plumbing, sprinkler system, HVAC (heating, ventilation, air conditioning) and moving parts like elevators and escalators. They wear out or are made obsolete every seven to fifteen years. Space plan is defined as the interior layout formed by the placement of floors and ceilings, walls and doors. Stuff is the furnishing such as chairs, desks, phones, pictures, kitchen appliances, lamps (Brand, 1994, p. 13). However, I argue that Brand does not take the ownership and economic situation of buildings into consideration, factors that are as important as the other elements for the transformation of buildings. Apart from the occupants’ needs and requirements, technological innovations lead to
dramatic changes in buildings. For instance, houses were revolutionized by the arrival of public water services around 1900, and subsequently by the introduction of electricity in the 1920s and 1930s and cable television in the 1970s (Brand, 1994, p. 19). Brand considers site as eternal and buildings as ephemeral. This is an important distinction to be aware of, especially when placed in the context of this research. In contrast to Brand, site is considered itself to be a dynamic element that is subject to continuous change, not a changeless constant, while buildings come to the front of the stage at certain times similar to actors in a theatre.

Focussing mainly on the maintenance and repair aspect in buildings, Stephen Graham and Nigel Thrift compare buildings to flows that are always in a state of flux in order to prevent the occurrence of decay (Graham & Thift, 2007, p. 6). Referring to Brand, they claim that many urban buildings are auto-constructed and continually adapted and altered a process that produces gradual but distinctive changes in their layout, skin and appearance.

The dynamism of buildings continues even when buildings are abandoned. Non-human actors such as pigeons, fungus and many others start to appear and make use of the space. Nature starts to reclaim the space through the introduction of overgrown weeds and plants. This aspect of dynamism was portrayed by Tim Edensor in his studies of abandoned industrial buildings. In further research on non-human actors in buildings, the trajectory of stone was traced by Edensor (2013) in the context of Manchester's architectural history. Edensor investigates the non-human matter in industrial ruins by paying attention to bodies appropriating the industrial ruins after their abandonment by humans, such as bird nests inside old fixtures and cupboards and the patterns they create by peeling and mouldering. He argues:

Birds nest inside old fixtures and cupboards, and other material gets gnawed at by mammals and insects, or is worked upon by bacteria, often producing elaborate patterns of warping, peeling and mouldering. These traces of non-human life-forms on the material textures of ruination reveal other unheralded, non-human ways of existing and interacting with matter... This hybridization undoes the order of things, transgressing the assigned boundaries between things, and between objects and ‘nature’. As things decay they lose their status as separate objects, fragmenting and
dissolving as discrete entities, becoming part of the soil or absorbed into non-human bodies (Edensor, 2005, p. 320).

Edensor's approach towards the study of non-human elements in the dynamic life of the site will be echoed in this research, even though with a focus on rather different non-human actors. The Actor Network Theory (ANT) is not limited to human individual actors; on the contrary, it is inclusionary of non-human, non individual entities. In ANT there is no set model for (human) actor, as the traditional social theory is not on its agenda. "The attribution of human, un-human, non-human, inhuman characteristics, the distribution of properties by these attributions, the connections established between them" (Latour, 1997) are its focus. As Bruno Latour argues, Actor Network Theory follows a given element through a number of connections and if it loses its connections then it also loses its importance. The water element of the case study, Tophane site and the trajectory of warehouse buildings situated in the site will be considered non-human actors that will be further investigated in this research project.

Referring to dynamism on the urban scale, Maria Kaika considers the city as a material entity, a thing that exists in a continuous state of transformation and change, passing through de-territorialized materials, a constantly evolving and mutable mechanism. She pays heed to other urban geographers and sociologists such as Harvey, Sennett, Castells, and Merrifield when stating that the city is "a circulatory conduit, a flux that is always material in all possible senses including symbolic and discursive flows, but never fixed" (Kaika, 2005, p. 27). Respectively, Ash Amin and Nigel Thrift consider the city to be present everywhere and in everything; the urbanised world is a chain of metropolitan areas connected by places and corridors of communication that together form a network (Amin & Thrift, 2002, p. 1). They evaluate cities as spatially open and cross cut by many different kinds of mobilities, flows of people, commodities, and information. In Cities Reimagining the Urban they state that:

We are not interested in systems, which so often imply that there is an immanent logic underlying urban life, but in the numerous systematizing networks which give a provisional ordering to urban life... we want to conceive cities as virtualities. That is,
we understand the trajectory of cities not as being instantiated through replications of the present, but as a set of potentials which contain unpredictable elements as a result of the co-evolution of problems and solutions. Each urban moment can spark performative improvisations which are unforeseen and unforeseeable. This is not a naive vitalism, but it is a politics of hope. This does not mean an unbridled optimism for the future, but rather, a firm belief in the actualities of change that can arise from the unexpected reaction to the vagaries of urban life, the novel organizations that can arise, and in general, the invention of new spaces of the political (Amin & Thrift, 2002, pp. 1-4).

According to Amin and Thrift, the urban life is ordered systematically through networks, thereby creating unpredictable potentials and improvisations. They emphasise the actualities of constant change, and the importance of the flux of the urban life for better understanding the dynamic nature of sites. In contrast, Thomas Gieryn has a different approach as he considers buildings to solidify society against time and continuous forces of change (Gieryn, 2002, p. 35). He claims that buildings stabilise social life by giving structure to social institutions, durability to social networks and persistence to behaviour patterns. According to him, some buildings fall into ruin, others are destroyed by human hands and most of them are endlessly renovated into something which functions differently to the original intention of the construction. He argues that buildings do not just sit and impose them, but rather are objects of interpretation, reinterpretation, narration, representation and meanings, and are usually more flexible than the walls and floors they depict.

A similar approach suggesting objects can also have a traceable life story has been developed by Arjun Appadurai. He argues that things in motion, such as in this case an industrial site, have a social life, a biography and a material culture that do not possess a stable identity. Appadurai claims that “economic exchange creates value which is embodied in commodities that are exchanged” (Appadurai, 1996, p. 3). He claims that by focussing on the things that are exchanged, rather than the forms or functions of exchange, it becomes possible to argue that what creates the link between exchange and value is politics. This argument can be used to justify the idea that commodities, like humans, have social lives. Appadurai regards commodities as subjects that have life histories or careers and that focus on the distribution of knowledge at different points in
their career (Appadurai, 1996, p. 26). These careers possess the greatest uniformity at the moment of production, when the commodity has had the least opportunity to accumulate an idiosyncratic biography. Appadurai accepts that every subject can have many biographies, such as psychological, professional, political, familial, and economic. He gives the example of a biography of a car, whereby it’s physical and technical biographies are known as its repair record, but its economic biography constitutes its sale and resale price, the rate of decline in its value, its response to recession, and its maintenance costs. Its social biography is regarded to be its role in the owner’s life or its history of ownership, incorporating even the society’s class structure and the sociology of the owner’s kin relations. He explains different biographies as:

All biographies - economic, technical, and social - may or may not be culturally informed. What would make a biography cultural is not what it deals with, but how and from what perspective. A culturally informed economic biography of an object would look at it as a culturally constructed entity, endowed with culturally specific meanings, and classified and reclassified into culturally constituted categories. It is from this point of view that I should like to propose a framework for looking at commodities - or rather, speaking processually, at commoditisation. But first, what is a commodity? The only time when the commodity status of a thing is beyond question is the moment of actual exchange. Most of the time, when the commodity is effectively out of the commodity sphere, its status is inevitably ambiguous and open to the push and pull of events and desires, as it is shuffled about in the flux of social life (Appadurai, 1996, pp. 68-83).

It is important, here, to make a distinction between Marxist and Pragmatist approaches. Appadurai’s perspective is influenced by Marxist philosophy; this philosophy would explain sites, buildings, and cultural artefacts to be shaped by external ideologies, forces and factors. This is in stark contrast with a pragmatist philosophy, which does not reduce buildings to social and cultural factors, but rather analyses them within their complex conditions, thereby considering the participation of different actors and the networks they shape. The irreductive approach will be further elaborated on in the following part.
Micro Scale and Irreductive Approach

It is important to understand and further analyse the irreductive approach in the context of this research, in order to grasp the complexity of the processes of urban transformation and waterfront regeneration, as well as actors and controversies that shape the industrial site. Here, I will investigate the site with all its complex layers, actors and controversies in order to map its political, economic, urban policy and planning strata. Focussing on the micro life of the industrial site will assist in detecting the macro picture of urban politics. Irreductive methods such as the pragmatist approach tend to explain situations not by referring to a set of externally produced theories and ideologies, but by relating a situation to its complex collection of contexts and associations. Isabelle Doucet clarifies the irreductive pragmatist approach and distinguishes it from reductionist approaches:

When approaching the architectural and urban condition in a pragmatist, irreductive manner, one resists the temptation to deploy a set of externally produced categories, theories or ideologies as frameworks through which the world can be understood. Instead one starts from the situation itself, from the specificity of that situation. It is not just about looking at how architecture and urban production are practised, but how they are practised in all their complexities and intricacies... Objects are thus considered as being "situated" in multiple networks; only accessible through "situated and embodied knowledges" The only way to understand and evaluate an object is by understanding all of its entanglements. Moreover, because an object's entanglements or "alliances" with the real change over time (over the course of an object's life), the boundaries of an object are never "fixed". Its boundaries change over time, which determines the fluidity of objects (Doucet, 2011, p. 31).

For instance, Bruno Latour's approach to analysing the urban condition, which can be recognised in his book Pasteurization of France, is inspired by the Pragmatist philosophy and is considered irreductive since sites; buildings and cultural artefacts are associated with many actors that are mobilised in networks. Latour clarifies his Actor Network Theory by claiming that "modern societies cannot be described without recognizing them as having a fibrous, thread like, wiry, string, ropy, capillary character that is never captured by the notions of levels, layers, territories, spheres, categories, structure, systems" (Latour,1997). Through his reflections on the work of French scientist Pasteur and his
struggle with microbes, Latour stresses the importance of the study of the micro scale instead of the macro scale. Through mobilisation in extended networks based on the associations of actors, these actors, in this case microbes can exert a power far beyond their individual significance. In his book, Latour suggests that French historians prefer to describe the battle against microbes led by French scientist Pasteur above the battles fought by Napoleon (Latour, 1988, p. 4). It is stated that Pasteur’s work does not emerge in society to influence it, but that it was already present in society and never ceased to be so. Latour stresses a similar argument when giving the example of the scientist Yersin, who described the problems in urban hygiene through his depiction of the city as a sick body. The circulation of microbes in this body is considered to be a simulation of the circulation of epidemics in an empire (Latour, 1988, p. 96). In this sense, these microbes can be interpreted as an analogy with architecture and buildings. Just as for Yersin the micro study of microbes could be used as an analogy for a macro understanding of the spread of an epidemic the movement of people through a city empire, so can the study of architecture and sites be approached through a micro study, the actors, architects and inhabitants as microbes and the buildings themselves as the body.

In parallel with Latour’s work on microbes, Graham and Thrift have an irreductive approach in their research matter investigating mostly ignored activities in social life such as repair and maintenance. They argue that repair and maintenance activities are an overlooked missing link in social theory. What they suggest is that existing “cultural constructions, and imaginations, of the infrastructure that sustains modern societies, actively work to push repair and maintenance activities beyond the attention of social science” (Graham & Thrift, 2007). Thus in order to highlight this lack of interest, they explore in detail some repair and maintenance activities in fields such as computer communications, electrics and automobile industry, and aim to excavate the politics of repair and maintenance in modern cities and societies. They consider all processes of maintenance and repair crucial to modern society due to their facilitation of infrastructural connection, movement and flow, and intend to “surface the invisible work” (Graham & Thrift, 2007, pp. 19-20) in order to make them the object of a more systematic and sustained attention. They interpret repair and maintenance as an ongoing process and as the engine room of modern economies and societies that allows the contemporary city to reproduce itself constantly. When taking
into consideration the architectural scale, Graham and Thrift argue that architects generally ignore the maintenance, repair and adaptation of their buildings in the design process.

From these examples it can be concluded that analysing the micro scale is very important. Rather than considering the micro scale as a reflection of the macro frameworks, or looking at things with preconceived ideologies, the most comprehensive understanding can be achieved by conducting a detailed analysis of the micro, trying to detect and convey all the possible dimensions of the subject of study.

**Architectural Practises and Networks**

Studying architectural practises or networks is an essential approach as it engages many different actors involved in the making of a building, urban neighbourhoods and even the city itself. The making of a building does not only involve a client and an architect, but it is a process that engages with users, neighbours, local historians, professional chambers, and NGO’s. Sometimes controversies will be generated, which can lead to court cases and other juridical processes being initiated. Moreover, the involvement of non-human actors in the process of making or destroying a site should not be neglected. According to Fredrik Nilsson, the aspect of "making" of physical action, actively doing and redoing, and changing things takes a central position in architectural design. He considers the processes of designing and making as ways of connecting to external factors and coping with the constantly changing conditions of the world. Physical and immaterial models are considered to facilitate integration of diverse perspectives and exposure and communication of insights to different actors (Nilsson, 2013).

When cultural geography literature is examined it is possible to detect examples of human and non-human factors, such as building materials, conceptual terms, emotions as well as repair and maintenance. Jane Jacobs and Peter Merriman follow Latour's tradition of focussing on the micro scale, hence their interest in the variety of actors involved in architectural practise. Besides the designer/architect and the occupant/user, the architectural practitioners can include builders, demolishers, conservators, maintenance
workers, DIY-ers, home makers, cleaners, artists and vandals (Jacobs & Merriman, 2011, pp. 211-212). All these actors affect the lifespan of a building. Moreover, Jacobs and Merriman include building materials such as bricks, steel, asbestos, and glass as well as other non-human actors such as walls, stairs, corridors, and rooms in architectural practice. According to them, human sentiments are also an important factor; emotions about a building such as love, hate or indifference affect the building’s atmosphere. Jacobs stresses the diversity in the fields of relations that hold the building together over time and in space, for example the relations between pipes, cables, managers, users, owners, and investors. She claims that the “materiality of the building is a relational effect; its ‘thing-ness’ is an achievement of a diverse network of associates and associations”. A building is always being made or unmade and holding together or pulling apart depending on the nature of these relations (Jacobs, 2006, p. 11). Jacobs and Merriman emphasise more abstract concepts in architecture (Jacobs & Merriman, 2011, p. 214). They stress the liquidity of architecture rather than the solidity of buildings and state that architectural forms may be conceived in terms of their openness and their ability to establish connection and continuity between interior and exterior, rather than their firmness and their reliance on all manner of openings, such as windows and doors, and technologies, such as air conditioning and modern communication technologies, to connect the indoors and outdoors. In this research, the dynamic understanding of a site as a state of flux will be applied to an industrial site in Istanbul.

Other authors also underline the involvement of various actors in the design process. Thomas Gieryn, for example, describes the design process as a representation of an artefact in graphic, verbal and numeric form. According to him, the transformation of the artefact into a material form is accomplished by a “design constituency”, which is a network of allies such as investors, patrons, consumers, managers, eager publics, regulator, and vendors (Gieryn, 2002, pp. 41-42). In addition, Gieryn claims that every design is a blueprint for human behaviour and social structure, as well as a schematic representation of the “thing” itself. In a parallel way, Larry Ford, studies how individual buildings are planned, designed, built, used, maintained and even destroyed, in order to analyse underlying urban processes (Ford, 2001). His approach is important and influential for this
research, since a similar approach will be used by zooming into certain time periods and individual buildings. Ford describes his approach as:

Building managers suggest architects, architects suggest redevelopment firms, and so on, until a long list of developers, planners, preservationists code enforcers, neighbours, neighbourhood groups, occupants, mafiosi, local historians, and everyone else involved in the making and breaking of a particular building or group of buildings evolves... I use fieldwork to nail down what often appear to be vague processes, such as redlining and gentrification. The story of the city seems richer when it includes the struggles of actual people to create, occupy, and maintain a specific building in the face of changing neighbourhood contexts or municipal priorities (Ford, 2001, p. 382).

The focus on non-human actors and their networks has been conducted by William Cronon in his book *Nature’s Metropolis* (1991). This work by Cronon is methodologically very influential as it describes the history of the metropolis of Chicago in the nineteenth century by linking the city and country through the tracing of certain materials and commodities. Cronon emphasises the importance of the 19th century for the development of the modern world; it was in this period when the foundations of contemporary society were formed through the creation of great cities, remarkable fertile farmlands, transportation links, and market institutions. Although he takes Chicago and the Great West as a case study for his book *Nature’s Metropolis*, his wider aim is "to explore century old economic and ecological transformations that have continued to affect all of North America and the rest of the world besides" (Cronon, 1991, pp. xv-xvi). The author's ambition to understand environmental change in relation to the actions of human beings by merging theories of ecology and economics is achieved through the organisation of his work around the topic of 19th century commodity flows, such as the movement of grain, lumber, meat, and other trade goods back and forth between Chicago and its hinterland. Cronon’s focus on commodity markets comes from his conviction that there are few economic institutions that affect human communities and natural ecosystems in the modern capitalist world.
If we wish to understand the ecological consequences of our own lives- if we wish to take political and moral responsibility for those consequences- we must reconstruct the linkages between commodities of our economy and the resources of our ecosystem. This is what I have tried to do. Nature’s Metropolis consists of a series of stories, each tracing the path between an urban market and the natural systems that supply it. I intend these stories as contributions to the history of nineteenth century Chicago and the story of the West, but I intend them as parables for our own lives as well (Cronon, 1991, p. xvii).

*Nature’s Metropolis* describes a series of historical journeys between city and country in an effort to understand the city’s place in nature. For Cronon Chicago in the nineteenth century United States represents a unique case, a city that had grown so large so rapidly that it had overwhelmed the countryside around it to create an urban periphery incomparable to any other metropolis of its time’. For the nineteenth century observer, Chicago seemed to be meant for greatness by nature’s own predictions. From this time forth, Chicago would be a metropolis, with a huge reach and dominance that flowed from its control over its periphery’s trade with the rest of the world.

Similar to Cronon’s approach, Maria Kaika follows the trajectory of the non-human actor water in the urban context. The urbanisation of water is the main theme in Kaika’s book *City of Flows*. In this book, Kaika aims to bring the fetishised social relations of production and the hidden material networks and flows that urbanise nature into the foreground. In this way, she is able to highlight the material, social and historical continuity between nature, the modern city, and the modern home. She conducts a historical geographical analysis of the urbanisation of water in Western metropolises, such as London and Athens, “by using water as a vehicle to follow its flow from nature to the modern city and into the modern home and explores the margins outside (dams reservoirs, etc) and underneath (networks, pipelines, etc.) the visible and familiar spaces of the modern city and the modern home” (Kaika, 2005, p. 4). Moreover, Kaika aims to trace the dynamic process of the transformation of nature as it is integrated into the modern metropolis and into the modern home. She argues that nature and cities are not separable entities or autonomous space envelopes, neither only human made nor only natural and those they are results of the same socio-spatial process of the urbanisation of nature. As the water flows from
spaces of production to spaces of consumption, it undertakes changes in its physical, socio-political and cultural character (Kaika, 2005, pp. 4-6). Kaika’s analysis covers different periods but focuses on modernity’s Promethean project which coincides with industrial growth, capital expansion and the production of modern cities. Following a similar approach, this project will focus on the trajectory of water, in this case the Bosporus in Istanbul, as a powerful non-human actor, which was stressed by all actors involved in this research. The trajectory of water is part of the life of the site not as a neutral and passive element but more as a non-human actor performing a major role on the shaping of the site. Water will be further discussed in Reclaiming the Water Chapter.

Expanding the argument that buildings have a social “life”, Albena Yaneva considers buildings capable of creating a social life by generating controversies and involving actors that enable or resist transformation. She states that buildings “provoke, challenge, mobilise, bug, and gather different assemblies of heterogeneous actors” (Yaneva, 2010, p. 20). She argues that a building itself is able to generate controversies, and that these design controversies cannot be explained by external social, cultural or political actors. Instead of investigating overarching ideologies, or exploring the discourses of architects, Yaneva proposes a realist and pragmatist approach that examines what architects do when they design a building. Reflecting on the controversies around the Whitney Museum in New York, Yaneva argues that “a building cannot be defined by what it is or what it means but only by what it does: what kind of disputes it provokes and how it resists attempts of transformation in different periods of non-human actors” (Yaneva, 2010, p. 25). She explains the causality between a building’s existence and its controversies and design performances over time, by claiming that it exists only if it acts, resists, affords, compels, and brings together different actors that ensure the building is being narrated and re-interpreted. Yaneva adds that:

A building seems to be the unexpected and improbable result of a slow process of hesitant and non-linear historical comparisons and interpretations of what a building does, of daring and sometimes arbitrary design experimentations and trials, and many different actors contribute to it as the architect’s initial choice are subjected to modifications due to a variety of constraints (Yaneva, 2010, pp. 25-26).
Following on from Latour's tradition, Yaneva stresses the relations, controversies and networks a building creates through its journey over time. Also referring to Latour's approach on networks, Isabelle Doucet underlines Latour's surprise that while dealing with messy, "fibrous, thread-like, wiry character" with intertwined knots that could be understood through their networks and associations, these networks are represented by modernism's "bald concepts" (Latour, 1997). According to Doucet, the key to understanding such objects and their associations is by sorting out the different components and trajectories (Doucet, 2011, p. 32). Once an object, a building, a design project has been unravelled, it is possible to see how it is situated in space and time and how it has been transformed.

It is crucial to analyse the actors, networks, and controversies that are attached to a site, a building, or a design project in order to fully grasp its trajectory through space and time. Instead of trying to understand a building by studying externally produced ideologies or concepts, the examination of its layers will show its complex dimension. This irreductive approach will not only clarify the uncommon, forgotten dimensions or the non-human actors involved, but will also shed light on the political, economic, urban policies, planning and many other macro frameworks that influence the trajectory of a building.

**Reuse of old buildings**

Small enterprises often prefer to move into older buildings instead of custom built structures, due to the smaller capital required. In addition to this economic benefit, the architectural character of these buildings attracts not only small businesses but also young urban professionals and the creative class, thereby turning the reuse of old buildings into a fashionable trend. In Jane Jacobs' well-known book *The Death and Life of American Cities*, she explains which users prefer to move into old buildings and why:

> Only operations that are well established, high turnover, standardized, or highly subsidized can afford, commonly, to carry the costs of new construction. Chain stores, chain restaurants, and banks go into new construction. But neighbourhood
bars, foreign restaurants, and pawn shops go into older buildings. Supermarkets and shoe stores go into new buildings; good bookstores, and antique dealers seldom do. Well subsidized opera and art museums often go into new buildings. But the unformalised feeders of the art studios, galleries, stores for musical instruments and art supplies, backrooms where the low earning power of a seat and table can absorb uneconomic discussions these go into old buildings. Old ideas can sometimes use new buildings. New ideas must come from old buildings (Jacobs, 1993, p. 245).

Stewart Brand notes that well-established architectural offices do not observe the fact that old buildings are quite popular among small enterprises, however, commercial developers follow this trend closely. Commercial developers notice that small businesses often use garages, warehouses, and self-storage units as start-up spaces, sometimes spawning whole Silicone Valley-type local boomtowns (Brand, 1994, p. 29). Brand argues that there is more to continuity of the physical environment than just habit and nostalgia. “Old buildings embody history. They are worlds; in all buildings we glimpse the world of previous generations. Old buildings give us that experience directly not through words” (Brand, 1994, p. 90). Moreover, it is common to see that rehabilitated buildings help to revive a whole neighbourhood, even a whole town or city; with the least attractive part of town suddenly becoming the most attractive. A revitalized neighbourhood attracts new investment, new business, and often tourists, leading to higher rents and tax revenues for local governments. In relation to re-use of industrial buildings, Brand refers to Didron, who stated in 1839 that: “It is better to preserve than to repair, better to repair than to restore, better to restore than to reconstruct” (Brand, 1994, p. 94). Brand also reminds us of important preservation and re-use regulations that have been formulated in 1992 by the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, and argues that the idea of “form follows function” is completely invalidated. A building becomes more interesting when it leaves its original function behind. He emphasises the newly emerged tendency of buying vacant factories, warehouses, terminals, and enclosed docks by visionary developers that are attracted by the large and adaptable spaces and the “picturesque” character generated by their heavy construction. Urban renewal had quite suddenly become acceptable, since it was no longer focused on the replacement of whole blocks and buildings, but instead kept intact most of the urban fabric and was limited to upgrading existing building services.
and floor plans. It was commercially attractive, so public funds were no longer required. City governments came under increasing pressure from preservationists to save every old big building, as adaptive use took off as the mainstream of preservationist activity (Brand, 1994, p. 104). Brand considers the reuse of factories and warehouses very convenient.

Warehouses and factories that were built between 1860 and 1930 are endlessly adaptable. They are broad, raw space, clear-spanned or widely columned, with good natural illumination and ventilation and high ceilings of 12 to 18 feet. The floors, built strong enough for storage or to hold heavy machinery, can handle the modern eye. Architectural ornament, if any, is likely to be generic, sound, and common. They welcome any use from corporate headquarters to live/work studios. The modern equivalents of these buildings the windowless tilt-up concrete structures out on the edge of town have nothing like the adaptability of the old brick warehouses. Another trait that invites longevity is strangeness. Almost any sufficiently odd building that has a modicum of functionality will attract supportive community bemusement and a sequence of creative occupants (Brand, 1994, p. 109).

Brand’s argument about the reuse of old industrial warehouses and factories is very important, as he underlines how versatile these buildings are for reuse with high ceilings and raw spatial qualities as well as possessing aesthetic industrial characteristics. Brand’s argument urges the understanding of industrial sites in their dynamic form and is very relevant for this research. His book How Buildings Learn: what happens after they’re built is methodologically inspirational for tracing the changes in buildings through time. The new relevance of industrial sites will be further discussed in Chapter 1 in which more light will be shed on the different ways abandoned de-industrialised sites are unlocked, transformed, and eventually reused.

Methodology

The fieldwork of this PhD research has been conducted in Turkey, particularly in Istanbul and Ankara, from the winter of 2011 until the summer of 2012. Twenty in-depth interviews have been conducted with actors involved in the trajectory of the Tophane site, which is
located in Istanbul harbour and compromises several warehouses. The interviewees include architects, planners, academics, urban planners, government officials, professional chambers' secretaries, independent researchers and activists who have been involved in the case study directly or who have specific expertise on the topics discussed. In addition, visual data such as architectural drawings, photographs, and maps have been collected from several archives. Also, photographs have been taken by the author in order to document the present state of the site.

Archival research was primarily carried out in the National Library in Ankara and the Ataturk Library in Istanbul. The archival research comprised of the collection of newspaper articles related with the case study area and more general urban planning initiatives in Istanbul. They are taken from issues of the local newspapers Cumhuriyet and Milliyet that have been published between the dates 1930 and 2014. Visual data such as old maps and photographs were obtained from the archives of the German Archaeology Institute and the French Institute of Anatolian Studies in Istanbul, while historical governmental documents have been retrieved from the Prime Ministry’s National Archives in Ankara. Content analysis of the collected newspaper press clippings, governmental and historical documents was also conducted during the archival research.

According to Arjun Appadurai, dynamic entities have a social life, a psychological, professional, political, familial, and economic biography as well as a material culture (Appadurai, 1996). In this research, it is argued that the case study site is dynamic and that it possesses a socio-political life, a biography. Due to the depth, richness, multidimensional and controversial character of the Tophane site, and the limitations that most research methods offer for uncovering these characteristics fully, the use of different methods offers better prospects for capturing the dynamics of the case study site more thoroughly. In order to respond to the aims and objectives of this research in a comprehensive manner, I have chosen to make use of different research methods for exploring the diverse aspects of the site. I have utilised both established and more innovative research methods such as "thick description" (Geertz, 1975), "Actor Network Theory" (Latour, 1997), "controversy mapping" (Yaneva, 2012) and layering.
After a careful analysis of the site’s historical trajectory, the contextual complexity of the site was understood as an accumulation of different changes of use. The Tophane site has never been constant; on the contrary, it has been shaped and reshaped several times throughout the history. The site has also been the subject of contest at different periods in its history, manifested at different levels. In addition the site has been a multi-actorial entity, which is reflected in the appearance and disappearance of many different actors for and against the transformation of the site over time. Moreover, the site has also been subject to a number of multi-dimensional interpretations by a wide range of actors. In order to reveal this contextual complexity, thick description is used as a method of analysis. Nevertheless, thick description itself would not be sufficient enough to cover the contested, multi-actorial and multi dimensional aspect of the Tophane site. In order to better understand the contested nature of the site in its multi-actorial specificity, controversy mapping and actor network theory are used. The use of layering as a methodological tool of analysis is introduced in order to decipher the multi-dimensional aspect of the site. The four different research methods complement each other in order to fully grasp the specificity of the Tophane site. The unique aspect of this interdisciplinary use of methodologies is that it allows for unpacking a site rather than analysing just a building or a project, which is more common in architectural scholarship.

The historical, political, economic and social history of the site will be discussed in order to understand the site’s contextual complexity. "Thick description", a research method developed by Clifford Geertz (Geertz, 1975), will be used as a method of analysis. Geertz argues that “the essential task of theory building here is not to codify abstract regularities but to make thick description possible, not to generalise across cases but to generalise within them” (Geertz, 1975, p. 25). And rather than starting with a set of observations and attempting to unify them under a governing law, such supposition begins with a set of presumptive signifiers and attempts to place them within an intelligible frame; the aim thereby is to support broad assertions about the role of culture in the construction of collective life by engaging them exactly with complex specifics (Geertz, 1975, p. 28). In other words, the aspiration is to draw general conclusions from specific, but very densely textured facts. The third chapter of this dissertation presents a historical recollection of the Tophane site in Istanbul, in a way that allows for concentrating on the life of the site.
throughout its history. This recollection will enable the revelation of the site’s dynamism and changeability by underlining the series of transformations that have reshaped the appearance of the Tophane site. The sources used for the thick description are the archival data, which facilitate a better understanding of the macro scale and provide an introduction to the actors involved in the transformation trajectory of the Tophane site, as well as the controversies surrounding this trajectory.

The fourth chapter of this dissertation focuses on the controversies surrounding the Tophane site in particular. The Tophane site has been the subject of numerous controversies involving several actors, which makes it difficult to fully grasp the dynamics of the site by using solely “thick description” as a methodological approach. Another methodological tactic is required for detecting and analysing the controversies surrounding the Tophane site. In order to follow, analyse and map the controversies surrounding the design and construction process of a building or a site, Yaneva proposes to utilise “controversy mapping” as a way of representing the building or site as a moving project (Yaneva, 2012, p. 22). In her research she attempts to trace the changing relations between actors, as well as the variations of budgets and material alterations. She argues that the involvement of actors, specifically their concerns and disagreements, makes a building more complex. In a similar way, the Tophane site has been subject to conflicting views, propagated by the involvement of a variety of actors at different moments in time. In order to grasp this contested nature of the site in its multi-actorial specificity, and to understand which actors are involved and what their concerns are within the major controversies, controversy mapping is used as a methodological tactic.

Controversy mapping makes it possible to analyse the involvement of actors in the transformation of the Tophane site and allows these actors to come to the front of the stage. However, the actors contributing to controversies are occasionally non-human actors. In order to include these non-human, non-individual entities as actors, the Actor Network Theory (ANT) approach is used. The focus of ANT is on the acknowledgment of human and non-human actors, as well as their connections with each other and their properties (Latour, 1997). The non-human actor that was emphasised by all the interviewees is the water element of the site, and the site’s connection and relation with
water. The fifth chapter of the dissertation analyses this relation between the Tophane site and water by focussing on the non-human element water.

As stated before the multi-dimensional nature as well as the complexity of the site requires alternative methodological approaches. The diverse dimensions of the transformation process can be uncovered through the investigation of the different layers of transformation. To reveal the layers that shape and reshape the life of the Tophane site layering will be used as a methodological approach. Layering, as an interpretation of thick description, helps to zoom in on the different layers of a particular case that have been created through the involvement of various actors. The concept of layering has generally been used in the context of heritage and conservation through the inclusion of historical layers. However, in this research this common use of the concept of layering will be expanded, thereby offering a methodological contribution to the wider research field as well as critiquing the limited application of layering in heritage literature. The use of layering as an analytic tool manifests the complexity of a building or site in many different ways. The Tophane site highlights very well that the layers of a site can constitute different dimensions, such as European integration, reuse, architecture, and public cultural life. As a result by juxtaposing these different layers, the multidimensional nature and the complexity of the site will be revealed. In addition, making use of layering as a methodological approach also helps to identify concerns of actors that are not deciphered by other methodological strategies.

Layering is not only a way of understanding the complexity of the site in this research, but it is also conceptually very interesting. Layering in architecture can be associated with the archaeological term "palimpsest" which is originally a parchment that had been scraped so that it could be reused. However, writing on top of another text produces numerous layers of information, preserving the historical importance of the previous texts as well. In the context of architecture, palimpsest describes the accumulated changes of an architectural design and its site, in that way creating a condition in which the layers of complex forms are integrated within a structure. Such a structure does not indicate a simple meaning but it continuously stimulates new readings through stratified layers while simultaneously keeping the original text's singularity.
The four different methodological tactics described above will contribute to a more irreductive and in-depth analysis of the site that acknowledges its different dimensions as well as the controversies that surround the site and the variety of actors involved in these controversies. These insights will help to distinguish all the different aspects contributing to the dynamic life of the site but at the same time they also reveal the complex and dynamic nature of the case study. As a result, it will become possible to grasp the socio-political, economic and cultural tendencies that trigger or prevent any transformations occurring on the site.

Structure of the Dissertation

Chapter 1 Waterfront Redevelopment will present an overview of waterfront redevelopment literature and will discuss urban regeneration in general and waterfront redevelopment in particular. The origins of waterfront redevelopment, the factors that act as conditions for the emergence of waterfront redevelopment and the purposes of waterfront redevelopment will be explored. Moreover, the typical urban programme and actors involved in waterfront redevelopment schemes will be discussed.

In Chapter 2 Tracing Cultural Regeneration and Urban Transformation the concept of cultural regeneration will be reflected upon, as well as the implementations of this concept in the Turkish context. This chapter will present a brief overview of cultural regeneration literature, in which the ideas of city-branding, capital of culture and tourism, as well as iconic architecture will be discussed. The chapter also includes an analysis of the concept of urban transformation in the Turkish context through the use of empirical data.

Chapter 3 Site life of Tophane Warehouses provides a historical recollection of the Tophane site in Istanbul, aimed at presenting the site as a dynamic entity with social trajectories. The Tophane site will be thoroughly introduced with the help of a wide range of visual data collected and prepared during fieldwork. The historical, political, economic and social history of the site will be discussed in order to understand the site’s contextual
complexity. The chapter will make use of what Geertz defines as “thick descriptions” of the trajectory of a site, in order to detect and understand the macro scale. This method of analysis will help to detect the contextual depthness of the Tophane site.

In chapter 4 *Mapping Controversies of Tophane warehouses: 1970-2013* the tracing of the trajectory of the Tophane site will be continued using a different methodology; the chapter will produce a controversy mapping of the site rather than a ‘thick description’. This Tophane site has been the subject of conflicting ambitions, with a variety of actors venting their different viewpoints at different times. Controversy mapping is used in order to understand the contested nature of the site in its multi-actorial specificity. The chapter will highlight major controversies around the Tophane site, such as congestion in the port, privatisation of the site, prioritisation of economic development above cultural concerns, opaque urban politics, and the vanishment of the architect. The multi-sited understanding of actors and their networks will be expressed with actor network diagrams. Controversy mapping will help to better understand which actors and concerns are involved, and how these were situated within actor networks in the context of major controversies. The archival research data in the form of newspaper clippings, journal articles, and in-depth interviews with involved actors will be the primary sources for this analysis.

Chapter 5 *Reclaiming the Water* will focus on the importance of the non-human actor water for the Tophane site. Cultural geography literature will provide a theoretical framework and will help to explain the link between architecture and flows. The chapter will investigate how the conception of water has changed from a functional object to an object of recreation. In addition, this chapter will explore the perception of water in Istanbul by zooming in to the Tophane port. The main sources used in this chapter are secondary sources, although the investigation will be supported by data obtained from archival research and in-depth interviews.

In chapter 6 *Understanding the Multi-Dimensionality of Tophane Site Through Layering*, the focus is put on the story behind the transformation of the non-human actor warehouse number four into the Museum of Modern Art ‘Istanbul Modern’. Layering will be used as the main method of analysis, which will help us to understand the multi-dimensional character
of the Tophane site that has been created through the many faceted interpretations of a wide range of actors. The different dimensions of the transformation process will be analysed through the description of different layers of transformation, notably: building a bridge with Europe; reuse; architectural translations; and cultural life.

The first three chapters of this dissertation present a critical review of three bodies of literature: waterfront redevelopment, cultural geography and architectural theory. The literature review will be followed by four analytical chapters that examine the controversies around the Tophane site and a range of non-human actors involved in the eventual transformation of the site. These chapters benefit from the use of different methods of analysis that will help to come to a better understanding of the empirical data presented. Throughout the empirical chapters, four methods of analysis have been utilised: thick description, ANT, controversy mapping, and layering. The innovative use of methodology will help to present the Tophane site as a "moving project", an object in flux. By tracing the trajectory of an industrial site rather than a building this research aims to contribute to existing cultural geography literature and architectural theory. The innovative aspect of the dissertation is that though it crosses the boundaries between these two literatures, it does not stay in any of these fields solely.
CHAPTER 1

WATERFRONT REDEVELOPMENT

This chapter revisits waterfront redevelopment literature for its particular relevance in understanding the context of the case study of the Tophane site in Istanbul. Waterfront redevelopment literature offers a useful insight into the historical process of deindustrialisation and its consequences, as well as the solutions proposed for dealing with these consequences, such as the regeneration purposes of waterfront redevelopment schemes and the objectives behind the introduction of new urban programmes for these redevelopment areas.

During this investigation of waterfront redevelopment literature, it becomes evident that most case studies are redevelopment schemes implemented in the United States, Canada and Europe. The most frequently analysed case studies are Baltimore, Boston and Toronto, cases that can be considered as the first generation of waterfront redevelopment. Other case studies often covered by waterfront literature are Canary Wharf, London; Battery Park City, New York; Granville Island, Vancouver; Darling Harbour, Sydney; Port Veil, Barcelona; East Docks, Amsterdam; Kop van Zuid, Rotterdam; and the Dublin, Tokyo, and Shanghai docklands, which could be considered as the second generation of case studies in the literature. Set within this context, this PhD research will contribute to the waterfront redevelopment literature by focussing on the Tophane port, Istanbul, through its comprehensive analysis of this case study that represents a dissimilar type of transformation than the case studies already mentioned. In addition, we will come to see that most of the case studies mentioned in waterfront redevelopment literature are completed success stories, while the Tophane case study is not. In fact the redevelopment scheme has never fully been initiated and it is therefore still unfinished, incomplete, and used temporarily.

In the first part of this chapter, I will discuss urban regeneration in general and then more specifically waterfront redevelopment, itself a particular type of urban regeneration. The
second part of the chapter will zoom in on the origins of waterfront redevelopment. In the third part the focus will be on some of the factors that act as conditions for the emergence of waterfront redevelopment, such as containerisation, deindustrialisation and corporatisation. In the fourth part, the purposes of waterfront redevelopment will be explored, while in the fifth part the urban programme that is usually proposed for waterfront redevelopment schemes will be analysed. And finally, in the sixth part, the typical actors involved in waterfront redevelopment will be discussed.

1.1. Urban Regeneration and Waterfront Redevelopment

In waterfront literature, several terms are used to describe the transformation of urban centres, such as urban regeneration, urban healing, urban transformation and urban renaissance. These terms not only all depict the creation of physical space or buildings in a particular site, but are also all concerned with the social and economic wellbeing of a particular area, often advertised as the quality of life. As part of this concern, a focus is usually placed on the quality and design of public space and the buildings that are incorporated in these schemes. According to Ann Breen and Dick Rigby waterfront regeneration has become one of the most fertile areas of urban planning and development (Breen & Rigby, 1994, p. 2). They argue that waterfront regeneration contributes significantly to the restoration of city centres in terms of their economic and social health, and that it acts as a manifestation of a society’s socio-cultural and environmental values, such as, environmentalism, architectural heritage preservation and changing socio-cultural attitudes (Breen & Rigby, 1994, p. 5). The characteristics through which these urban values are often expressed are high-density development, integration of various activities and uses, a diverse population, a mixture of old and new buildings, pedestrian priority, efficient use of public transportation, and a strong sense of place.

The most significant aspect of waterfronts until the mid-twentieth century was their function as ports which acted as major entry points into the city. Since then, however, technological advancements and changing demands have often led to a rapid industrial decline of these traditional port areas, their abandonment and subsequent redevelopment. Brian Hoyle
notes that, up until the mid-twentieth century, the waterfront traditionally formed an important part of cities; it was connected to the water and saw to the flourishing of urban-based functions (Hoyle, 2002, p. 141). City ports functioned as gateways where the transportation of goods was facilitated, where ships were equipped, crews assembled and urban services developed to encourage maritime trade. However, the physical shape of cities changes constantly according to changing human demands, and in the second half of the twentieth century port areas started to become spatially separated from urban functions. Rapid technological advancement in recent decades led to dramatic transformations in maritime transport, and as a result, port facilities were often relocated to sites where large areas of land were available for construction of more modern ports. Their relocation was further reinforced by global political and economic changes. Stephen Craig-Smith and Michael Fagence acknowledge the links between spatial restructuring in urban areas and wider economic, social and political change in advanced capitalist societies (Craig-Smith & Fagence, 1995, p. 8). This global and systematic process of change affecting waterfront areas has been variously described as post-industrial, post-fordist, or as an era of flexible accumulation (Harvey, A Brief History of Neoliberalism, 2005). In an era of global economic restructuring, one dimension of flexible capital accumulation has been the inter-locational and international competition to attract capital for the funding of waterfront revitalization projects. Craig-Smith and Fagence point out that new industry located itself directly in these new port areas, such as green-field peripheral sites, thereby evading the older docks (Craig-Smith & Fagence, 1995, pp. 6-7). As a result, former ports gradually lost their reason for existence. As a consequence, large areas of waterfront land were abandoned and underwent radical changes in appearance caused by general neglect, declined infrastructure, and ultimately, dereliction.

The difference between the post-industrial city and the industrial city is considerable in regards to the spatial distribution of the various socio-economic classes' urban policy priorities and the overall urban ambiance. Timothy Sieber places emphasis on the point that socio-economic class connotations change over time, as evidenced in the fact that the older industrial docks are no longer places for manual work or the blue collar working class (Sieber, 1991, pp. 131-132). The newly emerging post-industrial cities offer, instead, representations and images of new urban realities, new popular cultures, and new
metropolitan elites. These cities, consequently, also reshape the existing urban infrastructure. Former dock areas, for example, are transformed into places targeting the white collar service sector. According to Sieber, the overall urban ambiance of these ‘new docks’ is one that can be described as a leisure and entertainment atmosphere, rather than a work atmosphere that used to be omnipresent. Sieber denotes that the industrial past of port cities was rendered invisible in most urban preservation schemes, heritage programmes, marketing campaigns and popular historical celebrations. The reason for this ‘selective amnesia’ of the industrial past is that popular urban history tends to focus on preindustrial themes and the city’s relationship with nature rather than its industrial past (Sieber, 1991, p. 132). He underlines the fact that post-industrial themes increasingly dominate publicly accessible information sources in the form of educational programs, park interpretations, public celebrations and museum collections.

This transformation of former docks from a predominantly functional use towards leisure activities resonates with the increased orientation on leisure, recreational participation, and environmental and heritage concerns, typical of the post-industrial era. Many of the urban waterfront areas have, thus, been redeveloped with the purpose of boosting conservation, recreation and tourism and are qualified as catalysts for redevelopment. I would, however, argue that, without socio-economic and cultural considerations, recreation and tourism fall short in triggering a long-lasting and sustainable redevelopment.

1.2. Origins of Waterfront Redevelopment

After a short introduction to the concept of regeneration in general and waterfront redevelopment in particular, the focus in this section is on some questions that aim to better investigate waterfront redevelopment. When did waterfront regeneration start? What can be regarded as the origins of waterfront regeneration?

Brian Hoyle dates the shifts in maritime transport technology to the 1950s, but the decline of docks and the subsequent demand for their revitalisation did not become apparent until the end of the 1960s (Hoyle, 2002, p. 142). During the 1970s and 1980s it is possible to
see an increase in the number of waterfront redevelopment schemes in North America, Europe, Australasia and Japan. Breen & Rigby date the beginning of the waterfront redevelopment phenomenon to the 1960s and its subsequent blooming to the 1970s (Breen & Rigby, 1994, p. 10). They claim that its acceleration happened during the 1980s and that waterfront redevelopment continues to be implemented up to the present day.

The original ideas behind waterfront redevelopment were, according to Breen and Rigby, developed by the City Beautiful Movement. This was a town planning movement cultivated in the United States that advocated wide boulevards and other impressive urban settings for public buildings; as such evoking the grandeur and splendour of historical cities. Its origins date back to the World’s Fair: Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1893 (Thrinder, 1992). The City Beautiful movement ripened at the turn of 19th century and its ideas were implemented during this time in a number of cities, specifically through industry and transport transformation schemes for waterfronts. The central ideal behind the movement was urban beautification, which promoted civic well-being and the social benefits of public landscapes and parks (Breen & Rigby, 1994, pp. 11-12). Tracing the origins of waterfront development back to the ideas of the City Beautiful Movement helps us to better understand and observe the continuous transformation in the Tophane case since its early beginnings at the twentieth century.

Literature about waterfront regeneration and waterfront development emerged only quite recently. Most of the literature (often in the form of edited books) dates back to the end of the 1990s, when waterfront planning and development became a separate field of study. Some key contributions to waterfront redevelopment literature are Ann Breen and Dick Rigby’s *Waterfronts Cities Claim Their Edge* (1994), Stephen Craig-Smith and Michael Fagence’s *Recreation and Tourism as a Catalyst for Urban Waterfront Redevelopment* (1995), which focuses on recreation and tourism; the historical analysis of four port cities in Han Meyer’s *City and Port Transformation of Port Cities, London, Barcelona, New York, Rotterdam* (1999); Richard Marshall’s *Waterfronts in Post-Industrial Cities* (2001); and Brian Hoyle’s *Urban Waterfront Revitalisation in Developing Countries* (2000), which includes a contribution to his studies on developing countries. More recent literature such as Beatriz Garcia’s *Cultural Policy and Urban Regeneration in Western European Cities*:

To these publications, one can add numerous conferences, workshops and specialised courses about waterfront redevelopment, held at different universities. In 1982, a bimonthly magazine Waterfront World was published. Also, some international organisations such as the Association Internationale Villes et Ports (Le Havre, France), the Centro Internazionale Cittì d’Acqua (Venice, Italy) and the Waterfront Vitalisation and Environment Research Centre (Tokyo, Japan), have been founded in order to promote the idea of waterfront redevelopment for the reintegration of urban waterfronts into the city.

1.3. Conditions for Waterfront Redevelopment

When considering the conditions that determine the occurrence of waterfront regeneration, authors advocate different categorisations. According to Sieber, there are three essential conditions for the emergence of waterfront revitalisation (Sieber, 1991, p. 122). The first one is the change in technology in maritime transportation and cargo handling that occurred after World War II, and which is usually referred to as containerisation. Deindustrialisation is named as the second condition by Sieber, while the third condition is the corporatisation of the city, which can be summarised as the remodelling of public administration in line with business models. For Sieber, containerisation, deindustrialisation and corporatisation are the central elements in the post-industrial economic transformation common to cities experiencing revitalisation of their waterfronts. However, Craig-Smith & Fagence only state two conditions that determine the emergence of waterfront revitalisation (Craig-Smith & Fagence, 1995). One of these conditions is containerisation, while the second one is the promotion of tourism and leisure as major economic interests. Other scholars, Breen & Rigby, state five conditions instead (Breen & Rigby, 1994, pp. 10-11). They argue that besides containerisation, the emergence of historical preservation movements, the clean-up of contaminated water in the context of increasing environmental awareness, the economic pressure to redevelop central city
areas, and the availability of financial and procedural assistance from the government for urban renewal form the conditions of waterfront regeneration. Interestingly, containerisation is mentioned by all the three sources as an essential condition for waterfront redevelopment. Although there are similarities in the categorisation of the different authors involved in waterfront literature, I follow Sieber's categorisation for this analysis because it overlaps with most of the issues included in the other categorisations and it is the most relevant for my research. In the following part, Sieber's three conditions for waterfront redevelopment will be further analysed.

1.3.1. Containerisation

Since World War II, maritime technology has undergone tremendous changes. The capacity and size of freight ships has increased and with the introduction of containers cargo handling technologies have developed various innovations. Craig-Smith and Fagence, amongst others, have indicated the steady increase in the capacity and size of cargo vessels. In the 1970's the dead weight of an average cargo or container ship was 25,000 tons, however today this is 40,000 tons. The maximum dead weight of a dry bulk carrier used to be 100,000 tons, but this figure has more than doubled; for tankers it used to be 300,000 tons, however today this is 500,000 tons (Craig-Smith & Fagence, 1995, p. 6). Therefore the docks built in the nineteenth century were no longer sufficient for handling these new large ships. Containerisation, which is the change from bulk cargo to container cargo, is an important factor in driving changes in the existing patterns of the spatial organisations of port activities. It enables faster loading and unloading whilst also requiring more spacious harbour facilities for container storage. In addition, containerisation requires larger port areas with mechanized handling, and accessibility to motorways and railroads.

The inner city ports were aging and usually lacked these technological improvements as well as available space for expansion of the ports. As a result, existing inner city ports could no longer fulfil the requirements that were expected from modern ports. Instead, new ports emerged at the outskirts of cities. They were considered more appropriate thanks to
their deeper water access, which accommodated for tankers and larger size freight ships; their provision of sufficient space for storage of containers; and their connection to railroad and motorway infrastructure. Another factor contributing to the discontinuing of downtown city ports was the increased competition of air transport that led to a shift from the exclusive use of ships to a more widespread use of planes for transoceanic transport and travel. Furthermore, the construction of extensive road infrastructure such as bridges and motorways led to an increase in the use of trucks and cars. As a result many inner city ports were left disused and would decay.

Similarly, Richard Marshall stresses the influence of technological advancement and containerisation. Namely, the newly emerging information-based, service-oriented economic systems no longer relied on the industrial and manufacturing operations of the past (Marshall, 2001, p. 5). New technological improvements redefine the relationship between transport and industry, leading to new systems of road, rail and water transport that respond to the requirements of containerisation. These changes ultimately shifted the operating bases for global water transport away from the historic waterfronts. In a more recent source, Carola Hein stresses the importance of technological transformation as witnessed in the development of new shipping vessels, new fuels, new cargo, the railway and the telegraphy in port cities (Hein, 2011, pp. 16-17). Containerisation transforms the modus operandi of transportation through the reshaping of shipping lanes and harbour facilities, the creation of new port functions and activities, and the attraction of new groups of people. All these transformations drained many waterfronts of life, but at the same time encouraged planners and investors to invent new plans for former port areas in order to realise offices, leisure activities, tourism and cruise terminals. As argued by Hein, harbour transformation, globalisation of trade and the emergence of waterfront revitalisation are all a direct result of containerisation.

### 1.3.2. Deindustrialisation

During the last century, the industrial sector has experienced important changes in terms of geographical relocation. This resulted in a shift from an economy based on industrial
production towards an economy dominated by an expanding service sector. In addition to containerisation, Sieber identifies deindustrialisation of inner city areas as another condition for the occurrence of waterfront redevelopment (Sieber, 1991, pp. 122-123). The process of deindustrialisation had been taking place since World War I, but accelerated after World War II, when manufacturing facilities were pushed out from inner city into the outer and suburban parts of the city; where land was cheaper and pollution more manageable. As part of global economic restructuring, overseas locations attracted manufacturing facilities of many industrial corporations due to their promises of cheaper labour and tax benefits. Thus, as Sieber underlines, much of the deactivated industrial facilities in port cities, such as maritime facilities and shipyards, were situated in waterfront locations. Industries such as steel and automobile manufacturing in particular have been enormously reliant on access to waterways for the transport of raw materials.

Neo-liberal planning policies tapped into the increasing malfunctioning of inner city areas under de-industrialisation and sought to improve these areas into international-regional centres capable of attracting shopping facilities and promoting tourism. These policies can be criticised due to the fact that they aim to maintain and reproduce the capitalist market economy by focusing on cultural gentrification whilst ignoring socio economic processes, unemployment issues and social displacement. Although such a shift in urban policy seems to acknowledge the difficulties faced by many city centres in the last decades of the twentieth century, many critics point to the inherent flaws in neoliberal ideology, and the negative effects the implementation of neoliberal policies would have for post-industrial city.

One of these critics, David Harvey, characterises neo-liberalism as an economic-political ideology that favours private property rights, free markets, and free trade (Harvey, 2005). He defines neo-liberalism as “a theory of political-economic practices which proposes human well-being can best be advance by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade” (Harvey, 2005, p.2). In this system, the role of the state is limited to creating and preserving an appropriate institutional framework by guaranteeing the quality and integrity of money; setting up defence structures, such as a military and
police; supporting legal structures and functions required to protect private property rights; and guaranteeing the proper functioning of markets or creating markets if they do not exist. In this limited capacity, the state cannot possibly possess enough information to second-guess market signals, which renders it impossible for the state to intervene elaborately in the market system. According to Jamie Peck and Kevin Ward, during the 1980s this neo-liberal perspective effectively promoted a more deregulated business environment in order to encourage market responsiveness, and reduced spatial planning to a mere material consideration, expected to provide an enabling context for property-led regeneration (Peck & Ward, 2002). As a result, in the early 1990s, one could observe “the emergence of collaborative consensus building agendas, with the plan led system as the material consideration in determining development proposals” (Williams, 2002, p. 155). The shift in the economic structure has led to deindustrialisation and abandonment of inner-city industrial facilities, many of which were located by the waterfronts. Neo-liberal planning policies seek to promote tourism and real estate development and therefore former industrial sites by the waterfronts were ideal locations to facilitate these uses.

1.3.3. Corporatisation

As a result of deindustrialisation, the corporate, information and service sectors became more prominent in the central city economies, as evident in the rise of the banking and finance sector, business and professional services, real estate development, tourism, health care, and education. A shift occurred from blue collar to white collar sectors. Sieber stresses the increase in the occupation of office towers by new organisations from the private, public and non-profit sectors, and a subsequent increase in the number of corporate headquarters (Sieber, 1991, pp. 123-124). In addition, tourism and leisure were now recognised as economic contributors. Craig-Smith and Fagence for instance pointed out how this growing interest in tourism and leisure led to the prioritisation of developing recreational venues offering historic and heritage opportunities (Craig-Smith & Fagence, 1995, p. ix). These growing demands for consumption and leisure opportunities triggered gentrification and revitalisation. This was especially the case in post-industrial settings
such as, waterfront areas that were left vacant after the relocation of their industrial facilities.

1.4. Purposes of Waterfront Redevelopment

One of the common purposes of waterfront redevelopment is to transform the waterfronts into public spaces. The aim of most waterfront regeneration schemes is to facilitate public use of the waterfront so that citizens can be near the water, walk along the water and enjoy the scenery. Another significant purpose of waterfront redevelopment that appears in the literature is to restore the appearance of the abandoned and deteriorating waterfronts. Craig-Smith & Fagence highlight public access to water as a primary purpose of waterfront redevelopment (Craig-Smith & Fagence, 1995, pp. 137-138). They concentrate on three principal purposes of waterfront redevelopment; providing public access to the waterfront, improving the image of the derelict waterfront areas, and contributing to the economic regeneration of the city by “breathing new life” into the waterfront areas. Another purpose of waterfront regeneration, identified by Craig-Smith & Fagence (1995, p.150) is to secure the conservation of heritage buildings and sites, and to contribute to strategic urban development strategies for economic, physical, and social improvements of the city.

Similarly, according to Hoyle (2002, pp. 142-143) and Breen & Rigby (1994, p. 24) public access to water is one of the primary purposes of waterfront redevelopment. After centuries of utilitarian, maritime and industrial use of waterfronts, public accessibility has gained in importance; water is considered a natural feature that people wish to see, to be near to, or even to touch. Beyond this human desire, Breen & Rigby underline the fact that access to the shoreline is a public right that goes back to Roman times, when free access to navigable waters and foreshores was the right of every citizen (Breen & Rigby, 1994, p. 24). Therefore, most waterfront redevelopment schemes now encourage public access to the waterfront, even if only in the form of strolling along the shore. Breen and Rigby indeed suggest that all waterfront regeneration schemes should ensure public access to the shore. In addition, they suggest providing visual access through vista corridors. However,
some waterfront regeneration projects still prohibit public access to the shore and instead prioritise the implementation of gated housing estates along the waterfront.

The literature also gives evidence of other purposes for waterfront redevelopment. Hoyle (2002, p.142-143), for example, recognises new attitudes to the conservation of urban heritage, and a movement towards the prevention of waterfront zones. Other cases evince the reconciliation (rather than separation) between waterfront and urban cores. Finally, one also finds attempts to encourage the provision of open green space to cultivate social diversity and a sense of community or to maintain links with the past.

Another important aspect is the image improvement of the waterfront areas. After the abandonment of the former industrial facilities, and the resultant decay of the waterfront, it became a public obligation to improve the deteriorating image of the waterfront (Craig-Smith & Fagence, 1995, p. 139). At the same time, others have conversely recognised a quality in the decay. According to Breen & Rigby, for example, "character" is a mysterious quality that makes a place unique. The more characterful a place, the more interesting it becomes. They argue that the attraction of industrial waterfronts is their funkiness and character; what appears as messy to some, may mean a "genuine atmosphere and source of charm" to others (Breen & Rigby, 1994). This was the case with the "the 1950's coffee shop, the ramshackle roadhouse, the weather-beaten watering hole, the fish shack, the bait shop and rust that accompany industrial waterfronts." In addition, boat repair yards or small family businesses, offer an opportunity to connect with a location's past. Breen and Rigby (1994, p. 26) therefore criticise waterfront regeneration schemes for over ambitiously cleaning up the site and not showing appreciation for the site's historic and functional character.

1.5. New Urban Programme for Waterfront Redevelopment Areas

From the previous section the two principal purposes of waterfront redevelopment schemes were discussed, which are the provision of public access to waterfronts and improvement of the image of waterfront areas. One way to achieve both is through re-
programming waterfront areas. Waterfront sites are often programmed for leisure, recreation, and tourism. Craig-Smith and Fagence connect such new uses with attempts to develop new functions and structures for waterfronts whilst preserving heritage buildings (Craig-Smith & Fagence, 1995, p. 150). They also suggest the preservation of the uniqueness of a location; by creating a suitable and characteristic ambience and by organising special events that highlight this uniqueness. Craig-Smith & Fagence claim that:

The opportunities to "breathe new life" into waterfront districts focus on new activities to replace those which no longer have a direct dependency on the locations they once used. Thus, the strategies of economic regeneration and revitalization have shifted in focus toward leisure-related activities, to commercial accommodation, to special forms of residential development, and to specialized retailing. This situation inevitably drives strategies of waterfront redevelopment into a multifunction model. (Craig-Smith & Fagence, 1995, pp. 139-140)

The formula of successful waterfront projects suggested by Craig-Smith & Fagence is a careful mix of well-matched commercial uses and considerate management of heritage buildings in order to adapt them to new commercial challenges; the adoption of a consistent commercial and aesthetic ambience; the successful pedestrian linkage of the waterfront to other public areas; and the incorporation of leisure and commercial facilities (Craig-Smith & Fagence, 1995, pp. 141-145). They claim that incorporation of tourism through the provision of visitor attractions can be done successfully by mixing these activities with retail cultural opportunities as well as hotel accommodation. The key to achieving this mixture is to maintain as many heritage buildings as possible and to incorporate new structures through a design that shows empathy with existing structures. Land-use continuity, compatibility and continuity in architectural style can all be achieved through the regulation of building heights and mass, scale of development and density. Informed by their analysis of several waterfront redevelopment schemes, Craig-Smith & Fagence highlight the danger of these schemes becoming cloned or copied, which they call the “disneyfication” of waterfront areas. According to Craig-Smith & Fagence, this avoidance of copy-pasting of successful cases is the main challenge of the planning and design profession.
On the other hand, Breen and Rigby argue that prescriptive zoning, which prohibits the mixing of different uses, would be a mistake because each site has specific merits (Breen & Rigby, 1994, p. 26). Keeping in mind the specificities of each site can trigger more interesting waterfront redevelopments and result in areas that collect a fascinating mixture of seemingly incompatible activities instead of resulting in featureless environments.

A restaurant amid ship repair dry docks, condominiums beside a commercial fishing industry, a library with a retail marketplace, an art school next to a concrete plant, a park within a port, a farmer’s market next to a sewage treatment plant, and condominiums beside an active port (Breen & Rigby, 1994).

According to Breen and Rigby, waterfronts also possess a grittiness and no-nonsense quality that contradict with today’s glossy re-developments. Breen and Rigby also discuss the fact that waterfront redevelopment schemes are increasingly being presented in the media and also by certain academics as a phenomenon relating to "festival market places", a term that emerged in the mid 1970s. The festival market approach, as described by Dirk Schubert, is also known as "Rousification", in reference to the developer James Rouse, who was involved in festival markets in Sydney, Boston, New York, Norfolk, Santa Monica, and Osaka (Schubert, 2011, p. 64). This approach advocates tourist-orientated shopping facilities and leisure-led revitalisation combining hotels, small shops, boutiques, restaurants, and bars with a publicly accessible waterfront in close proximity to the city centre. The US festival market model copied the typology of European port cities and market places and was, in turn, subsequently exported to Europe and Asia as a commercial concept.

Schubert presents a periodisation of waterfront revitalisation projects from the mid-1960s onwards and mainly in North American cities such as Baltimore, Boston and San Francisco (Schubert, 2011, p. 63). According to Schubert, these projects adopted a learning-through-practice approach that focussed on the development of touristic facilities, hotels and offices and emerged as a result of privatisation and market-led urban planning. Most projects appear to be similar in function and subject to similar criticism; namely for being a mere ‘concrete curtain’ along the waterfronts. Baltimore Inner Harbour, for instance, is the most imitated American urban renewal and waterfront revitalisation
scheme. It is composed of a convention centre, hotel, sport facilities, aquarium and a festival marketplace. The project splits the responsibilities for public space between private and public sectors based on a ‘shared risk’ approach. This resulted in the enhancement, but also the commercialisation of public space. An important note that is provided by Schubert is that the success of the Baltimore model is hugely overemphasised and that the improvements around the harbour are juxtaposed with the remarkable crisis-ridden urban reality at the time of realisation. Schubert adds that city marketing campaigns play an important role in determining the eventual success of waterfront redevelopment projects in the competition between cities.

Different approaches towards the redevelopment of waterfronts were forged by a variety of cities and their planners at the beginning of the 1990s. European seaport cities such as Oslo, Rotterdam, and Gothenburg adopted participatory planning processes and a step-by-step approach involving design competitions and master plans that encouraged early realisation of culture and leisure facilities like aquariums and museums so as to push market-led redevelopment. Schubert argues that:

At the beginning of the new millennium, a new generation of projects emerged. Private-public partnerships and professional planning management dominated the global competition between waterfront revitalisation projects. These projects were used in new city marketing strategies that were based on unique seaport heritage. At that time luxury housing and mixed used developments became more widespread. The disuse of port areas and waterfronts, often dramatised in Europe because of delays in many areas, is the normal process that will, at least, lead to rapid reutilisation. Here the revitalisation of ports and waterfronts often takes years, if not decades from the time of disuse to start of reorganisation. (Schubert, 2011, p. 64)

In the previous paragraphs, I have focussed on the new urban programme that industrial sites often adopt as a consequence of waterfront redevelopment schemes and the objectives behind these changes in use. In most cases, the urban programme that is implemented on these sites is a mixture of leisure, recreation and tourism facilities. The significance of achieving a balance between preserving heritage buildings and incorporating new structures in the ultimate design of the waterfront redevelopment
schemes was underlined. In doing so, the development objectives and approaches of popular case studies of waterfront redevelopment schemes were revisited, such as the festival market approach.

1.6. Actors involved in Waterfront Redevelopment

Most of the waterfront redevelopment literature stresses the objectives and purposes of waterfront redevelopment and analyses case studies where waterfront redevelopment schemes have been implemented. However, the actors involved in the conception and realisation of waterfront redevelopment schemes are not always comprehensively emphasised. An in-depth analysis of the role of the actors involved in the transformation process of waterfront redevelopment schemes, such as architects, planners, real estate development firms, and government agencies, is usually missing. Instead, these actors are often merely listed as involved parties without further elaboration. However, when one aims to understand the processes behind waterfront redevelopment schemes, the involved actors and stakeholders deserve greater analytical attention. Who are these actors? Sieber, for instance, includes the efforts of urban professionals from the urban design, planning, real estate development, governmental, and non-profit educational sectors, and technical consulting organisations (Sieber, 1991, p. 125). For Sieber, the newly emerging group of urban professionals can be considered among the creators as well as the users of the waterfront redevelopment schemes. Craig-Smith & Fagence include also the local-business community, local government administration, and central government departments as the possible initiators of waterfront revitalisation projects (Craig-Smith & Fagence, 1995, p. 147). Their influence is effectuated through, for example, the organisation of special events, the allocation of government funding, the inclusion of buildings in a heritage register, or the imposition of a general regional strategy.

As argued by Graeme Evans (2004), through the involvement of multiple stakeholders, influence in the decision-making process and power over the allocated resources is more equally distributed and small interest groups can yield influence on the eventual outcomes. External parties, such as master planners, star-architects and cultural intermediaries are
brought in to create a vision for a place. The involvement of different stakeholders in the process can be considered more democratic and consensual. However, this over-complicated, intricate network of different interests may also result in a slowing down of the implementation of the waterfront redevelopment schemes, sometimes even halting it altogether.

In the large-scale, Turkish transformation projects studied in this thesis, it is essential to consider the involvement of many different actors such as architects, municipalities, ministries, professional chambers, NGO's, civil societies, court cases, and private enterprises. In the Turkish case, where the land ownership of the former industrial sites still belongs to the State, the actors driving the revitalisation project cannot simply be reduced to local government versus private developers. Instead, the realisation of such waterfront transformation schemes triggered the cooperation of the public and private sectors.

The Turkish case will demonstrate the important role played by actors, in waterfront redevelopment. Surprisingly, this role is underestimated, or at least under-addressed in most waterfront redevelopment literature. One notable exception is the work of Evans, whilst even he does not provide an in-depth analysis of the nature of the involvement of the actors. By elaborating on the role of the actors involved in waterfront regeneration, this thesis aims to address this gap in the waterfront redevelopment literature.

1.7. Conclusions

One of the contributions of this PhD research is to waterfront redevelopment literature. As mentioned before the existing waterfront redevelopment literature even in more recent examples lacks in-depth analysis of the involvement of the actors in waterfront redevelopment processes. For instance, urban professionals, professional chambers and government institutions play a significant part in the physical transformation of waterfront redevelopment schemes. In this PhD research, an in-depth analysis of the role and the significance of the actors involved in the waterfront regeneration scheme will be conducted. One of the contributions of this PhD research to waterfront redevelopment literature is the emphasis placed on the involvement of the actors in a specific case. By
doing so, a detailed analysis of a trajectory of a waterfront regeneration site can be achieved. Another contribution of this research is to expand the focus of existing literature to other geographies by zooming in to a Turkish case study. In addition, this research highlights the specificity of a site by focussing on an uncompleted redevelopment scheme, thereby contrasting with the existing waterfront regeneration literature in which waterfront redevelopment is often studied through the description of best practice or other completed projects. Instead, the case study included in this research, the Tophane warehouses in Istanbul, has not undergone a physical change that can be considered as one of the waterfront redevelopment literature’s examples of a success story. The change in the Tophane site was more incremental. It started with an intervention in one of several warehouses, followed by minor changes in its environment (vacant spaces and industrial empty shells). In the meantime, the other warehouses on the site were used temporarily for a variety of functions. For instance the Turkish State Theatres used a warehouse for stage and costume workshops. And Mimar Sinan University was transforming another warehouse into a museum of contemporary art. These small and temporary changes, that are somehow not part of the original regeneration plans, are essential for the development and dynamism of the site. The lack of permanent urban programming triggered the creativity of different stakeholders.

Why did the Galataport project not work out? Why have the Tophane warehouses still not been transformed? Is the non-transparency of the planning decision to blame? Or is the lack of progress due to the involvement of too many or, on the contrary, too few actors? Could there be resistance to change inspired by the natural character of the site? Some of these questions will be addressed in the empirical chapters that follow.
CHAPTER 2

TRACING CULTURAL REGENERATION AND URBAN TRANSFORMATION

For the last thirty years, the effort towards transforming industrial cities into service-oriented economies has been accompanied by a growing interest in using culture as a tool for urban regeneration... a key realisation during the last decades of the 20th century was that, although cities have always had cultural functions, the evolution of a global, service-oriented economy has placed culture at the very centre of urban development, and has shifted traditional notions of culture as art and heritage to a view of culture as an economic asset, a commodity with market value and, as such, a valuable producer of marketable city spaces. (Garcia, 2004, pp. 312-314)

In this chapter the aim is to further elaborate the concept of cultural regeneration and reflect upon its implementations in the form of urban transformation in the Turkish context through the views of expert academics and urban professionals. This chapter is composed of two main parts. In the first part I present a brief overview of the literature concerned with cultural regeneration. In doing so, I will revisit Graeme Evans’ model for understanding the insertion of culture into regeneration in three different stages. In addition, two important architectural manifestations of cultural regeneration will be presented. Firstly, the role that city branding plays in cultural regeneration strategies will be highlighted, and secondly, I will investigate the concept of iconic architecture and its importance for city branding. In the second part of the chapter, this theoretical framework will be compared with the practice of urban transformation schemes in Turkey through the analysis of data collected during interviews with the actors who have expertise in the topic.

When the regeneration plans for the Tophane site are analysed, the central role of culture becomes evident. Most of the regeneration schemes designed for the site involve arts and cultural elements. Analysing the logic behind cultural regeneration is more relevant for the case study then focussing on other regeneration frameworks such as economic or social
regeneration. Most regeneration schemes are considered to encourage a direct relation between culture, recreation and tourism. For example, recreation and tourism are considered to be the catalysts of urban waterfront redevelopment by Craig-Smith & Fagence (1995), while Brian Hoyle (2002) sees the emergence of urban tourism as a major global industry in the twenty-first century and as an important driver behind the development of water fronts in touristic and historic port cities.

The origins of art-led regeneration and city marketing can be traced to the 1970s and early 1980s, when cultural concerns were becoming more prominent in many U.S. and European cities. Referring to Kong, Garcia denotes that during these decades, major arts developments and high profile events in the city centres were often related to heritage themes and targeted towards creating an increase in cultural tourism (Garcia, 2004, p. 315). This trend has contributed to the revival of urban public spaces and a significant growth in public-private partnerships designated with the task of addressing urban issues.

2.1. The Role of Culture in Urban Regeneration Processes

The incorporation of cultural activity in the regeneration process is explained by Graeme Evans with three models depending on the degree of incorporation: the first model is culture-led regeneration; the second model is cultural regeneration, while the third model is culture and regeneration (Evans, 2004, p. 968). In the following parts, I will determine the relevance of these models for the case study.

Of these three models mentioned before, culture-led regeneration represents the highest degree of incorporation of culture in the regeneration process and it accepts cultural activity as the catalyst and driver of regeneration, change and movement (Evans, 2004, p. 968). In culture-led regeneration, cultural activity has a high public profile and it often acts as the mark or symbol of the entire regeneration scheme. This cultural activity can entail the design and subsequent construction or reuse of a building or buildings for public or mixed cultural use, such as the reuse of open space in the form of garden festivals or exposites. The cultural activity can also come in the form of the organisation of a programme of
events that is then used to re-brand a place, such as arts festivals and public art schemes. Evans argues that these cultural interventions are designed to generate uniqueness in order to raise awareness and create excitement for regeneration schemes, and that this distinctiveness is often not achieved in non-cultural regeneration schemes. Money and originality of design alone are not enough to ensure the success of these emblematic projects and without the active support from local communities many of them are doomed to fail.

Different from culture-led regeneration, the cultural regeneration model envisions the integration of cultural activities into an area strategy together with other activities in the environmental, social, and economic spheres. According to Evans, this model is closely related to the creative city model that is prevalent in contemporary urban cultural policy. It is a model in which current culture and design-led city visions have been integrated but with their cultural flagship projects generally failing to fulfil their social and economic regeneration promises. The involvement of local communities in the cultural regeneration model is less evident (Evans, 2004). Some communities in self-styled cultural cities tend to remain outside the regeneration process, because they do not recognise that these schemes with their new cultural spaces are created partly for the benefit of themselves and perceive them to be unreachable.

Distinguishable from the two previous models, the culture and regeneration model completely ignores cultural activity as a contributor to regeneration at the strategic development or master planning stage. As stated by Evans, such interventions are often small, such as public art programmes for office development. Often, once the primary office and residential buildings of the regeneration scheme have been designed, cultural programmes in the form of a heritage interpretation centre or local history museum is designated to a less valuable part of the scheme. In some cases there is no planned provision for cultural programs and in those occasions cultural organisations make their own interventions by commissioning artists to make public art or street furniture, recording the history of their area, setting up a regular music night and so on. As argued by Evans, this model does not entail the total absence of cultural activity, but does not promote cultural activity as an integral part of the regeneration process (Evans, 2004, pp. 969-70).
However, cultural interventions can make an impact on the eventual outcome of the regeneration scheme by enhancing the facilities and services that were initially planned.

When looking at the Tophane site, we can recognise the different models in the several stages of regeneration. The initial Galataport regeneration scheme, which was never realised, and the transformation of one warehouse into Istanbul Museum of Modern Art can both be considered as a representation of the cultural regeneration model, since the architects claim that a cultural facility constituted the main programme of their project.

Having presented three different models of evaluating the degree of incorporation of cultural activity in regeneration projects, the focus will shift to two of the most significant urban manifestation of cultural regeneration, which are city branding and iconic architecture. Both these concepts have been acknowledged widely within the academic community as major forces behind urban revitalisation in the last decades. City branding and iconic architecture will be further elaborated in the following sections.

### 2.1.1. City branding

The political and economic atmosphere after the 1990s helped to accelerate the use of cultural elements in the urban context. Cities started to be advertised by using iconicity and cultural elements in order to promote a destination brand. These destination brands were sourced by cultural projects that aimed to promote an international identity and to provide economic growth. As a result, cities were expected to be able to compete economically on the global scale and to become sites for consumption and celebration of culture. Through this process, new spaces and buildings were created and these newly acquired assets of the city were promoted robustly. Museums, for example, are important architectural signature buildings of city branding for which the building design features very prominently, and sometimes even more prominently than the museum’s collection.

The concept and techniques of product branding are adopted by place marketing as part of urban management strategies that were developed for the purpose of European
integration (Kavaratzis & Ashworth, 2005, p. 506). According to Mihalis Kavaratzis and G.J. Ashworth, a serious attempt to develop place marketing as a distinctive approach was initiated in the beginning of the 1990s. The further development of place marketing and the subsequent transition from place marketing to place branding is facilitated by the extensive use of product branding and corporate branding. Kavaratzis and Ashworth highlight the mental images produced by branding as:

Place branding centres on people’s perceptions and images and puts them at the heart of orchestrated activities, designed to shape the place and its future. Managing the place brand becomes an attempt to influence and treat those mental maps in a way that is deemed favourable to the present circumstances and future needs of the place (Kavaratzis & Ashworth, 2005, p. 507).

Three main techniques for city branding that are frequently used by urban planners have been listed by Kavaratzis and Ashworth (2005, p.513). The first of these techniques is "personality branding", which was successfully applied in the branding of Barcelona as the city that represents Gaudi. The second technique is "flagship construction", which is exemplified by the construction of the Pompidou Centre in Paris. The third technique often used by urban planners is "events branding". They argue that all these three techniques attract attention, place recognition and promote awareness as well as raise associations between the place and its assets that are deemed beneficial to the economic and social development of the city.

The use of city marketing or city branding techniques has been accelerated as a result of the increasing juxtaposition of culture and economics in the urban context (Garcia, 2004, pp. 315-316). Some authors such as Tibbot are in favour of city branding and argue that it is an essential mechanism to maximise the impact of cultural endeavours. Building on Tibbot’s argument, Beatriz Garcia argues that city branding is not just a separate element of a destination but rather incorporates individual attractions and buildings into an overarching infrastructure that helps to create a unified destination brand and sense of place (Garcia, 2004, p. 316). The creation of a destination brand is guided by long term planning and operational processes that are set up to connect with the consumer in order to acquire market share and other economic benefits. It is stressed that cultural projects
provide emotional fuel for successful destination brands and cultural brands can be commodified by commercial regeneration schemes through the successful execution and branding of cultural projects included in these regeneration schemes. A deeper investigation of the case study in the empirical chapters of this research will help us to better understand the theoretical frameworks and the concepts presented here.

Garcia notes that cities have shown a striking capacity to produce culture in the form of art, ideas, styles, ways of life, and to use culture to encourage high levels of economic innovation and growth. As a result, these culture-generating capacities of cities are being used for productive purposes. This process is used in capital cities to form an international identity for the purpose of global economic competition (Garcia, 2004, p. 317). In order to attract tourist capital and private sector investment as an economic replacement for the disappeared industrial base, former industrial cities tend to embrace the process of redefinition of city identity even more enthusiastically. Drawing on these theories, my aim here is to investigate to what extent the culture generating capacity of Istanbul is increased through the opening of Istanbul Modern and how this happens.

Critics of city branding often highlight that this strategy can create an artificial and misleading narrative that is used to direct attention away from the growing economic, social and racial polarisation that occur within cities. David Harvey, who is supportive of this critique towards city branding, (Harvey, 1990) highlights that the concept of "the architecture of spectacle", which advocates surface glitter and transitory participatory pleasure of display as well as short life of enjoyment, can be seen as the fundamental success of a strategy of this kind. In this sense, Baltimore functions as the major example that Harvey discusses, however, new urban spaces such as Fisherman's Wharf in San Francisco, South Street Seaport in New York, Covent Garden and the Docklands in London and Riverwalk in San Antonio are other examples of organised spectacles that repeat every imaginable historical event. In addition, there are more temporary events such as the Los Angeles Olympic Games and the Liverpool Garden Festival that are based on the same concept. Harvey argues:

Cities and places now it seems take much more care to create a positive and high quality image of place, and have sought architecture and forms of urban design
that respond to such need. That they should be so pressed, and that the result should be a serial repetition of successful models (such as Baltimore’s Harbour Place) is understandable, given the grim history of deindustrialisation and restructuring that left most major cities in the advanced capitalist world with few options except to compete with each other, mainly as financial, consumption, and entertainment centres. Imagining a city through the organisation of spectacular urban spaces became a means to attract capital and people in a period of intensified inter-urban competition and urban entrepreneurialism... It is important here to note how architecture and urban design have responded to these new-felt urban needs. The projection of a definite image of place blessed with certain qualities, the organisation of spectacle and theatricality, have been achieved through an eclectic mix of styles, historical quotation, ornamentation, and the diversification of surfaces. (Harvey, 1990, pp. 91-93)

In line with Harvey’s argument about architectural style, Graeme Evans argues that architectural expression becomes dominated by form, so much so that there is a danger that while museum buildings become cultural status symbols, what is displayed inside them matters less (Evans, 2003, p. 431). Evans uses the term “globalisation of edutainment” for this type of urban cultural development, which denotes the transmission of power through a mobile metropolitan elite of museum and gallery directors, signature architects, branded chain stores and footloose performers that all require a network of cultural institutions to circulate their ideas, brand images, and tour collections and other cultural productions in order to achieve maximum cultural and economic capital return. The phenomenon of “globalisation of edutainment” can be recognised quite clearly in the case study of this research. Evans argues that this is problematic but at the same time represents an irresistible Grand Project which blends modernist architecture with a postmodern frame based on the recreation of traditional industrial forms such as bridges, ferries, wheels, funiculars, public utilities, factories and festival marketplaces; a Grand Project that accepts the city as the finest and most strategic site for collective noticeable consumption and celebration (Evans, 2003, p. 436). Post-industrial city centres are increasing their population, a tendency that contradicts the post-Fordist predictions of de-urbanisation accompanied by decentralisation of cultural production. This concentration of cultural consumption smoothenes the process of culturally hard-branding the city, a process that Evans describes as the power and practices of commercial branding and its packaged
entertainment. Evans stresses that what is being branded in these cities is the city itself, and that the museum becomes an icon of the post-industrial urbanity (Evans, 2003, p. 437). Brands are considered to be sources of differentiation, but at the same time sources of identification, recognition, continuity and collectivism. He refers to Simmel, who states that branding city quarters in the past provided a link between the individual and collective culture and identity, reconnecting the locale with a sense of socio-cultural belonging to a neighbourhood, city or nation. Traditional institutions, social classes and political parties have become less relevant mechanisms for expressing identity as the cultural power to create an image for the purpose of framing a vision of the city has become more prominent. In the contemporary situation it is media corporations, art museums, or politicians that are influencing the creation of new spaces that showcase public cultures, and images to stamp a collective identity. Mark Jayne evaluates image production of urban centres as:

An increasingly ubiquitous vision of urbanity promoted by city imaginers is the development or enhancement of distinct social and spatial areas -urban villages- such as cultural and ethnic quarters. In these spaces of consumption, now synonymous with the post-industrial economy, image becomes everything. The symbolic and cultural assets of the city are vigorously promoted, and cities are branded as attractive places to live, work and play. In urban villages, promotion of both high and low culture is undertaken as cities appeal to the consumption practices of the emerging new riches of the professional, managerial, and service classes. Images of conspicuous consumption in the shape of art, food, music, fashion, and entertainment are promoted in these urban 'shop windows' created either through the enhancement of historically distinctive areas or by developing and generating signatures for previously culturally or spatially ambiguous areas (Jayne, 2000, p. 12).

Jayne considers the intermingling of capital and cultural symbolism to be conducted through the framing of culture. He argues local response to a decaying urban fabric relates to the specific conditions of the post-industrial city, an argument that emphasises mass consumption rather than mass production. These specific conditions are local opportunities and constraints that respond to geographical dimensions of regional, national, supranational and global systems of space (Jayne, 2000, p. 13). Jayne stresses the fact
that cities in the post-industrial West are going through a process of reorientation and redefinition with altering degrees of success. Attempting to understand the unevenness of this process requires looking at the internal identities of cities and their inhabitants, matching the re-imaginings created by cultural mediators with the reception of these re-imaginings by social groups that all have their own mindsets and agendas (Jayne, 2000, p. 21).

Since rebranding has become a slogan for cultural and economic competitiveness, the most tangible spatial formations of urban renewal are cultural quarters. Interestingly, these spatial formations seem to be not only a result of competition on the global scale, but also of negotiation on the local scale. Having highlighted the prominent role that is attributed to architecture in promoting a city brand or image through the design of public, and often cultural, buildings or icons, it has become relevant to investigate further the phenomenon of iconic architecture.

2.1.2. Iconic Architecture

The second architectural manifestation that can be observed in many cultural regeneration schemes is the introduction of a building designed to be iconic and likely to be conceived by a star-architect. But how can iconic architecture be defined, and what is its role in the context of a regeneration scheme? Leslie Sklair refers to iconic architecture as buildings and spaces that are famous for those engaged in and around architecture as well as the public at large and that have special symbolic and aesthetic significance. The argument of Sklair is that iconicity in architecture is defined in terms of fame and special symbolic and aesthetic significance as applied to buildings, spaces and in some cases architects themselves. He argues that before the start of globalisation, roughly in the 1960s, iconic architecture tended to be driven by the state or religious institutions, yet there have been iconic buildings built before the 1960s that were inspired by neither of these two actors (Sklair, 2010, p. 138). However, since the 1960s iconic architecture is conceptualised as a hegemonic project of the transnational capitalist class.
Iconic architecture strives to turn more or less all public space into consumerist space, not only in the obvious case of shopping malls but more generally in all cultural spaces, notably museums and sports complexes... My argument is that iconicity plays a central role in promoting the culture-ideology of consumerism in the interests of those who control capitalist globalization, namely the transnational capitalist class, largely through their ownership and/or control of transnational corporations (Sklair, 2010, pp. 136-137).

Iconic architecture can carry and express design in several ways. What Jane Jacobs and Peter Merriman argue is that the architect is excessively attached to iconic buildings as they are considered to be the designer's signatures, such as Norman Foster's Gherkin, Frank Gehry's Bilbao Guggenheim and Zaha Hadid's MAXXI building (Jacobs & Merriman, 2011, p. 215). Architects are part of global elite of designers who operate on a global scale never experienced before. Sklair argues that the electronic revolution in the 1960s enabled the creation of spectacular buildings with new materials and techniques such as computer aided design (CAD) and computer aided manufacturing (CAM) that were not possible to design and execute before. These new patterns of production in architecture and engineering are widely spread (Sklair, 2010, p. 138). With the globalisation of capitalism the cultural ideology of consumerism started to become more widespread, and iconic architecture began to be used in deliberate ways to transform the built environment, thereby linking iconic architecture and architects analytically with globalisation. What's more, cities can even become associated with a specific cultural icon or the architect responsible for it; for example Mackintosh's Glasgow, Gaudi's Barcelona, and Guggenheim's Bilbao. Leslie Sklair goes as far as to argue that cities without icons are not able to compete on the global stage:

In Glasgow Charles Rennie Mackintosh and in Barcelona Antoni Gaudi are now part of the marketing of the cities... Among many clear and already well-researched examples of this phenomenon two stand out: first, what has been termed the Bilbao effect, referring to the continuing influence of Frank Gehry's Guggenheim Bilbao and second, the case of the foreign architects, notably Herzog and de Meuron, Rem Koolhaas and Paul Andreu, designing iconic structures in the build-up to the Beijing Olympics. Cosmopolitan iconic architects are now an essential element in the marketing strategies of globalizing urban growth coalitions... The first iconic museum of the global era was probably Frank Lloyd Wright's Guggenheim Museum in New York, completed in 1959 a few months after the death of the architect, and
40 years later Frank Gehry’s Guggenheim Bilbao has become just as iconic (Sklair, 2010, pp. 140-146).

Landmark building has become a fundamental element of urban regeneration, specifically in post-industrial cities (Evans, 2004, p.977). However, Evans questions the logic behind the building of icons as he indicates that not every town can sustain its own Tate Modern and the long term sustainability of such iconic statements is increasingly being questioned. As stated by Evans, iconic building as a regenerative catalyst might be the wrong answer. Similarly, Garcia refers to the danger of brand decay with the icon losing its impact and uniqueness that a more pluralist range of representation necessitates (Garcia, 2004, p. 317).

An original approach to iconicity in architecture has been presented by Maria Kaika. Her articles "Architecture and Crisis: reinventing the icon re-imagining London re-branding the city" and "Autistic architecture: the fall of the icon and the rise of serial object of architecture" deal with iconic architecture and its close relation with private capital. According to her, iconic architecture can be described as "autistic" in its interaction with public space. One of the first types of iconic buildings constructed in the name of private capital was American skyscrapers in the early 20th century, but they lost their charm as business locations from the 1970s onwards. As a result, these earlier iconic buildings were ignored or redeveloped, and a new generation of impressively designed corporate buildings have been implemented around the globe (Kaika, 2011, p. 1). She argues that this re-conceptualisation of what the most appropriate architecture for business locations constitutes is not because the earlier iconic buildings do not fulfil up to date infrastructural specifications or the need for flexible workspace, but rather because of the excessive relationship between private capital and the city (Kaika, 2011, p. 4). She considers contemporary corporate commissions to function as "self-referential mono-semantic Autistic objects, which enhance the urban skyline, but make no attempt to reclaim, recommend or re-impose meaning to cities" (Kaika, 2011, p. 34). Kaika elaborates the relationship between architecture with capitalism as:

In the renewed love-affair between state and private capital under the Keynesian logic of post-war urban development, corporate image and national identity formation went hand in glove with the construction of buildings with ample
spectacular public spaces, designed to reassure urban civil society that economic and political life rested on solid foundations. Today's fetishised objects of architecture are similarly called upon to constitute the language for a society in search of a new identity, for corporations and cities in need of re-branding. Over the past ten years or so, the commissioning of iconic buildings across the world goes hand in hand with the crash of property markets and the biggest real estate crisis in living memory. As Dubai's frenzy production of architectural icons and its subsequent dramatic collapse has once again shown, the overproduction of emblematic buildings during periods of crisis acts as a means to provide an architectonic ‘fix’ to the ills of an economy and a society in search of a coherent ideology, and a new myth for itself (Kaika, 2010, p. 458).

The description of the relationship of iconic architecture with property markets and capital as a cure, as an architectonic fix to the illness of economy is an interesting implication. Kaika argues that the new symbolic and material role, the distinct social characteristics as well as the iconification that come with the commission of contemporary corporate buildings demand a re-conceptualisation of these commissions, removing them from the category of iconic objects and into a category which she refers to as "Autistic Architecture" (Kaika, 2011, p. 4) placing them closer to what Baudrillard calls 'serial' objects. She describes them as autistic due to their reflexive effects on the production and use of urban space in the contemporary city. In the contemporary city, buildings are expected to have a shelf-life of less than 50 years and their users are expected to remain not more than a few years. This use of the city differs hugely from the traditional city, in which urban elites were keen to cast their tradition in stone through buildings that would survive for centuries. Kaika considers this new imaginary of a city-in the making, increasingly shaped by unattached urban elites and ephemeral buildings, as the ultimate flexible object that is available for urban speculation on the run and left unclaimed by its citizens. She claims that these buildings show no loyalty or attachment towards the city that hosts them, much like the corporations and elites that commission them. The buildings operate as self-contained machines, their interior spaces inaccessible and sealed off from the public. These buildings are not designed to engage with urban space, but instead function much more like amoebas. (Kaika, 2010, p. 468). Today, in an effort to restore meaning and synthesis and to showcase economic supremacy, iconic architectural commissions are erected in urban skylines all around the world. In this context, Kaika points out that "cities
become something of a curiosity shop, a backdrop for the display of curious architectural objects” (Kaika, 2010, p. 471). She argues that it is this moment of change that has elevated architectural form and the urban skyline to the status of pivotal autonomous entities, turning the skyline into something of an obsession, a fetish for planners, architects, developers, architectural patrons and urban authorities.

In the first part of this chapter, the focus was put on the relation between culture and regeneration schemes, thereby highlighting the use of culture and architecture as a way of marketing cities through the use of city branding policies. In addition, the role of the architect in the shaping of the contemporary city, the relationship between architecture and private capital, and the emergence of iconic architecture as a symbol of corporate capitalism were discussed. In the second part, the emphasis will be put on the connections between iconicity, city branding, and cultural regeneration and how these concepts help us understand the specific case study, the Tophane site in Istanbul. These connections will be further elaborated on by investigating the globalisation process of Turkey, and Istanbul specifically. The interview data collected during the fieldwork will serve as useful material for analysing the concept of urban transformation in Turkey.

2.2. Globalisation of Istanbul

The process of becoming a global city by adapting to the trends of globalisation has long been a major ambition of Istanbul. Historically, with its strategic location on major trade routes, Istanbul has always been part of a global network of cities. According to academic Çağlar Keyder, due to the fact that Istanbul was an imperial capital for more than fifteen hundred years, the city has always been considered to be a global city unlike other cities in the region, and it had long been attracting a “jealous gaze” from Europe, the Balkans and the Middle East (Keyder, 1999, p. 3). He highlights the unique geographic position of the city along the Bosporus, a commercial passage that functions as the key to Black Sea trade, and the availability of the Golden Horn as a splendid natural harbour. Istanbul profited from this position on the crossroads of long distance trade routes between the Middle East and Europe and between the Balkans and Western Asia. Keyder stresses the
fact that Istanbul's urban fabric always reflected its location by saying that "the axes of the old city were drawn along its docks and warehouses and the gates in the land walls through which overland traders entered and exited" (Keyder, 1999, p. 4). Istanbul aspired to be the largest permanent market place situated between India and Western Europe and during its imperial history, merchants and travellers arrived from all over the world to buy and sell produce brought in from China, India, Persia, the Caucasus, USSR, Egypt, Syria, the Balkans, Genoa and Venice. Since the abolition of the Ottoman Empire however, Istanbul gradually declined as a major international trade centre through the loss of its dominant economic position in the newly established nation state of Turkey. By the 1980s, internationalisation of capital was accepted to be an inescapable remedy for Turkey's failing economy, a remedy that was implemented through the introduction of structural adjustment, liberalisation, and privatisation. Keyder explains that:

It was gradually admitted by all that national regulation was compromised; that there would be no real challenge to the global logic of capital; and that the contours of the material world, ranging from the sites of investment to the patterns of consumption, from land development to building practices, were increasingly being determined by choices made by private capital that was rapidly being inserted into the accelerated flows of globalisation (Keyder, 1999, p. 13).

As a result of the accelerated flows of global capital, small and specialised banks of domestic origin repositioned themselves in order to take advantage of a boom in export and construction. From an architectural point of view, this change manifested itself through the appearance of luxury hotels and office towers for international banks and trading companies, luxurious housing developments, and new temples of consumption in the form of shopping malls as well as international boutiques. In the upper income neighbourhoods of Istanbul main avenues were upgraded, and as a result it became possible to stroll or sit in a café and experience a de-contextualised urban space of global homogeneity. Keyder considers Istanbul in the 1980s to be a specific version of casino capitalism and yuppie enthusiasm (Keyder, 1999, p. 15). These times of intensive urban restructuring were accompanied by a changing attitude towards urban autonomy, and meant that Istanbul's local government acquired additional funds to rebuild the city. Keyder mentions that the mayor of Istanbul during the 1980s, Bedrettin Dalan, commenced a number of
restructuring projects in Istanbul thereby creating momentum and laying the framework for the transformation of Istanbul from a "national prime city ravaged by rapid immigration into a newly imagined world city" (Keyder, 1999, p. 16). During Dalan's period as mayor of Istanbul, a series of urban renewal projects that had been waiting on the drawing board for more than thirty years were finally initiated, and large areas of the 19th century inner-city neighbourhoods were cleared, central city small manufacturing establishments were evicted and new boulevards along the Golden Horn and the Bosphorus were built. Keyder considers Istanbul as "rapidly becoming a city designed for cultural consumption, easier to visit with a well-defined tourist area containing monuments and heritage quotations in the form of restored neighbourhoods, easily accessible from the newly built hotels" (Keyder, 1999, p. 17). Moreover, with the construction of numerous modern office towers, an international business district was gradually emerging. Istanbul in the 1980s was a showcase of Turkey's new era of integration into the global economy.

In addition to the upgrading of the urban fabric to the standards suitable for international businesses, a global city must have an information infrastructure in place to serve the need for reliable ways of communication between the nodes of the global system of information flows. Keyder states that "Istanbul experiences the impact of globalisation, that it becomes globalized in the sense of a place where the intensification of global flows of money, capital, people, ideas, signs, and information is experienced; but it is not becoming a global city as envisaged in the model" (Keyder, 1999, p. 19). As mentioned before, in the context of the globalising trend of Istanbul, the city faced large transformation projects aimed at upgrading the historical neighbourhoods, clearing squatter areas and regenerating the waterfronts such as the Tophane site. The regeneration of Tophane will be further elaborated upon in the following section through the use of empirical data, namely interviews conducted with the actors involved in the transformation of the Tophane site.

2.3. Urban Transformation in Turkey

Urban transformation is a new phenomenon in the case of Turkey emerging in the context of urban regeneration and city-branding, specifically accelerated during the last twenty
years. A large percentage of urban transformation projects entail the replacement of squatter housing with high-rise housing blocks. A significant part of the urban transformation programme requires the transformation of former industrial sites into high profile housing, shopping malls or hotels. The Tophane site was one of the mega urban transformation projects. In these urban transformation projects we can detect the involvement of influential governmental actors such as the Prime Ministry Housing Development Administration of Turkey (TOKI), the Prime Ministry Privatisation Bureau, and the Ministry of Environment and Urban Planning. These actors have been subject to change during the last ten years, and have become more powerful during this period. According to its own statistics and projections, the Prime Ministry Housing Development Administration of Turkey (TOKI) has constructed more than half a million residences between 2002 and 2011, and is planning to complete a million by the end of 2023. The figures show that 15% of the 655,000 residences are squatter clearances, 5% is post-earthquake housing, 22% is designed for low income housing, and 44% for middle income housing (TOKI, 2015). What can be observed from these figures is that middle income housing composes a large percentage of completed housing projects.

In this part the empirical data will help us to understand the concept of urban transformation in Turkey. Interviews have been conducted with experts and actors involved in the transformation of the Tophane site. These actors are architects, planners, government officers, representatives of professional chambers and academics. The interviewees were selected after archival research into the transformation process of Tophane site or by recommendations of the other interviewees. In-depth interviews were conducted with the interviewees, typically lasting between one and a half and two hours. As part of these interviews, the interviewees were asked about their opinions on the implementation and success of urban transformation projects in Turkey. There are both opponents and supporters of urban transformation among the interviewees. The actors who work in the governmental institutions support urban transformation and argue that sites that are subject to transformation are improved and are being modernised. The majority of the actors, which includes architects, professional chamber representatives, and academics, criticised the way urban transformation is realised within the Turkish context. They qualified urban transformation projects in Turkey as anti-democratic, opaque
and non-participatory, as well as exclusionary of the urban poor. Some argued that a city like Istanbul, with its historical and natural beauties, loses its identity and historical value through the implementation of these mega projects. There was a consensus that urban transformation projects should be part of a process of urban planning that includes a vision for the city.

The need for urban transformation in Istanbul was derived from an increasing population and a limited existing housing stock. Practising architect Doğan Tekeli emphasised this need (Interview with Tekeli D., 2012) by stating that in 1985 the population of Istanbul was 5.4 million compared to a population of 13.2 million in 2011, with Istanbul now housing almost 20 percent of the total population of Turkey. The insufficient capacity of the existing housing stock to accommodate this multiplying population has led to an enormous demand for new development, both in the city centre and in the periphery. Similarly, urban transformation was seen as a necessity by architect Melkan Gürol Tabanlioğlu, as long as the urban transformation programmes were incorporated into a master plan and a city vision. The decision to initiate an urban transformation project should adhere to such a master plan; otherwise transformation projects cannot be considered strategic (Interview with Tabanlioğlu, 2012). She proposed that the correct process is for municipalities to form advisory boards before initiating rehabilitation programmes in the periphery of the city, but that many of these urban transformation programmes do not consider the strategic regeneration of inner city areas instead. Moreover, Tabanlioğlu stressed that the demolishing of squatters and the construction of tall housing blocks is a detrimental policy and that the responsibility for the execution of such projects should not be given to TOKİ only.

In a similar way, Doğan Tekeli argued that these urban transformation projects should possess two features; they should be designed and executed in line with regulations and they should have a proper design quality. In addition to these two features, urban transformation projects need to be consistent with the vision for the city and the master plan. Frequent changes to the city's development plans have undermined their effectiveness, a practice that is especially harmful to the city since the rapid growth of Istanbul necessitates a robust and long-term strategy.
In summary, urban transformation in the Turkish context can be considered to possess four characteristics. Firstly, urban transformation in Turkey is mostly applied to unhealthy building stock such as squatter housing. Secondly, urban transformation is a result of the need to transform Istanbul into a city that can compete with other cities and regions for investment in the context of a globalised economy. The third characteristic of urban transformation is its political nature, and the political power that is exercised through it. The fourth characteristic of urban transformation is its dependency on influential governmental actors. The following parts will analyse these four characteristics more elaborately.

2.3.1. Unhealthy Building Stock

In Turkey, buildings vulnerable to earthquakes and squatter settlements constitute a large percentage of the building stock that has been targeted by urban transformation projects, though the scope of urban transformation is usually wider in the second category due to the extensive areas of land that are occupied by squatter settlements. The secretary of the Board of the Chamber of Planners, Akif Burak Atlar, pointed out that 70 percent of the building stock is illegal, but that development amnesties have been granted during election times in the last fifty years (Interview with Atlar, 2012). He stated that the urban development of Istanbul has been unsustainable and implemented without the existence of a proper plan, especially the urban development conducted under the neo-liberal policies of the 1980’s, when internal immigration from Eastern Turkey resulted in the erection of squatter settlements. Due to occasional construction amnesties, these settlements were legitimized gradually and as a result a new middle class emerged. Atlar stated that the replacement of these squatter developments is the main reason behind urban transformation. He also emphasises that urban transformation projects often lead to increases in the value of land and property nearby, but that the inhabitants of the affected sites are usually excluded from this economic gain, as most of them are tenants. One example of this phenomenon is the urban transformation of Sulukule. Atlar recalls that an insufficient building strength to resist earthquakes was declared to be the reason of this transformation, but that this technicality is often used to hide a more important financial incentive. At the same time, Atlar clarified that original landowners were usually
encouraged to unite their respective plots into larger development sites, so that real estate developers could acquire permission to build more densely. He pointed out that this legal framework has led to a large increase in the number of high-rise housing blocks in the periphery of the city, however, he considered this type of urban development as problematic since no proper reservation for social infrastructure such as public open spaces, greenery, sport and health facilities is included in most of these transformation plans.

In a parallel way, academic İlhan Tekeli also highlighted earthquake resistance and squatter clearance as the major reasons behind urban transformation in Turkey. Tekeli has been involved in conducting an extensive analysis of Turkish urban transformation in comparison with the urban transformation in England (Interview with Tekeli İ., 2012). He considered that urban transformation in England could be best explained as an attempt to adjust cities to conditions such as the information society, flexible accumulation, post-modernism and globalisation, and that Turkey is experiencing the effects of all these conditions as well. However, the differences between the implementation of urban transformation schemes in the two countries are prominent according to Tekeli. The first difference is the scope of transformation, which is broader in Turkey, and the area affected by urban transformation, which is usually more extensive in Turkey. Also, squatter settlements or a need for earthquake resistance do not exist in England, whereas in Turkey legitimisation of urban transformation is based on the replacement of unhealthy building stock (Interview with Tekeli İ., 2012). The importance of earthquake resistance as a reason behind urban transformation is also mentioned by several other experts such as Doğan Tekeli, who argued that 50 percent of the existing housing stock is not resistant to earthquakes (Interview with Tekeli D., 2012). The legitimisation of urban transformation in Turkey comes from the fact that an extensive share of the housing stock either consists of squatters or is vulnerable to earthquakes. The large extent of land area covered by these squatter settlements renders these settlements more attractive for redevelopment, because of the scarcity of substantial development lots in the inner cities.
2.3.2. Brand cities and global economic competition

Economic competition between cities in the context of a globalised economic system can be considered as another important catalyst for extensive urban transformation schemes in Turkey. As mentioned before, the ambition to compete in the global arena has led to the introduction of new urban strategies such as city branding and the promotion of iconic architecture. Mücerra Yarıçı, a representative of the Chamber of Architects’ Istanbul Branch evaluated urban transformation in Turkey as part of this political economic context (Interview with Yarıçı, 2012). She contended that neo-liberal urban policies in the 1980s included the unrestricted flow of global capital into its ideological discourse. Within this political economic climate, global competition was promoted and concepts like brand cities emerged. As a result, Turkish cities and towns started to promote themselves as brands and a new urban politics emerged that responded to this economic logic through the implementation of large scale urban transformation and infrastructure projects. Yarıçı related these tendencies with the economic condition of flexible production, and the emergence of an urban cooperation model based on the restructuring of labour, the introduction of corporate governance, and the dominance of the private sector. She argued that the traditional master plan was gradually being abandoned in favour of individual projects. Yarıçı stated that urban transformation represents an economic and urban policy program that has very serious implications for Turkish cities, and specifically for Istanbul. Urban transformation intends to transform cities from networks of production into networks of consumption and marketing relations. In fact, urban revitalisation strategies such as the privatisation of public resources, real-estate oriented economic development and city branding have been pursued in response to de-industrialisation. She claimed that de-industrialisation and flexible accumulation, characterised by the moving of production areas to the Far East where a cheaper labour force is available, have led to the introduction of a different production-consumption relation into Western cities. Yarıçı gave the example of Istanbul’s mega projects, a collection of 25 urban transformation schemes prepared in cohesion with the new mission-vision of the city that advocated transforming Istanbul into a world brand city. Underlining a related process that can be witnessed in Istanbul, Akif Burak Atlar, from the Chamber of Planners refers to the concept of Dubaification. He clarified it as:
Recently it is possible to see a process of Dubaification occurring in Istanbul. Dubai created a touristic value with some prestigious projects, however, Istanbul is a historical reference point for civilisations, it was the capital of empires and now is a world heritage city. It is a discussion point to what extent Istanbul needs projects like the ones in Dubai. It is a way to propose some attraction points and gain touristic value which will contribute to different economic sectors. However, in a world city like Istanbul, with all these historical features such a strategy will cause value loss. I am not talking about commercial value; of course more commercial value will be created. There will be a situation in which inhabitants; citizens will not experience any value from this change. There are quite a few examples of this in Istanbul, such as the Haydarpasa project which was intended to be transformed into a main port. It is an example of industrial archaeology. The station function of the building will be changed and it will be forgotten (Interview with Atlar, 2012).

Similar to Atlar’s concerns about the loss of architectural value in Istanbul as a result of the process of Dubaification, Yapıcı highlighted her concerns about the loss of identity in the city through the gradual removal of historical, cultural, and natural values of Istanbul by an urban government that respects economic interests only. City branding is an important factor promoting the implementation of urban transformation projects in Turkey, specifically in a city like Istanbul. The overambitious mega projects proposed for the city, at the beginning of the new millennium, do not only create a concrete jungle that ruins the urban greenery and ecological system of the city, but also pose as a possible threat to the historical characteristics and the silhouette of the city.

2.3.3. Politics of Urban Transformation

Another significant aspect underlined by many interviewees was the political nature of urban transformation projects in Turkey. Most interviewees considered the lack of transparency and participation in urban transformation as anti-democratic, and even socially exclusionary of certain groups of citizens. For instance İlhan Tekeli argued that this opaque and political nature of urban transformation in Turkey presents a very different picture from the West, where urban transformation is usually transparent and plans are
negotiable (Interview with Tekeli İ., 2012). He underlined that political power in Turkey was based on a conservative ideology often associated with Islamic groups and embraced destructive renewal as the main urban strategy. As a result, inhabitants of squatter settlements were gradually forced out. Tekeli also stressed that these urban transformation policies are very different from the policies of the Turgut Özal period (1983-1989), when the inhabitants of squatter settlements used to receive a share in the profits from urban speculation. Today the legal framework is different, and rather than providing squatters with a share of the profit, the government tends to take their rights from them. The imposition of these harsh conditions of urban transformation on the urban poor was also emphasised in a recent article in Newsweek (Miller, 2014) which stressed the obscurity and politically motivated agendas surrounding major urban transformation projects.

Supporting a similar argument, academic Uğur Tanyeli highlighted that the majority of major urban transformation projects in Turkey can be considered as totalitarian, anti-democratic and exclusionary of the inhabitants of the area (Interview with Tanyeli, 2011). He pointed out that laws have been prepared for the purpose of preventing inhabitants going to court. Similarly to other interviewees, Tanyeli also emphasised the social exclusion imposed by urban transformation projects, and considered these projects as a form of slum clearance by making a comparison with slum clearance projects in Soho, London in the 1860's. He argued that there is public support for these clearances, since most people assume that the neighbourhoods affected by urban transformation projects were places where gypsies, vagabonds and the urban poor lived, and that just a small minority of the public wonders what will happen to the original inhabitants of these neighbourhoods.

The opaque nature of urban transformation was stressed by Yapıcı by referring the practice of basing its legitimisation on the need to improve earthquake resistance using as an example a statement made by Idris Sütlüce, who was the Head of Earthquake Commission of the National Assembly. In this statement, he claimed that "urban transformation is good but in countries with a proper democracy it is becoming impossible to realise urban transformation" (Interview with Yapıcı, 2012). Yapıcı emphasised the importance of TOKİ as an urban actor and the social exclusion and division that emerged
as a result of urban transformation. She made a comparison between Turkish and English urban transformation as:

The biggest mechanism and tool for marketing Istanbul to the global real-estate sector in the name of culture and tourism industry is urban transformation. In support of the attraction of direct foreign investment, earthquake resistance and the vulnerability of the built environment is being used as an excuse. On the one hand, there is a very liberal economic atmosphere harmonious with the neoliberal ideology, adopting the free market economy of capitalism; on the other hand there is also a state monopoly in the construction sector by TOKİ... Least important is the urban health and safety because there is no such aim in these urban transformation projects. One outcome of [the process of urban transformation] is the change of ownership patterns with the collection of small plots by the public sector. Another negative outcome is that these projects cause spatial and social division. What we have is really urban transformation but much more the transformation of ownership patterns, the social tissue, and the [urban] functions. When you look again it is not like urban transformation in England where re-functioning of de-industrial areas is accomplished by bringing in mixed uses and regenerating the area. In Turkey, [urban transformation] is the destruction of large residential areas and the construction of high residential towers and shopping malls instead (Interview with Yapıcı, 2012).

Yapıcı criticised the fact that decisions are not formed in a transparent way, and that public involvement in the decision processes is very limited. According to her, no planning authority or public law has the power to prevent this situation, and even if they had, public concern about rights to proper housing, adequate public facilities and unrestricted communication is very constrained. Yapıcı believed that during this anti-democratic process, NGO’s, professional chambers and other democratic organisations are being isolated and made non-functional. Their only way to confront these urban practices is through juridical battle; however, there have also been efforts to undermine such attempts through the politicisation of the law system. Likewise, Akif Burak Atlar indicated the lack of a democratic process behind the design and implementation of urban transformation projects. He argued that it is unacceptable that people living in areas affected by urban transformation are not involved in the transformation process. The politics behind urban
transformation can be considered neither as transparent nor as participatory. In fact, it can be argued that these state-led processes are socially exclusionary for the urban poor.

2.3.4. The Role of Governmental Actors

One of the most significant aspects of urban transformation in Turkey is the involvement of powerful governmental actors during different stages of transformation. Yapıcı claimed that virtually all government bodies are involved in the implementation of urban transformation programmes. She indicated that the Prime Ministry Privatisation Bureau, the newly founded Ministry of Environment and Planning, TOKİ, the Prime Minister himself and the Assembly are important actors. İlhan Tekeli stated this aspect as one of the differences from the transformation schemes in European cities, where transformation is usually realised by private real estate developers and through the process of gentrification (Interview with Tekeli İ., 2012). According to Tekeli, as well as other interviewees, one of the most important actors involved in urban transformation is TOKİ (Prime Ministry Housing Development Administration of Turkey). It is a government institution directed by the Prime Ministry that engages in building housing projects. Tekeli noted that TOKİ is not subject to any juridical order and has the power to forcefully expropriate any land that it wishes. In addition, TOKİ is not limited to the construction of housing only; it is allowed to make profit from its real estate and it can decide to transfer its land to other governmental bodies. It is therefore equipped with all the mechanisms of authorization.

İlhan Tekeli pointed out that, when the mechanism of urban transformation in Turkey are analysed, it can be concluded that the AKP government operated unlike any other government in the world. Moreover, Tekeli claimed that TOKİ, with its unique combination of authorities, could not be allowed in any other constitution. TOKİ has so much power that it can operate without any formal opposition. With the foundation of the Ministry of Environment and Urbanism and the subsequent transfer of planning power from local authorities to this new ministry, opposition from local authorities has been made even less likely. According to Tekeli, this uniquely powerful operational mechanism is very
destructive and civil society seems to be left without any other options than submitting to it. In addition, Tekeli argued that government resorts to a show of power by stating that:

Turkey is changing but in the context of a different political understanding and power coalition. It is transforming itself through the insertion of different actors and processes and in a very destructive process. Why the Tophane site was not subject to destruction as part of this destructive process is firstly due to the fact that civil society is resisting and secondly due to the fact that the area emerges as cheap land for the private sector to realise their social responsibility projects. That is what TOKİ intends by moving the responsibilities from the local to the central governments. When AKP became government, they planned to make the local authorities stronger. The authorities of TOKİ are known. Now the government has formed a stronger mechanism of control with the foundation of the new Ministry of Environment and Planning, a mechanism that transforms top-down. They claim that these changes will bring in a lot of money, that Istanbul's level among the world cities will increase and that what will be produced will be very aesthetical, designed by important architects. This situation could create a society that is unbearable to live in. Place might lose its character. Aesthetics cannot guarantee to make a location a place. If these outcomes will be the case, it is impossible to live peacefully (Interview with Tekeli İ., 2012).

In a similar way, architect Doğan Tekeli also explained how urban transformation projects are conducted and which actors were involved. His argument was that the majority of urban transformation projects are targeted towards the renewal of old parts of the city such as Tophane, Taksim, and Sulukule that are subject to partial master plans only have dense construction rights. One important factor required for urban transformation is the availability of an extensive area (Interview with Tekeli D., 2012). As the most prominent actor, TOKİ usually comes in and transforms these areas into high-rise housing blocks. Parallel to Doğan Tekeli’s argument, Mücella Yapıcı from the Chamber of Architects highlighted the abnormal powers of TOKİ:

This institution makes all of its own decisions, can acquire all private and public land, and then plan it, sell it, or transfer it. TOKİ is a governmental institution which is not inspected, growing rapidly and making profit obscurely. Short term solutions to economic problems are attempted by creating this state versus real estate mechanism that activates urban economic gains (Interview with Yapıcı, 2012).
Influential governmental actors with extraordinary planning powers are involved in the urban transformation process in Turkey. The centralisation of these powers increases the control that the central state exercises on the decision making process, a form of governance that excludes local municipalities, non-governmental bodies as well as citizens. This centralised character of urban transformation is problematic and differs from the nature of urban transformation abroad.

2.4. Conclusions

In this chapter the concept of urban regeneration and its implementations in the Turkish context were analysed. Graeme Evans’ model describing three different stages of insertion of cultural activities into regeneration schemes was used for understanding the important role that culture often plays in revitalising contemporary cities. In addition, two significant architectural manifestations of cultural regeneration, city branding and iconic architecture, were further elaborated. City branding promotes cities as objects of advertisement with the use of cultural and iconic buildings in order to create destination brands, international identities and, ultimately, to increase economic growth. Iconic architecture has become an indispensible element of these urban regeneration strategies through its ability to create associations between cities and their cultural icons, or the architect responsible for them.

In the last part of this chapter, I aimed to explain how the concept of urban transformation as an interpretation of urban regeneration is understood by the Turkish academic community and professional chambers. Urban transformation in the Turkish context generally differs from European urban transformation projects, as the main aim of redevelopment in the European context is to regenerate de-industrialised sites in order to create brand cities that are able to compete in the context of a global economy. In the Turkish context, urban transformation is usually wider in its scope of transformation and subject to a different range of actors. The actors involved in the urban transformation projects in Turkey are mainly government bodies, whereas it is possible to observe the
involvement of private sector entrepreneurs and real estate developers in urban transformation schemes in Europe.

Interviewees generally agreed on the anti-democratic and opaque nature of urban transformation in the Turkish context. The most important critique is that the original inhabitants of areas affected by urban transformation are excluded from the transformation process, a mechanism that ultimately leads to social exclusion. The transformation process itself is advertised in a neo-liberal way through city branding strategies; however, the actors involved are mostly government institutions. Almost all interviewees mentioned the involvement of significant governmental actors such as TOKİ and the Ministry of Environment and Urbanism as powerful urban actors that possess abnormal authority in the decision-making and implementation stages of urban transformation. Some interviewees declared their worries about the accelerating development projects which posed a potential danger for the historical and natural identity of Istanbul. Having presented the general conditions in which urban transformation projects operate in Turkey, I intend to discuss the urban transformation strategies in a more detailed way by focussing on the trajectory of the Tophane site in the following chapter.
This research argues that the site should be extracted from its traditional definitions, drawing on Yaneva’s argument that emphasises buildings as moving projects. The accepted definition of site should be rethought; contrary to its definition as “an area of ground on which a town, building or monument is constructed” (Dictionary, 2014), a site is not just a passive piece of land, and although it is different from the city or a building, it might actually contain buildings. A site is a moving project, a dynamic entity with its own history and a social trajectory that is formed by human interventions at certain points in its history. This chapter presents a historical recollection of the Tophane site in Istanbul, thereby focusing on its site life through history. The goal of this recollection is to show the site’s movability, changeability and dynamism by highlighting the series of transformations that have reshaped, and continue to reshape, the appearance of the site.

This chapter will aim to elaborate on some important questions that relate to the social trajectory of the site. What is the specificity of the Tophane site? What are the important historical moments for this site’s trajectory? How does the site look at different stages of transformation? In order to find answers to these questions, this chapter will present a “thick description” (Geertz, 1975) of the Tophane site. Clifford Geertz argues that by producing thick descriptions, one is able to draw large conclusions from small, but very densely textured facts instead of starting with a set of observations and trying to incorporate these into a prevailing philosophy (Geertz, 1975, pp. 25-28). The use of thick description in this research will benefit from the inclusion of archival data, thereby enabling the inclusion of the voices of the actors involved in the social trajectory of the site and facilitating a better understanding of the macro scale.

The thick description and further analysis of the social life of the Tophane site will make use of three main sources. These are secondary sources, in-depth interviews with actors and newspaper clippings from the coverage of the transformation of the site. The fieldwork that has generated these sources was conducted in Istanbul and Ankara from Winter 2011
until Summer 2012. In-depth interviews were conducted with the actors that were involved in the trajectory of the case study or that have expertise on the topics presented in this research. The ranges of interviewees include architects, planners, academics, government officers, professional chambers' representatives, and independent researchers. Visual data such as architectural drawings, photographs, and maps were collected from the actor's archives or from the archives of the German Archaeology Institute and the French Institute of Anatolian Studies in Istanbul. Archival research was conducted mainly in the National Library in Ankara and the Ataturk Library in Istanbul. During the archival research, relevant articles published in the local newspapers Cumhuriyet and Milliyet between the dates 1930 and 2014 were collected and content analysis of these newspaper press clippings, together with governmental and historical documents, was conducted. Through this process, over five hundred articles relating to the trajectory of the Tophane site were analysed.

The specificity of the Tophane site is derived from its unique location within a metropolis of fourteen million inhabitants. It is located along the Bosphorus at the intersection with the Golden Horn and overlooks the historical peninsula, thereby offering stunning views of Topkapı Palace, Hagia Sophia and Blue Mosque. The site is located in the Tophane neighbourhood, within the borders of Beyoğlu Municipality and within walking distance from Beşiktaş, Galata Tower, İstiklal Street, Eminönü and the central Taksim Square. The site is very well connected to other parts of the city by public transport, and is accessible by tram, which runs from Kabataş to Bağcılar, and by ferry, through stops in Karaköy and Eminönü that are within fifteen minutes walking distance. The close proximity to the historical peninsula has turned the site into a convenient location for the docking of cruise ships, enabling tourists to visit the historical and touristic parts of the city as a day trip. Due to its centrality and its network vortex position, the site facilitates intense flows of ships, goods, strangers, as well as tourists, and attracts the interest of many different actors. The site is quite prominent in Istanbul’s silhouette as well and its central location, offering stunning views across the Bosphorus, has rendered the site into one of the most controversial and contested sites in the Turkish context.
In this chapter the socio-political, economical, and historical context of the Tophane site will be explained by depicting the major transformation it went through from the end of the 1800s until today, based on findings from secondary and archival sources such as newspaper clippings. A timeline diagram will help to illustrate the life of the Tophane site by placing emphasis on the main historical events in this transformation story, such as the establishment of the Ford Factory and related free zone, and the construction of the Tophane warehouses. In the last part of this chapter the controversy around the construction of the warehouses will be discussed.

3.1. Socio-Political Economic and Historical Context

As mentioned before, the site where the Tophane warehouses are located is very prominent and in close proximity to central parts of Istanbul. At the local scale, the site is surrounded by historical monuments such as the Kılıç Ali Paşa Mosque and Complex, designed by Mimar Sinan and built between 1578 and 1587, the Tophane Fountain, built in 1732 on the order of Sultan Mahmut I, the baroque style Nusretiye Mosque, built between 1823 and 1826 during the reign of Sultan Mahmut I, the Tophane-i Amire, built during the reign of Fatih Sultan Mehmet as an armoury, the Tophane Pavilion, designed and built as a reception pavilion for welcoming foreign government guests in 1852 by the British architect William James Smith on the order of Sultan Abdülmecid, and the Mimar Sinan University of Fine Arts (Figure 1). In addition, the site is in close proximity to Dolmabahçe Palace, which was built between 1843 and 1856 and designed by Armenian architects Garabet Balyan and Nigoğos Balyan on the order of Sultan Abdülmecit, who was in favour of European music and culture, as reflected in the application of a mixture of European architectural styles in the Palace, such as baroque, rococo and neo classical.

The name Tophane, which means artillery barracks in Turkish, comes from the artillery barracks built in this area and ordered by the Sultan Mehmet the Conqueror. After its construction the site became an area intended for military production. The armoury was extended in the time of Bayezid II (1481-1512) but was eventually replaced during the reign of Sultan Süleyman the Magnificent (1520-1566). Captured artillery from previous
Wars were laid and displayed on the shore as war trophies. Towards the seventeenth century the popularity of the Tophane area as a place of residence increased, as evidenced by the erection of houses around the site. The construction of mosques and fountains followed (Şahsuvaroğlu, 1957). Sultan Selim III (1789-1807) implemented radical changes to Tophane by ordering some of the trees in the square to be cut down and the trophy artilleries to be removed. He designated the square as a military training ground and ordered the renewal of the old artillery barracks and other production facilities. The renovations executed during this time were extensive and were even mentioned in the poem "How happy Tophane became" (Şahsuvaroğlu, 1957). Inspired by industrial innovations taking place in the nineteenth century, Sultan Mahmut II ordered the construction of equipment factories and a new artillery barracks, while the existing artillery barracks were renovated. Later on, the small shops surrounding the Tophane square were demolished and the square was cleared. The artillery barracks could be seen in the 1840 map of Hellert (Figure 2) and from the photos of the period (Figure 3, 4, 5). After a big fire destroyed much of the Tophane area in 1892, Sultan Mahmut II ordered the restoration of Tophane and the construction of new artillery barracks, small factories and a new mosque. During the nineteenth century Tophane square also acted as a place where markets and popular theatre shows from foreign theatre companies were hosted. It is possible to observe that even before 1900 the Tophane site was subject to continuous physical transformations, renovation and social change.

Figure 1: Tophane warehouses and surrounding buildings
Figure 2: Map of Hellert of Istanbul, dating 1840 showing the area used as armouy.

Figure 3: Photo taken by Abdullah Frères in 1880 showing the Tophane artillery barracks, Nusretiye Mosque (Source: German Archaeology Institute, Istanbul, 15.02.2012)
Figure 4: Photo taken by Sebah and Joaillier in 1900 showing a close up view of the square and Tophane armoury (Source: German Archaeology Institute, Istanbul, 15.02.2012)

Figure 5: Interior view of Gun factory of Ottoman Empire (Source: http://www.frmtr.com/tarih-ve-inkilap-tarihi/4696706-osmanli-imparatorlugu-resimlerle-3.html accessed 17.09.2012)
3.2. Building Regulations and Permits

Due to its close proximity to Dolmabahçe Palace, the Tophane site has been subject to severe building regulations since the end of 1800s. The site was considered to be part of Dolmabahçe's glacis, which denotes a slope of earth surrounding a fortress that is designed to keep any potential threat away from the fort. The Tophane site is also part of a spatial network of military barracks to which the concurrent army barracks located in Istanbul at Taksim and Maçka also belonged. This historical geographical context of the Tophane warehouses is further elaborated on by the academic Murat Güvenç. He considered the Tophane site to be a very important case study that showcases the power structure of the Turkish planning system in the 19th century:

In the mid 19th century, Dolmabahçe Palace was constructed as a result of intensive social unrest. There were demonstrations, and Mahmud II hardly saved his own life. He lived with the fear of assassination. Then his son wanted Dolmabahçe Palace to be built. They formed something around the palace which is called Glacis in planning literature. It is an area where construction is not permitted. On one side there is Dolmabahçe, on the other side Gümüşsuyu. There is a system of military barracks around the palace; Taksim barracks and Maçka barracks, and there, on that site, is the Tophane barracks. There was no permission to build something other than military barracks, nothing but graveyards. That is why the construction permissions on the left side of Büyükdere Road are so different from the right side of it. If there is a big public space at the right side of Büyükdere Road such as Maçka Park, Conference Valley, open-air museum that is all related with the fact that the area did not have construction permission. There was unbelievable security around the Palace. And since security became even more important Abdülhamit II did not even stay there, instead he was living in Yıldız Palace. Glacis is a security band constructed around important locations like palaces. This system was valid until the 1950s (Interview with Güvenç, 2011).

The location of Dolmabahçe Palace and the related ban on construction around the palace are important factors that explain why the artillery barracks were located in Tophane. One other important factor in the transformation of the Tophane site is the construction of the harbour. In 1892 a decision was made to start the construction of the harbour, a decision that necessitated the construction of warehouses in Tophane. The harbour and the artillery barracks can be seen in the photograph of Abdullah Frères, which dates back to 1900 (Figure 6). On the 1905 maps of Goad, it is possible to trace the Tophane customs building
that was erected on the site in 1894. In October 1895 a decision was made to construct a warehouse building next to the customs building for the storage of guns, but they were damaged by an earthquake in December 1895. In the map of 1914 German Blues (Figure 7) it is possible to observe the existence of these warehouses. The construction process of the harbour has been clarified by a government officer from the Prime Ministry Privatisation Bureau:

The harbour consists of two parts: Karaköy and Salıpazarı, which was used as a loading port. First to be built was the Karaköy harbour, followed by the Salıpazarı harbour where the warehouses are situated. Karaköy harbour is 515 meters long, Salıpazarı is 600 meters long. The construction of Karaköy harbour started in April 1892. Starting from Tophane, the sea was filled towards Karaköy. In 1894 rock blocks were placed in a 340 metre long section of Karaköy harbour. In 1895 the first ship approached to the harbour, thereby marking the opening of the harbour. In October 1895 the construction of the 758 metre Karaköy harbour was completed. The construction of Salıpazarı and Barınak cafe started in 1957 and was completed within a short period (Interview with government officer, 2012).

The importance of the harbour for the development of the city has been underlined by most of the interviewees. For example, Doğan Tekeli stressed the fact that the emergence of the steam ship during the Tanzimat period (1839-1855) and the shifts from caravan trade towards ship trade were important factors in selecting the Tophane area for the construction of a harbour, and resulted in a demand for space to store goods arriving at the harbour (Interview with Tekeli D., 2012). The importance of the Tophane-i Amire building as one of the earliest forms of industrial heritage in the site has been highlighted by İlhan Tekeli (Interview with Tekeli, İ., 2012). The Tophane-i Amire building dates back to the 15th and 16th centuries and acts as a showcase for Turkish industrialisation. Tekeli argued that the building plays an important role in the foundation of the first modern industry, the emergence of a working class and the creation of working class movements.

The Tophane-i Amire armoury is not the only building that is significant in the site. As mentioned before, there are several listed historical buildings situated in the site. The former Post Office, the General Directorate of Turkish Maritime Institution, the Çinili Han, which is used as General Directorate of Customs Protection, and the clock tower in Tophane square are among these listed buildings. The warehouses were built for the
purpose of storage and there is no preservation decision on the warehouses, which makes them vulnerable for possible destruction plans. Another important element in the history of the site, as mentioned by Uğur Tanyeli, is the occurrence of a flag tower constructed in the time of Sultan Mahmut II on the location where the clock tower is located today (Interview with Tanyeli, 2011). The flag tower was a new invention at the time and, as Tanyeli suggested, corresponds with the consolidation of the modern Turkish flag during the reign of Mahmut II. The fact that new building typologies such as the flag tower and the clock tower were incorporated in the Tophane site shows the significance of the site during earlier times. The addition of numerous warehouses to the site was permitted in 1926 by the Istanbul Dock and Warehouse Company. This is considered to be one of the major historical moments in the trajectory of the site, a moment that highlighted the transformation of the site from military to commercial purposes.

Figure 6: Photo of Tophane harbour and artillery barracks by Abdullah Frères 1900. (Source: German Archaeology Institute, Istanbul, 15.02.2012)
3.3. Ford Factory and Free Zone

In January 1927 the Turkish Ambassador in Athens prepared a report setting out the intention of Ford Motor Factory to found a factory in Istanbul. Upon this request of Ford Motor Factory, the Ford Motor Company Exports and Imports contract was prepared in June 1928 and subsequently signed on the 5th December 1928 by the Ministry of Finance at the time. However, the warehouses that were assigned for use by Ford Motor Company were still in use as warehouses and therefore needed to be emptied. At the end of December 1928 it was decided to move the goods stored in the Tophane warehouses, which belonged to Seyr-i Sefain, to warehouses in Kuruçeşme. The representative of Ford for Egypt, a certain Mr. Collins, and the Paris representative travelled to Istanbul in April 1929 (Cumhuriyet, 19.04.1929) and inspected the condition of the vacated warehouses in Tophane for the anticipated start of production in June 1929.
The reason why Istanbul was deemed to be preferable for establishing a Ford Motor Company factory can be traced from the report prepared by the Turkish ambassador in Athens. In his report it is stated that one of Ford’s managers, Mr Lange, visited the Embassy of the Turkish Republic in Athens in 1927 and declared their intention to establish a factory at the port of Istanbul. Due to the geographical position of Istanbul, the city was suitable for meeting the needs of the Near East and USSR markets (Odman, 2011). The motivation behind the decision to select Istanbul port as the location for establishing a Ford Assembly plant was that the site was convenient for transporting goods by water. The proposed export capacity of 14,000 motor vehicles annually from Istanbul port was anticipated to be double the capacity available in the existing Trieste port, which serves as evidence that Ford was attempting to define Istanbul as the new regional production centre.

The fact that the Ford Factory was located in the Tophane site is not very prominent in the urban history of Istanbul. The factory is not included in the literature about the Istanbul port, even though the establishment of Ford’s manufacturing facilities define a significant period in the history of the city. The careful study of the social life of the Tophane site has uncovered parts of the history of the site and thereby contributes to the local history of the city. Only two out of sixteen interviewees, Murat Güvenç and İlhan Tekeli, were aware of Ford Motor Company’s existence on the site. Güvenç clarified the decision to establish a Ford Motor Company factory in Tophane by referring to the political-economic situation of the Turkish Republic during the late 1920s. He noted that the area where Ford Company chose to settle was founded as a free zone before the statist period of Republican economy. According to Güvenç, the economic policies before and after 1929 were very different from each other. As stated by the Lausanne Treaty, the Turkish Republic was not free to apply its own economic policies as a condition for paying back inherited Ottoman debts (Interview with Güvenç, 2011). In the context of the economic policy to ease access for foreign capital, Ford Motor Company demanded a site to establish a factory, so that it would be able to export more easily to USSR and the Middle East. Under the liberal economic policies of the late 1920s this demand by Ford was accepted. The factory initially produced lots of cars, however, according to Güvenç the percentage of sales went down
after the 1929 economic depression and the factory was eventually forced to cease production.

The Ford Factory's existence on the site was explained by İlhan Tekeli by reference to the economic aims of Ford Motor Company and the political aims of the Turkish Republic. He highlighted the potential effects that the Ford Factory would have on Turkey's automobile and motorway development. For example, through the implementation of the "T model" of Ford, cars were made affordable to the middle classes. Parallel to this, Ford Motor Company was aiming to expand its operations internationally by founding assembly plants in several countries, and one of these would be in Istanbul.

The first free zone of Turkey was realised in Tophane in 1928. I do not know if they have used anything remaining from the former artillery warehouses for this factory's buildings. That is possible but I guess after the production of 400-500 (motor vehicles the factory) had to cease. The reason of this coincides with the world economic crisis in 1929, the projects of Ford not only here in Turkey but also in other five or six countries collapsed. Of course this has something to do with the world crisis. But parallel to this is the repercussion of it in Turkey, which is the construction works plan prepared in 1929 when Recep Bey was the Minister of Public Works. In this plan, importance was given to motorways. The most extensive development of motorways in Turkey is in 1948 after the Second World War. Nonetheless, the 1929 plan included aims to construct about 15,000 kms of good quality intercity motorways, and these aims were based on the investments of Ford in Turkey. But this plan was also halted due to the economic crash. If Ford Factory had been able to make more production in Turkey, the motorway breakthrough of Turkey could have started earlier (Interview with Tekeli İ., 2012).

Tekeli's assertion that the existence of the Ford Factory might have contributed to a breakthrough in the construction of motorways in Turkey is very striking. However, the survival of the Ford Factory on the Tophane site was not long enough to facilitate this breakthrough. Although Güvenç and Tekeli both claim that the Factory closed soon after the economic crisis of 1929, the archival research does not support this claim. Newspapers advertisements of Ford cars produced in Ford Factory Istanbul were published right through the 1930s. Some secondary sources state that the Ford Factory was closed in 1934, however, in April 1935 the Cumhuriyet newspaper reported on the existence of smuggling practices in the Ford Factory. The Ministry of Customs selected a
committee charged with the task of investigating the accounts of the Ford Factory. The committee found that smuggling occurred between February and March 1935 and involved the mis-weighing of lorries and changing the receipts (Cumhuriyet, 9.4.1935). Consequently the officers involved in the smuggling were fired, although the court case continued until November 1935 (Cumhuriyet, 1.11.1935). There is some evidence to be found that state that the contract for the usage of the warehouses as a Ford assembly plant was extended in April 1940. The signing of a contract between Ford representatives and the Turkish government concerning the ten-year extension of the lease can be traced in a newspaper article in the Cumhuriyet (Cumhuriyet, 11.4.1940). It was agreed that Ford Company was to occupy one third of the site for conducting its production. Although it has been proved highly unlikely that the Factory closed in the 1930s, there is no clear indication of when the Factory eventually ceased production.

3.4. Architecture versus Industry

The decision of Ford Motor Company to use the existing warehouses in Tophane marks a very important phase of the urban history of the site, shifting its main function towards industrial purposes from the beginning of 20th century onwards (Figure 8, 9). This change from warehouse to Ford Motor Factory represents the second major phase of transformation in the trajectory of the site. The factory was the first Ford Motor Company premises and the first car factory to be constructed in Turkey, while the Tophane area was the first free zone to be established in the country. The Ford Factory's existence in the site shows the specificity of the site for the industrial history and legacy of Turkey. However, neither the architectural qualities nor the strategic location of the site were among the issues discussed at the time of construction, even though the opening of the Ford factory was celebrated as a significant step in the process of industrialisation in the media at the time (Cumhuriyet, 25.6.1930). Apart from the economic benefits of increased production and trade, the passing down of technical knowledge of car manufacture to Turkish workers would benefit the technological advancement of the country's industry. The cars and lorries produced in Tophane were exactly the same as the ones produced in America, but in Tophane the cars were produced by Turkish artisans, a fact highlighted in one of the
newspapers of the time (Figure 10). The workers in the factory would be able to learn the process of car manufacturing and could be empowered to shape the foundations of automobile manufacturing in the country. Expressions of praise and astonishment about the state-of-the-art production taking place in the factory can be found in another newspaper article (Cumhuriyet, 2.7.1930). The warehouses were considered to be in a dilapidated condition, however, the production in the factory was considered to be in line with the latest technology of the time. The perfection, discipline and punctuality of the production process in the factory (Figure 11) were particularly praised by the media, with special attention being given to innovative production features such as the assembly line and division of labour (Cumhuriyet, 3.8.1930). Every car coming out of the factory was evaluated to be a product of perfection and discipline. The order associated with the assembly line in the factory was considered to be a showcase of the quality of industrial manufacturing in Turkey. It is quite common to come across full page advertisements (Figure 12) promoting the Ford cars produced by the Turkish workers, with some of the advertisements stating the contribution that Ford made to the development of Turkish manufacturing and assembly, and to Turkish industrialisation as a whole.

Figure 8: Ford Motor Company Exports in Istanbul adjacent to Nusretiye Mosque (Source: Odman, 2011)
Figure 9: Ford Motor Company Exports in Istanbul (Source: Odman, 2011)

Figure 10: Newspaper article titled "The first car factory in the country" (Source: Cumhuriyet, 25.6.1930)
Figure 11: Newspaper article showing the production line in the Ford Factory Istanbul titled "How are the Ford cars and lorries produced in Ford Factory Istanbul?" (Source: Cumhuriyet, 3 August 1930)

Figure 12: Full page Ford advertisement (Source: Cumhuriyet, 23 March 1932)
As production in the Ford factory proceeded, the contract of Ford was extended in 1940, whereby Ford Motor Company was allocated one third of the site for continuing its production. Between 1935 and the end of the 1940s the site underwent refurbishment efforts, which can be traced by studying the newspaper coverage of the time. In several articles it is possible to detect a shift in emphasis from the industrial aspect towards the spatial conditions and potential transformations of the site. In May 1935 an article was published that reported on the continuing clearance in the Galata port in anticipation of a refurbishment (Figure 13) (Cumhuriyet, 29.5.1935). As part of this clearance project, the access points to the port were enlarged, while the wall in the port and the vacant sheds were demolished, as well as the barns located near the location where the ferries from USSR and Romania approached.

The plans for the construction of new ports were prepared by the Pools and Factories Administration and sent to the Ministry of Economy in 1935 (Cumhuriyet, 14.5.1935), which designed a more extensive scheme that was finally sent to the council of deputies. The scheme envisaged the phased construction of new ports between Tophane and Fındıklı with a budget of two million Turkish liras with the works planned to be finished by 1936 (Cumhuriyet, 23.5.1935). The first phase entailed the reconstruction of the missing parts of the port between Sarayburnu and the Galata gate. According to the refurbishment proposals, ships would approach the docks between Tophane and Salıpazarı, while cargo ships coming from Europe would approach the docks between the Tophane and Galata passenger terminals. The use of ports number 1,2,3 in Galata and Sirkeci was allocated to ferries. The buoys in the harbour were to be removed with exception of those guiding transatlantic ships. All the existing buildings located between Tophane and Fındıkı were to be transformed into warehouses. After the termination the contract of Ford Factory, the warehouses it occupied were to be transferred to the Ministry. However, in contrast to these plans the contract for the lease of the warehouses by Ford Motor Company was instead extended.

Another part of the port refurbishment project was the proposed arrangement for the Golden Horn to become an inner harbour. The Golden Horn was to be cleaned and new docks were to be built. In October 1935, speedy progress in the refurbishment of the port
was reported, reflected in the restoration of the passenger terminal and the refurbishment of pavements (Cumhuriyet, 12.10.1935). Obsolete sheds and goods were demolished and a new road from the passenger terminal towards Tophane was built. In addition, a decision was made to replace the fenestrations of the port by a new griddle fence in order to avoid smuggling in the customs but it was not possible to construct this fence around the whole site as a result of the limited budget (Cumhuriyet, 7.7.1935). Street lighting in the port was improved and there were plans to install new equipment for loading and unloading cars from ships (Cumhuriyet, 27.7.1935). With this new equipment goods could be placed directly in warehouses, thereby halving the expenses for loading in the port. In December 1936 the refurbishment project was still underway, as stated in the newspaper article titled "Refurbishment in port Galata". The port administration was engaged in strengthening the foundations of the port against erosion by depositing big rocks into the sea. The strengthening of the foundations was due to be completed in March 1937. In addition to these activities, transit animal barns were being demolished and the new fences were being placed.

The completion of the refurbishment project in the port was not reflected in the media. Instead, the Cumhuriyet newspaper reported in May 1937 that the Tophane square was beginning to be used as a storage space for shipwrecks and ironmongery and that this situation in the square was detrimental to its environment (Cumhuriyet, 5.5.1937) (Figure 14). The publication of the article triggered a visit to the site by the Prime Minister and questions about the management of the site. Once it was understood that the square was used for the repair of ships, The Prime Minister requested the removal of the shipwrecks and clearance of the port, a request that was duly honoured. The Maritime Administration decided to construct a garden in Tophane square instead, a fact that can be seen from an article published just a few days later (Cumhuriyet, 8.5.1937).

In September of the same year, a new plan for the port of Istanbul was prepared by M. Gibb (Figure 15) (Cumhuriyet, 10.9.1937). Gibb’s plan included new warehouses, a passenger terminal, a public square and a car park located in Tophane square. However, the further development of the plan was not covered in the media. Instead, it was reported in 1940 that there was a need for warehouses in Istanbul harbour (Cumhuriyet, 24.3.1940),
which indicates that Gibb’s plan was never fully implemented. In order to overcome this need, negotiations with Ford Motor Company were conducted and the renewed use of two old warehouses in the site was secured. Due to the construction of a ferry terminal in Sarayburnu, it was decided that these warehouses should be demolished instead and other warehouses needed to be acquired by the General Directory of Ports. As mentioned before, a new contract was eventually signed with Ford Motor Company that allowed the use of some of its facilities for other purposes.

In 1949, the port of Istanbul was again subject to refurbishment, and this time the plans envisaged a renewal of the Salıpazarı dock (Cumhuriyet, 13.11.1949). This project entailed the construction of 280 metres of new plumbing and dock facilities and the installation of new equipment. With the addition of this new equipment, two ships of ten tons each would be able to anchor at the renewed Salıpazarı dock and a thousand tons of unloading per hour was predicted. The refurbishment of the Tophane port and warehouses was anticipated after the completion of the Salıpazarı project.

The port of Istanbul as a whole, and the Tophane site in specific, has been the subject of constant change since the beginning of the 1900s, fuelled by a continuous demand for refurbishment or enlargement of the port. A number of refurbishment and infrastructural improvement projects have been executed as a result of this demand for progress, which is reflected in the use of the port by different actors, either as artillery barracks, warehouses or industrial production facilities. The site has witnessed the involvement of global actors either as planner, user or contractor. Ford has been a significant international actor present in the site. The site has been frequently covered by the media as well, thereby sometimes highlighting the architectural and physical features, improvements or with the perfection of industrial production as in the case of Ford. On these occasions the site’s physical improvement was not reflected on by the media. One of the sets of global actors involved was the international planners hired to prepare plans for the port however their implementation was never fully realised. In the following part, the focus will shift towards the global networks and actors that were involved in the trajectory of the Tophane site.
Figure 13: Article showing before and after the demolished barns in the port Galata (Source: Cumhuriyet, 29 May 1935)

Figure 14: Newspaper article showing the devastated situation of Tophane square full of shipwrecks (Source: Cumhuriyet, 5 May 1937)
3.5. Global versus Local

Global tendencies have played an essential role in the formation and transformation of the Tophane port in Istanbul. As highlighted before, Ford Motor Company was one of the most significant of these global actors through its production, assembly and shipment of automobiles on the site. International agencies and representatives that were involved in preparing plans for the port, such as M. Gibb, were other actors that played an important role. With the election of the Democrat Party in the 1950s a new phase in Turkey’s political
history began, and Turkey’s political position became more entangled with international networks. The 1950s marked the beginning of a multiple party system, and within this system the Democrat Party was in a position to introduce liberal political policies. In the decades following WWII, Turkey started to increase imports and exports as a direct result of the new political landscape. Murat Güvenç linked the construction of the Istanbul harbour and Tophane warehouses to the political framework of the Democrat Party Period (Interview with Güvenç, 2011). He argued that Turkey became much more involved with the international world. The national industry started to grow, however, at the same time the industry became more dependent on imports. In return for the import of a wide range of products, Turkey was mostly exporting agricultural goods produced in Izmir, and goods such as cement, nails, wood, brick, sugar, construction iron. Everything else had to be imported, for instance pipes, glass, paint, and many others. With an increase in the volume of imported goods, the port of Istanbul started to have difficulties in meeting the demands for storage capacity.

The first attempt to meet this demand was through the enlargement of the existing port facilities. The proposals for the enlargement of Tophane port together with Haydarpaşa, Alsancak and İskenderun ports were made possible through a 12.5 million dollars loan from the International Bank of Imports and Exports. In August 1950 the construction works in Tophane port started (Cumhuriyet, 11.8.1950). The preparation stage and the drilling for the foundation were nearly completed by October 1951 (Cumhuriyet, 13.10.1951), while the whole enlargement project was finally completed in 1952. However, the enlargement did not provide sufficient capacity for the port so in September 1953 a new plan for extension of the Istanbul port was prepared (Cumhuriyet, 19.9.1953). The general director of the Maritime Bank at the time, Ulvi Yenali, explained that the new port facilities were to be given a modern form, so that the process of loading and unloading would be speedier. Foreign port facilities were taken as an example and as a result five new pontoons were to be constructed, each carrying a warehouse with iron and skeleton on top of them. In addition, new buoys were to be placed in the new 355 metre long harbour.

Even though enlargement and improvement of the port had taken place by the end of 1952, the need for larger warehouses in Istanbul port was not yet met. The proposal to construct a large warehouse in Tophane was first reported in June 1954 (Cumhuriyet,
5.6.1954). After the completion of the necessary preparations by the Maritime Bank and the Ministry of Public Works, the execution of the proposals was awarded to the Danish Construction Company Campax. As a part of this new project, the port was to be extended from Sarayburnu to Galata and Tophane through the construction of two new porches of 3000m² and 4000m². Behind the porches a new large warehouse of 20000m² would be erected (Cumhuriyet, 4.7.1954).

İlhan Tekeli reiterates Güvenç’s argument that the warehouses in Tophane were constructed in order to meet a need for storage space that emerged as a result of the expansion of foreign trade during the Democrat Party period (Interview with Tekeli İ., 2012). He claimed that warehouses were not only places where goods were loaded and unloaded, but at the same time they were places where the stored goods were insured. Tekeli pointed out that the Tophane warehouses are among the most significant investments by the government during the Democratic Party period, since the decision meant that the issue of where to locate the port of Istanbul was now finally being resolved (Interview with Tekeli İ., 2012). According to Tekeli, Tophane was selected as the site to construct these warehouses because the decision was made not to relocate the port of Istanbul outside the city. He referred to the prevalent opinion at the time that the harbour in Tophane and Haydarpaşa should be moved outside the city, and Henri Prost’s proposals to move the port to Yenikapı. However, Tekeli argued that this proposal was not something that could be executed easily because the development model of the city in the 1950s resembled a growing oil stain, meaning that the city did not expand through the construction of big projects at the outskirts but was growing through the addition of individual buildings instead. One feature of the Tophane area in the 1950s, as underlined by Tekeli, is that it was not so much a prominent site, but that it was well connected with the city through the main transportation links. As a result of the economic situation during the Democrat Party Period, the increasing import surplus required space for storage. The construction of the Tophane warehouses coincides with this time in the 1950s. As we can see the continuous change and improvement in the Tophane port did not lose pace.

The construction of the Tophane port was an important project for the country, and therefore it attracted a significant amount of attention from the media as well as from the
government. As the construction of the port was in progress, the Prime Minister of the time, Adnan Menderes, and his committee visited the construction site of the warehouses in Tophane in December 1954 (Cumhuriyet, 29.12.1954). He was informed about the progress in the construction by the experts. The Prime Minister's visit to the site is an important indicator of the significance of the new warehouses. The warehouses were considered to be a contemporary and progressive project for the benefit of the country. At the time of the visit, 310 metres of the envisaged 500 metres long dock had been completed, and the plan to build one large warehouse had given way to a decision to construct two warehouses of two storeys high, thereby enlarging the programme to 48000m² of warehouse area and 12500m² of open area. Moreover, plans for 50 metres long shed for smaller vehicles were also included. The anticipated opening date of the warehouses was set in early 1956, however, in February 1955 a big fire in the construction site destroyed a large amount of construction materials, resulting in a delay of one and a half month (Cumhuriyet, 16.2.1955). In June 1955 newspapers reported that the plan for the construction of two warehouses instead of one was again adjusted. The latest plan included three warehouses (Figure 16) (Cumhuriyet, 2.6.1955). In addition, the Maritime Bank decided to construct a business centre and several additional warehouses with a combined programme of 52900m² behind the existing warehouses and a 313 metres long block of offices in between them, thereby adding another 19900 m² of space to the programme. During the construction of the first three warehouses along the water 8 engineers and 500 workers were working 10 hours a day. In September 1956 they were finally completed.

The progress of the construction works in the port was reported on in detail in a cover page article in Cumhuriyet in October 1955, accompanied by a photograph of the site (Figure 17) (Cumhuriyet, 22.10.1955). In this article it is stated that 4484 pillars of 18 metres long would be knocked into the water in order to extend the port from 310 metres to 610 metres, so that freight ships would be able to anchor. As a result, some of the buildings were subject to demolition. The number of warehouses along the water was to be increased to four. These revisions were to be the last ones, and resulted in the final shape of the port that can be seen today. The number of workers was planned to be doubled when the second phase of the construction was to start. Similarly to the construction of the
first three warehouses, 8 engineers and 500 workers toiled 10 hours a day on the fourth and the number of workers was to be doubled when the second phase of the construction was to start.

President Celal Bayar and Prime Minister Adnan Menderes visited the construction site in Tophane again in March 1956, when they were informed on the progress of the construction works (Cumhuriyet, 6.3.1956). In order to make space for the fourth warehouse along the shore, the old building of Maritime Bank was demolished and two offices of five storeys high were to be built (Cumhuriyet, 6.7.1956). The construction of the 300 metres of the extended port and of two 4000m² warehouses was completed by July 1956, in addition to the opening of a new road from Salıpaçarı to Tophane and the demolition of big walls, which were blocking the sea view. In October 1956 the latest extension of the Tophane port was opened and the port was ready to operate, a moment that was celebrated in the media (Figure 18) (Cumhuriyet, 21.10.1956). The depth of the port was about 10-11 metres, allowing big ships to anchor. The progress in the construction works in the last three months before the opening of the port had been rapid. Cranes were installed in front of the two completed warehouses and the capacity of the second warehouse was tested at the end of November 1956. The operation of the completed warehouses was expected to start by the beginning of 1957, with the Prime Minister expected to attend the opening.

Figure 16: How the Salıpaçarı shore would look like after the warehouse project (Source: Cumhuriyet, 2 June 1955)
Figure 17: The construction works in Salıpazarı harbour (Source: Cumhuriyet, 22 October 1955)

Figure 18: The completion of the first phase of the construction works in Salıpazarı port (Source: Cumhuriyet, 21 October 1956)
The second phase of the project was initiated in November 1956 and included a further 290 metre long port extension, as well as the construction of three five storey blocks containing warehouses and offices along the road. According to the contract, the second phase was estimated to cost 40 million Turkish liras, and the extension of the port was to be completed within thirty months. Eight modern cranes were ordered from a foreign company, a fact that underlines again the involvement of global actors in the transformation process in the Tophane site. The construction of the warehouses and offices was anticipated to start at the beginning of 1957 and to be completed within two years. After completion of the second phase there was no need to store goods in the Golden Horn anymore, this meant that the Golden Horn would lose its industrial functions.

By the end of November 1957 the third warehouse was close to completion (Cumhuriyet, 27.11.1957). The completed Tophane port opened in June 1958. The new port was able to receive four ships at the same time and the availability of up-to date loading-unloading facilities meant that the port was equipped to meet the needs of modern trade. As another confirmation of the significance of the project for the government, President Celal Bayar and Prime Minister Adnan Menderes were present at the opening ceremony (Cumhuriyet, 2.6.1958). The amount of media coverage is another indication of the importance of this project for the country. The construction process of the Tophane port was reported on regularly and often with great attention, as witnessed by the frequent inclusion of large photographs and the occasional allocation of the cover page to the story.

The only criticism expressed at the time of construction of the Tophane port came from the academic Tuğrul Akçura, and was published in a newspaper article dating back to July 1958 (Akçura, 1958). In his article, Akçura mentioned the importance of the port for the development of the city, and emphasised that the port of Istanbul was being constructed near Galata/Tophane solely due to the availability of the site. However, Akçura criticised the fact that the roads that were being built would create problems for the neighbourhood by adding more traffic to the insufficient infrastructure network. Moreover, the harbour would be a source of pollution for its environment. In addition, Akçura argued that the construction of new warehouses would ruin the beauty of the city. The port would attract industry and needed space to expand; the lack of available land in Haydarpaşa and
Tophane rendered both locations inconvenient for the construction of the port. The principles of city planning required workers to live not too far from where they work, but the neighbourhoods around Haydarpaşa and Tophane ports were rather expensive for workers' accommodation. As a result, Akçura concluded that the development of the Tophane and Haydarpaşa ports were inadequate for the long term and suggested the construction of the port in another location within the spatial framework dictated by the master plan.

Similarly to Akçura, some of the other interviewees as well labelled the selection of the location for construction of the port as a poor decision. However, due to the unpredictable nature of the spatial development of the city, selecting a proper location for the construction of the port was not an easy task. Murat Güvenç argued that selection of Galata/Tophane as the location for the port represented a short-sighted planning decision in order to allow construction of the warehouses on that site (Interview with Güvenç, 2011). Güvenç stressed the destruction occurring in Karaköy and Tophane as part of the zeitgeist of the 1950s, when large scale urban clearing operations were quite common in European cities. He stated that the warehouses were completed in the late 1950s and that they continued to function until 1973, which meant that their life span was only 15 years. Although the warehouses were not vacated in 1973, according to him they became irrelevant after the opening of the Bosphorus Bridge. It became more difficult and unnecessary to transport goods to and from Tophane, and gradually all the harbour functions were transferred to Haydarpaşa port on the Asian side of the Bosphorus. Güvenç expressed his disappointment over the fact that the entire urban heritage of the Tophane site was erased for the construction of warehouses that functioned for such a brief period and viewed this outcome as the result of decisions which ignored long term considerations. After the warehouses lost their function, decision makers were expected to correct their mistake, but instead they left the warehouses vacant and without any purpose for 40 years. As a result, access to the shore has been denied to the inhabitants of the city for nearly half a century. Güvenç argued:

Where to construct the harbour of Istanbul? Prost proposed to build the harbour of Istanbul in Yenikapi, but it was an expensive solution. As a cheaper and easier solution, the idea of extending the Galata harbour while extending the road (Meclis-i Mebusan Road) and demolishing the barracks came to mind. When there is a
harbour it brings trucks and transportation. Most of Istanbul's industry was leaving Topkapı in those times and some were located in Bomonti. Karaköy square needed to be rebuilt in order to transport goods through the bridge. Then they built the warehouses there and it started to work. Renowned architect Sedat Hakkı Eldem presented interesting designs in which one side of the building would be warehouse and the other side office. We need to admit these buildings are important for architectural history. However, Karaköy square was demolished and there was a road constructed in the middle of the harbour (Interview with Güvenç, 2011).

Architect Doğan Tekeli follows a similar reasoning as Güvenç when it comes to the construction of the Tophane/Salıpazarı warehouses. He underlined that Prost was hired as urban planner during the 1940s when Lütfü Kırdar was mayor of Istanbul, and planning attempts were made to address the overpopulation of Istanbul (Interview with Tekeli D., 2012). According to Tekeli, the opening of Dolmabahçe Park, Atatürk Boulevard, Sarachane, and Unkapı Road fits within the planning framework developed by Prost. He assumed that the enlargement of Meclis-i Mebusan Road, right in front of the warehouses and the Tophane-i Amire building, was also part of this plan. Figures 19 and 20 show the situation of the area before and during the construction of the Meclis-i Mebusan Road.

Uğur Tanyeli dates the start of the transformation of the Tophane site to the 1950s, when the construction of the first warehouses along the shore commenced (Interview with Tanyeli, 2011). The blocks combining offices and warehouses along the Meclis-i Mebusan Road were not constructed until 1960. Tanyeli suggested that these warehouses were prepared and built by an American construction firm. However, Ersen Gürsel claimed that the warehouses were designed by Sedat Hakkı Eldem, a prominent Turkish architect. He also mentioned a discussion between the Ministry and a Director of the Maritime Institution, Sedat Erkin, about the designs of Tophane square (Interview with Gürsel, 2011). Sedat Erkin defended the idea of rebuilding Tophane square and opening the site towards the sea, while the Ministry supported the idea of constructing a fourth warehouse by the shore. Gürsel asserted that according to the plan prepared by Sedat Hakkı Eldem, two sides of the Tophane square were allocated to shops and the artillery barracks, marshal buildings, and a row of existing shops were protected and re-functioned (Figure 21). However, this design for Tophane Square was never realised and as discussed earlier, and as can be observed today, the idea of the Ministry of Development was eventually implemented and the fourth warehouse was constructed.
Figure 19: The condition of the area before the demolition for enlargement of Meclis-i Mebusan Road (Source: Personal archive of Ömer Devrim Aksoyak)

Figure 20: Demolitions after the enlargement of Meclis-i Mebusan Road in front of Tophane-i Amire building (Source: Personal archive of Ömer Devrim Aksoyak)
Figure 21: The master plan of Tophane warehouses (Source: http://v3.arkitera.com/news.php?action=display NewsItem&ID=5637 accessed 11.11.2013)

Figure 22: Construction of warehouses in Tophane (Source: Personal archive of Ömer Faruk Aksoyak)
Figure 23: Construction of warehouses by the shore in Tophane in 1957 (Source: German Archaeology Institute, Istanbul, 15.02.2012)

Figure 24: The construction of warehouses are completed in 1960 (Source: German Archaeology Institute, Istanbul, 15.02.2012)

3.6. Conclusions
In this chapter, the aim was to make a "thick description" of the case study by showing the transformations the Tophane site went through in time. The socio-political, economical, and historical context of the Tophane site has been explained by placing emphasis on the important moments in its transformation trajectory. Secondary and archival sources, were used in order to gather a detailed account of these transformations. These sources include governmental archival documents from the Prime Ministry Republican Archives, and newspaper clippings from the newspapers Cumhuriyet and Milliyet published between 1930 until 2014. From its origins as a location for an artillery barracks, the site has been through continuous transformations, such as the construction of warehouses in the late nineteenth century, the establishment of the first Turkish free zone and factory of the Ford Motor Company in the late 1920s, extensive refurbishment and clearance in the 1940s, and again the construction of the warehouses in the 1950s as the last phase of major transformation. Throughout the process of continuous change, global tendencies and international actors have had a significant impact on the site, either as users, contractors, or planners.

The more central a site, the more intense the site life becomes in terms of the occurrence of flows of goods and people and the involvement of different actors. Due to its high connectivity, the site has occupied a network vortex position in central Istanbul’s transportation infrastructure. The site is quite prominent in Istanbul’s silhouette as well, and offers impressive views of the historical peninsula. Its importance and prominence has been reflected in the amount of attention the site has generated from the media over time, with newspapers focussing particularly on the architectural features and physical improvements of the site and the nature of industrial activity that was taking place. Due to the centrality of the site, transformation has been the subject of controversy and critiques, particularly the transformations occurring after WWII. The following chapter "Mapping Controversies" will focus on the controversies around more recent and future plans for the site, thereby making use of controversy mapping and introducing actor network diagrams.
TIMELINE OF TOPHANE WAREHOUSES

The Tophane area acted as the port where international marine trade was facilitated since the Genoese settled in the area during the 13th century. Along with the Genoese traders, Byzantine, Ottoman, English, French, Dutch, Venetian, Turkish and Greek traders used this port for centuries.

Fatih Sultan Mehmet ordered the construction of an artillery barracks in Tophane. Consequently, the neighbourhood became a military production area. The artillery was extended in the time of Bayezid II (1481-1512), while Kanuni Sultan Süleyman (1520-1566) ordered to demolish the old buildings and the construction of a new artillery barracks. On the shore, artillery pieces captured in previous wars were exhibited as trophies. Selim III (1789-1807) made radical changes in Tophane; he ordered some of the trees in the square to be cut down, and he removed the artillery pieces on the shore, while using the square for the training of the army. In addition, he ordered the renewal of the old artillery barracks and other production facilities. With the arrival of important innovations in industrial production in the 19th century, Mahmut II ordered for the construction of equipment factories and a new artillery barracks. He also renovated the existing artillery barracks. Later on, the small shops were demolished and the square was cleared. (Şahsuvaroğlu, Cumhuriyet, 1957)

In 1892, a big fire occurred in Tophane and spread to Dolmabahçe.

Mahmut II wanted the Tophane area to be restored. A new artillery barracks, small factories and a new mosque were constructed. In the 19th century Tophane square was hosting markets and theatre shows conducted by foreign theatre companies. These theatre shows were attracting large crowds. (Şahsuvaroğlu, Cumhuriyet, 1957)
In October 1895, the decision was made to construct a warehouse building next to the customs building. A 1914 map of Istanbul, part of the ‘Alman Mavilen’ collection, shows these warehouses that were used for the storage of guns.

On the 1918 Necip Bey plans it is possible to detect the existence of a dock and a police station in the Tophane area.
1926

In 1926, the Istanbul Dock and Warehouse Company decided to construct numerous warehouses.
In May 1926, these Tophane warehouses were handed over to Seyr-i Sefain (the current Maritime Administration).

1929

The Tophane warehouses were rented to Ford Motor Company for the purpose of establishing an assembly factory, the first Ford factory and free zone of Turkey.

Ford Egypt representative Mr Collins and Ford Paris representative visited Istanbul.
They inspected the condition of the warehouses and scrutinised the two prospective directors that were coming from Ford's Trieste factory. The goods in the warehouses were being removed and by the end of April 1929 the warehouses would be delivered to Ford. The first shipment of spare parts would arrive soon after and the production of the factory would start by June 1929. (Cumhuriyet, 19 April 1929)
3 August 1930
Newspaper advertisement titled "How are Ford autos being produced in Tophane Factory?" highlights the production process by explaining the workings of the assembly line and the organisation of workers according to division of labour. (Cumhuriyet, 3.8.1930)
Smuggling reported in the Ford Factory
The Ministry of Customs decided to launch an investigation into the accounts of the Ford Company as a result of reported smuggling activities in the customs area. The investigation was carried out by three customs inspectors, one representative of the Chamber of Trade, and one inspector from the treasury. This team investigated the entire accounts of the Ford Company, leading back to its foundation and discovered two cases of smuggling in the period after its foundation six years before. (Cumhuriyet, 6.5.1935)

Galata port is getting cleaned
Until the implementation of the new project, the existing port facilities in Tophane were improved. The wall and the unused sheds were demolished and the access points to the port were enlarged. The barns located near the arrival point of ferries from Russia and Romania were demolished as well. (Cumhuriyet, 29.05.1935)

New ports to be built
The project for the refurbishment of the Tophane port was sent and approved by the Ministry of Economy. The Ministry put aside two million liras for the construction of new docks between Sarayburnu and the Galata bridge, in Tophane and Findikli. The construction works were meant to be finished by 1936. After the completion of the new docks, the Findikli area could accommodate all passenger ships. The freight ships could approach to the area between Findikli and Tophane. Travellers could arrive at the Tophane passenger terminal, while local ferries could approach to the Galata bridge and Sarayburnu. The Golden Horn was arranged as an inner harbour by cleaning the shores and constructing new docks. (Cumhuriyet, 23.4.1935)
**Istanbul's New port**

The plans for the new port were prepared by M. Gibb. In this plan, a new passenger terminal, warehouse, car park, and public square would be included in the site. (Cum. 10.9.1937)

---

**1940**

**Warehouse crisis**

In the 1940s a demand for new warehouses arisen in Istanbul port. In order to find a way to meet this demand, meetings with the Ford Motor Company were held. It was decided to rent out the two old warehouses in the site as storage facilities. In contrast, the warehouses in Sarayburnu were to be demolished due to the construction works of the ferry terminal there.

Therefore, the General Directory of Ports was trying to acquire new buildings that could be used as warehouses. (Cumhuriyet, 21.3.1940)

---

**Fords contract extended**

The ten year contract signed between the government and Ford Motor Factory expired in 1939, prompting negotiations between Ford and the government about the extension of the contract. Meanwhile, government investigations into Ford's company accounts were going on due to reported smuggling activities. Eventually it was agreed that Ford Motor Company would occupy one third of the site for conducting its production. (Cumhuriyet, 11.4.1940)
1949

**Salipazarı plumbing and port under reduction**
As part of a new project for a 280 metre port extension, plumbing and other preparations for the new Salipazarı docks were initiated. After extension of the docks and installation of new loading equipment, two ships of ten ton could anchor at the port and a thousand ton of freight could be unloaded per hour. After the completion of this project, the refurbishment of the Tophane port and warehouses was planned. This project of was under preparation. (*Cumhuriyet, 13.11.1949*)

1950

**Construction works in Tophane dock**
The projects for the enlargement of Tophane, Haydarpaşa, Alsancak and İskenderun ports were sent to the Ministries. In order to realise these enlargements, credit would be granted from the International Bank of Import and Exports. (*Cumhuriyet, 11.8.1950*)

1954

**Large warehouse project to be constructed in Salipazarı**
In order to meet the demand for warehouse spaces in Istanbul port, the Maritime Bank and Ministry of Public Work were preparing the construction of a new large warehouse project. The contract of the plans was awarded to the Danish construction company Campax, due to the fact that this project was very extensive. Soon after a contract was signed between the General Director of the Maritime Bank, Yusuf Ziya Öniş, and the representatives of Campax Company, the construction works would start. (*Cumhuriyet, 5.6.1954*)

**Prime Minister’s visits**
Prime Minister Adnan Menderes and his committee visited the construction site of the warehouses in Salipazarı and were informed by the experts about the progress in the construction site. The construction works for the Salipazarı port and warehouses started with the construction of 310 metre of the 500 metre long dock in July 1954. Ships could anchor at the new docks and an automatic anchoring system for unloading freight would be installed. In addition, two warehouses of two storey high were to be constructed. After completion of the project, 48000 m² warehouse area and 12500 m² open area would be available. Moreover, a 50 metre long shed would be available for smaller vehicles. The warehouses and the port started to operate at the beginning of 1956. With the opening of the first phase of the harbour, the annual cargo handling capacity would be 200000 tons. Once the entire site would be operating this capacity would increase to 300000 tons a year. (*Cumhuriyet, 29.12.1954*)

1955

On 16 February 1955 a big fire hit the Salipazarı port. During the fire, a large amount of construction materials was destroyed, and therefore a one and a half month delay in the construction works was expected. (*Cumhuriyet, 16.2.1955*)
Three large transit warehouses to be built in Salıpazarı
The construction works in Salıpazarı port were progressing on full speed despite the fire in February 1955. After the fire, a large amount of construction material was delivered in order to keep the construction going. 1300 pillars had been constructed, about two third of the total amount. The construction of the piers was expected to be concluded by October 1955. Three large transit warehouses would be constructed as well. Big cranes that were to be installed in the port could unload goods directly from the ships into the warehouses. One of the warehouses was almost ready for pouring concrete. The Maritime Bank made a decision to construct a business centre and additional warehouses along the Meclis-i-Mebusan Road. These additional warehouses would provide another 52900 m² of programme. In between the two sets of warehouses 18900 m² of offices would be erected. Three lifts with a capacity of 5.5 tons would be installed in each warehouse. The warehouses along the water were expected to be completed by the September 1958, while the construction of the warehouses along the road would start during the summer. (Cumhuriyet, 2.6.1955)

Salıpazarı port construction in progress
The big warehouse construction tried to be complete before October. The destruction of the old buildings of Maritime Bank started. In this way between the Academy of Fine Art until Tophane Mosque, there could be four warehouses and five storey two offices to be built. The construction works expected to be complete by the end of 1958. In the first phase of the construction works, the 300 metre of the port with 2250 piers and the construction of two storey high two warehouses completed.

The other one is in the last stage of construction. Both of the warehouses are 4000 m². The second phase of the construction is 290 metre long and so far 100 piers knocked in. According to the contract the duration of the second phase is thirty months. The four warehouses would accommodate 32.000 m² of space and the demolition of the site at its back would create 30.000 m² open space. A decision was made to install eight modern cranes, of which six could carry 3 tons of goods and two could carry 5 tons of goods. The cranes were ordered from a foreign company. The construction costs involved were 40 million liras. (Cumhuriyet, 6.7.1956)
New Salıpazarı port ready to operate
The construction works in the Tophane port were initiated two years before and in the last three months speedy progress was made. The area from Tophane until Fındıklı was cleared for the facilitation of the construction works. The construction of the three five storey warehouses and the offices at the back was expected to start after the new year and was expected to be completed within two years. The 300 metre dock was available for handling 15000 tons ships. The depth of the sea at the docks would be 10-11 metres deep, therefore large ships could approach easily.

With the newly available storage space in Tophane, there was no need to store goods in the Golden Horn anymore. Goods could be kept fresh within the closed spaces of the warehouses. The assembly of the modern cranes was almost finished as well. The construction works of the warehouses and the offices costed to Ministry of Public Works 40 million liras. The warehouses would start to operate within a few months. (Cumhuriyet, 21.10.1956)

In September 1957 the decision was made to widen the Necilis-ı-Mebusun Road behind the Salıpazarı warehouses between Karaköy and Ortaköy. This construction of the road caused quite a lot of destruction in the area.

The opening of the first phase of the Salıpazarı port The port was modernised according to the needs of the important import export centre that Istanbul is. President Celal Bayar and Prime Minister Adnan Menderes would be present at the opening ceremony. (Cumhuriyet, 2.6.1958)
**Istanbul port does not meet demands**

In the master plan of Istanbul no new area for port facilities was designated, but the existing port facilities were not sufficient. Although the construction of the Salıpazarı port in the middle of the city represented a large investment, the port was rendered useless in the case of strong southerly winds. In addition, a lot of money had been spent to avoid its collapse. The decision to hand the port over to the Maritime Bank was another mistake, as the Bank did not invest in the modernisation of the equipment of the port. During the summer season, which coincides with touristic period, the port was fully occupied by cruise ships. The Haydarpaşa port on the Asian side was not a good alternative because of its limited depth of the sea there. (Cumhuriyet, 15.8.1970)

**1974**

According to a new masterplan, the Haydarpaşa port would operate on full capacity, while there would be a new port constructed in Zeytinburnu. Salıpazarı port was allocated for exclusive use by tourist ships. (Cumhuriyet, 5.6.1974)

**1987**

Mimar Sinan University showed interest in some of the buildings on the site, due to its rising student numbers. According to their plan, the three warehouses by the shore and one warehouse in the back would be demolished. A new road connecting Kara Mustafapaşa Road with Kemeralı Road was included in the plans. Fındıklı Park would function as the open air exhibition space of the University. (Cumhuriyet, 30.1.1987)

**1990**

**New passenger port in Karaköy**

The Turkish Maritime Administration presented plans to build a new passenger port in Tophane. The warehouses would be transformed into hotel, business, shopping and entertainment facilities. The Turkish Maritime Administration did not seek to restrict entrepreneurs interested in transforming the site. The General directorate wanted a passenger port suitable for Istanbul, therefore a new passenger terminal was proposed in the 1120 metre long shore. Potential bidders were encouraged through the publication of advertisements. According to these adverts, entrepreneurs could make any changes in the buildings and the site. (Cumhuriyet, 5.9.1990)
1994

The fourth Istanbul Bienalle took place in warehouse number four between 10 November and 10 December 1995. In order to prepare for this event, the warehouse was repaired and the area was cleaned up and painted. (Cumhuriyet, 15.10.1995)

The Ministry of Culture and Tourism designated the site as a tourism area on 15 December 1994.

1998

Mimar Sinan University declared its desire to use one of the Salipazan warehouses. Suitcase tourism ceased to be accommodated on the site in 1999. By that time, the site had been used for this purpose for decades, particularly by Russian tourists.

2002

Galataport. The project promised a contemporary look to Salipazan shore and represented an investment value of 148 million dollars. 13.221 m2 of the site was allocated for a fair and congress centre, 11.000m2 for an art museum. The project also included shopping facilities and a 3.688 m2 aquarium.

2004

It was decided to transform warehouse number four into a museum of modern art. Istanbul Modern is the first Museum of Modern Art in Turkey. It was founded by the Istanbul Culture and Art Foundation under the leadership of Eczacıbaşı family. The museum opened its doors to the public on 11th December 2004. The museum is considered to be the core element of the Galataport project.
A lot of reactions and criticism to the Galataport project were published by the newspapers. Also, a big controversy surrounding the bidding process was reported on. The project was subject to a court case initiated by the Chamber of Planners, the Chamber of Architects and Istanbul Greater Municipality. As a result of this court case, the Galataport project was cancelled.

2012

The warehouses adjacent to Istanbul Modern start to be used for temporary functions and exhibitions, leading to a new name for the site: ‘Art Island’. Warehouse number 6 is used by State Theatres as their costume and decor ateliers. Warehouse number 5 is proposed as a Contemporary Art Museum by the Mimar Sinan Faculty of Fine Arts.
Istanbul Modern and NY MoMA cooperated for the International Young Architects Programme (YAP), which allows young architects to design a temporary structure in Istanbul Modern’s courtyard every year.

Figure 25: Timeline of Tophane warehouses
CHAPTER 4

"MAPPING CONTROVERSIES"¹ OF TOPHANE WAREHOUSES: 1970-2014

In this chapter the aim is to make a controversy mapping of the Tophane site, specifically mapping the controversies surrounding the Galataport project by focussing on the actors and their concerns. In relation to the tracking of the trajectory of the site, this chapter is a follow-up of Chapter 3 where the historical, political, economic and social history of the site was discussed by a 'thick description', however, the methodology applied in this chapter differs. The methodological approach of "controversy mapping" (Yaneva, 2012) will help to detect and analyse the actors involved in the controversy and their networks, concerns and standpoints, revealing the complexity and multiple dimensions of the disagreement. The subject of the main controversy that will further be examined in this chapter is the Galataport project, which is an urban transformation project proposed for the Tophane site. The design and the related bidding process has led to a split in opinions among designers, professional chambers, and associated governmental institutions, all of which have conflicting interests and concerns.

When the controversies surrounding the site are tracked, it is possible to witness that the intensity of the site life, in terms of the number of different actors involved and flows of goods and persons, is directly related to its centrality. The site has a network vortex position being at the crossing point, the central interconnection of these flows. The use of innovative methods of thick description and mapping the transformations of the sites allows for the argument that the site is a complex entity, whose frontiers or outlines are never clearly defined. It is a messy and heterogeneous socio-natural entity, neither simply a natural one; nor it is a purely social construction. The controversy mapping will help the voices of the actors involved in the transformation of the Tophane site to be heard, and allows these actors to come to the front of the stage. The chapter will start with discussing the multi-sited understanding of actors and their networks through the introduction of actor

¹ (Yaneva A., Mapping Controversies in Architecture, 2012)
network diagrams. In addition, the major dimensions of the controversies will be discussed, such as the architectural value of the warehouses, the congestion in the port, privatisation of the site, prioritisation of economic development above cultural concerns, and the opaque nature of urban politics.

The main source of this chapter is the archival research data, primarily newspaper clippings, journal articles and in-depth interviews conducted with the actors that were involved in the trajectory of the site or that have an expertise on the topic. As part of the archival research, an analysis of articles in the local newspapers Cumhuriyet and Milliyet between the dates 1930 and 2014 was conducted. Some of the interviewees shared their personal archives of the site, which include other newspaper clippings and journal articles. In this part of the chapter, the focus lies on the time period from the 1980s until 2014. Congestion in the port, the privatisation of the site, the proposal of the Galataport project and the related controversies can be observed in this time interval.

4.1. The Multi-Sited Understanding of Actors and Their Networks

Several actors involved in the transformation of the Tophane site were interviewed and contributed to this research. These interviewees include the representative of the Chamber of Architects’ Istanbul Branch, Mücenna Yapıcı, as well as the representative of the Chamber of Planner’s Istanbul Branch, Akif Burak Atlar. In addition, the architects of Galataport project and the Istanbul Modern project, Melkan Gürsel Tabanlioğlu from Tabanlioğlu Architecture, the curator of Istanbul Modern, Levent Çalışmış, and a practising architect who prepared a proposal for Istanbul Modern, Doğan Tekeli, were interviewed, as well as two government officers from the Prime Ministry Privatisation Bureau and Maritime Administration, two academics from Mimar Sinan University, and an activist from Tophane Initiative. In addition to interviews with the actors who have had a direct impact on the trajectory of the Tophane site, interviews were conducted with academics that have expertise on Istanbul and urban transformation, such as Uğur Tanyeli, İhan Tekeli, and Murat Güvenç. Tabanlioğlu Architects, the professional
chambers, the Prime Ministry Privatisation Bureau and the winners of the bidding process are actors that play very significant roles in the Galataport controversy.

The complexity and the multi-actorial character of the Tophane site are represented by actor network diagrams (Figure 26 and 44). The actors involved in the trajectory of the site often referred to each other, which makes it possible to understand the network that links the involved actors to each other. Figure 26 shows an overlaid diagram of all the actors and networks. This diagram is rather complex given the fact that it includes all the actors mentioned by actors involved in the Galataport controversy. Figures 27 to 34 show the actor network diagrams of the individual actors, which were prepared on the basis of the interviews. These actor network diagrams refer mainly to the actors involved in the Tophane site after the 1990s, in the period when the transformation of warehouse number 4 into a museum of modern art was completed and the proposals for the Galataport project were published. Figure 44, which has been prepared by using the newspaper clippings, is an actor network diagram which includes the main concerns and the timeline.

When the diagrams are analysed, some networks appear to be more extensive than others. Some of the actors with similar backgrounds have similar actor networks as well. For instance, different representatives of the professional chambers seem to have similar actor networks, which might be due to the similarity of their professional discourse. The architects responsible for the Galataport project and the transformation of the warehouses number 4 into Istanbul Modern Museum referred to their employer of the Istanbul Modern project, which is the Eczacıbaşı Foundation, and the owner of the warehouses, the Maritime Administration, in addition to other related ministries and governmental bodies. They also referred to the architect Sedat Hakkı Eldem, since they attribute the original design of the warehouses to him (Figure 27). It is quite interesting that they did not refer to the professional chambers or any other conflicting actors in the Galataport controversy.

Quite similarly to Tabanlıoğlu Architects, the curator of the Istanbul Modern Museum, Levent Çalışköğlu, referred only to the actors involved in the process of transformation of warehouse number 4 into Istanbul Modern, such as Tabanlıoğlu Architects, the Eczacıbaşı Foundation and IKSV, members of the Eczacıbaşı family, the Maritime Administration as
the owner of the warehouses, and the Prime Minister (Figure 28). However, he neither mentioned the actors of the Galataport controversy, nor the members of the bidding process. The government officer from the Prime Ministry Privatisation Bureau referred to other governmental bodies and ministries, the Preservation Board, Tabanlioğlu Architects, the Eczacıbaşı Foundation, and several consultancy firms. However the professional chambers or the actors involved in the bidding process were not mentioned. The omitting of certain key actors is possibly the result of a biased representation of the controversy. Different academics have comparable networks as well although they tend to refer to both sides of the controversy without omitting one or the other.

Latour underlines the importance of applying an irreductive approach rather than a reductive one when analysing a site. He argued that rather than trying to apply universal laws in a reductivist manner, Actor Network Theory takes irreducible, independent localities as a starting point and promotes the understanding of temporarily commensurable connections. Similar connections can be found when a multi-sited understanding of the insights provided by interviewees of this research is applied. While describing and explaining the transformation in the Tophane warehouses, different actors referred to different locations around the world and different locations in Istanbul as well, in order to better explain and understand the Tophane case. Also, they compared different transformation projects around the world, and found similarities between different cases, which can be seen in the series of diagrams (Figures 35 to 42). George Marcus provides a useful description of multi-sited ethnography in the discipline of anthropology:

Through multi-sited ethnography, comparison emerges from putting questions to an emergent object of study whose contours, sites, and relationships are not known beforehand, but are themselves a contribution of making an account that has different, complexly connected real-world sites of investigation. The object of study is ultimately mobile and multiply situated, so any ethnography of such an object will have a comparative dimension that is integral to it, in the form of juxtapositions of phenomena that conventionally have appeared to be (or conceptually have been kept) "worlds apart." Comparison re-enters the very act of ethnographic specification by a research design of juxtapositions in which the global is collapsed into and made an integral part of parallel, related local situations rather than something monolithic or external to them. This move towards comparison embedded in the multi-sited ethnography stimulates accounts of cultures composed in a landscape for which there is as yet no developed theoretical conception or descriptive model (Marcus, 1995).
The multi-sited understanding helps to explore the relationships between a variety of geographies all over the globe, and helps to establish the similarities or differences between them. This approach helps us to learn by understanding each other. Carola Hein uses a similar approach and proposes to make visible the connections between buildings and their multiple networks of research, design, and material, which could help one to understand the hidden identities and specific agendas of the linked places (Hein, 2011, pp. 247-249). She states that mapping and analysing the impact of global connections on the built environment helps to trace simultaneous developments that reply dramatically to outside motivations.

As networks change in extent, duration, stability, or types of participants, that outside influence impacts on the design and transformation of new buildings and landscapes. With these networks increasing in the nineteenth and twentieth century due to industrialisation and globalisation, new insights were acquired into the importance of networks through time, into the long term impact of globalisation on built form and into the difference in networks of elites and their buildings. In the time of increased globalisation, Hein claims that a networked analysis can allow us to explore beyond the borders of a single city, region, or country, and to learn how specific economic activities influence the built environment and social conditions in distant locations. In this way, hidden identities as well as city branding activities cultivate a resonant understanding of any given city as a point in a network that extends across time, space, and social boundaries.
Figure 26: The overlaid actor network diagram
Figure 27: The actor network diagram of Tabanlioğlu Architects

Figure 28: The actor network diagram of curator of Istanbul Modern Levent Çağıkolu
Figure 29: The actor network diagram of the Prime Ministry Privatisation Bureau

Figure 30: The actor network diagram of Ersen Gürsel
Figure 31: The actor network diagram of Doğan Tekeli

Figure 32: The actor network diagram of academic İlhan Tekeli
Figure 33: The actor network diagram of academic Murat Güvenç

Figure 34: The actor network diagram of academic Uğur Tanyeli
Figure 35: The multi-sited understanding diagram of Akif Burak Atlar from Chamber of Planners

Figure 36: The multi-sited understanding diagram of Mücella Yapıcı from Chamber of Architects
Figure 37: The multi-sited understanding diagram of Tabanlioğlu Architects

Figure 38: The multi-sited understanding diagram of the curator of Istanbul Modern Levent Çalıkkoğlu
Figure 39: The multi-sited understanding diagram of Ersen Gürsel

Figure 40: The multi-sited understanding diagram of Doğan Tekeli
Figure 41: The multi-sited understanding diagram of academic İlhan Tekeli

Figure 42: The multi-sited understanding diagram of academic Uğur Tanyeli
Figure 43: The overlaid multi-sited understanding diagram of actors.
Figure 44: The chronological actor network and concern diagram
4.2. Congestion in the Port

Congestion in the port was a significant problem for the site during the 1970s and 80s. Istanbul port was not able to provide sufficient facilities for the increase in port activities, especially through the summer months. This was evidenced by the newspaper coverage of the period (1970-1990). Ten out of eighteen articles published at the time addressing and criticising the insufficiency of the port facilities. Tourist ships had to wait for hours to anchor at the port and Istanbul port was known in the international ranking as one of the most congested ports. In the 1970's master plan of Istanbul, there was no new designated area for port facilities and the existing ones at the time were not sufficient (Cumhuriyet, 15.8.1970). The construction of Salıpazarı port in the middle of the city was considered to be an expensive investment, and in the occurrence of southerly wind the port became unusable. The Salıpazarı port was brought into the possession of the Maritime Bank, however this was considered to be an ill-informed decision as the Bank did not spend anything on the modernisation of the port. In addition, during the peak of the touristic period in the summer season, the port could not be used for other purposes. Haydarpaşa port, on the other hand, could not act as an alternative as it was not deep enough. The growing number of cruise ships in the port was underlined in an article (Cumhuriyet, 17.8.1973). The year 1973 registered a 35% increase in the number of cruise ships visiting Istanbul in comparison to 1972, and this number was expected to increase even more in the following years. Nevertheless, no extension to the Istanbul port was constructed, that was one of the main reasons for congestion. In addition, the departure points of domestic ship lines were located in the same port where the cruise ships would arrive, which was another significant reason for this congestion. Sirkeci port was expected to take over this purpose when it was completed. Domestic ship breakdowns were causing long delays and as a result tourist ships had to wait, even though they did not spend a long time in any one city. An article published in 1974 criticised the congestion in Istanbul port by stating that the port was becoming more incompatible everyday due to increasing businesses, and as a result it was either the cruise ships or freight ships that could be allocated to the harbour (Cumhuriyet, 13.4.1974). In 1974, the authorities made a decision to allocate the Karaköy port for tourist ships only and Salıpazarı port for freight ships. Nonetheless, during the tourist season the space allocated for tourist ships was not adequate. For instance in April 1974 the passengers of two tourist ships had to be carried to Karaköy by ferries.
After many complaints and criticisms, in June 1974 decision makers made an arrangement for the use of the ports (Cumhuriyet, 5.6.1974). According to this master plan, Haydarpaşa port was designated to operate on full capacity and Salıpazarı port was allocated for tourist ships only. In addition, a new port was to be constructed in Zeytinburnu. However, in January 1975 complaints about the congestion in the İstanbul port were still continuing. Ongoing congestion was mainly caused by the trucks waiting in front of the warehouses for the loading and unloading of goods (Figure 45) (Cumhuriyet, 7.1.1975). It was suggested that these trucks should not pass through the city centre due to the fact that they were causing traffic congestion. The extension of the Haydarpaşa harbour and an increase in efficiency in Salıpazarı port were also suggested as solutions for avoiding the congestion in the port. Another suggestion was the extension of ports in Anatolia, such as Izmit port, which is strategically positioned for distributing goods into Anatolia. The congestion had an impact on the economy as well, causing an annual loss of 350 million liras, which was about ten and a half million sterling at the time.

The congestion problem did not seem to be solved after the introduction of the aforementioned improvements in the 1970s. Even more newspaper articles were published about new proposals to try to resolve the problems of the port during the 1980s. One example was a newspaper article that underlined the Bosporus as one of the most important waterways and İstanbul as a unique waterfront city with important connections to the Mediterranean, Aegean, and Black Sea. However, according to this article the harbour capacity was very limited for such an important city (Cumhuriyet, 12.3.1982). The 1200 metre long combined ports of Karaköy and Salıpzarı could only accommodate nine ships. Keeping in mind the needs of the following decades the authorities aimed to solve the problems of İstanbul port by extending the port facilities from Ahırkapı towards Kumkapı and to allocate İstanbul port to passenger ships only.

Congestion in the port was a particular problem for the Tophane port. Another problem was the existence of different claims for use of the site, sparking a competition between an international audience that arrived to the city by cruise ships and the local İstanbulites.
4.3. Building for the World or Building for the Locals

Alongside the discussions about the sufficiency of port facilities, there was also a controversy around the use of the warehouses, played out between the local and the global perspectives. The global perspective claimed that the Tophane site should link in with international trends through its development as a tourism area equipped with relevant facilities. The critical location of the site was a very important aspect in terms of these global ambitions. The site was considered to be a place that would be able to lift the image of the city and to advertise Istanbul. Since the beginning of the twentieth century, the site was always subject to the interest of global actors such as Ford, the Danish Construction Company Campex, and the Royal Caribbean Group, which were either involved as a user, investor, architect or contractor. The relevance of these global actors for the site can be observed from the Actor Network and Concern Diagram in Figure 44, particularly in relation to the concerns around the use and design of the site at different stages of its life, as well as the bidding process. Moreover, the site has a long history as a location of international trade, thus importing not only foreign goods, but also foreign ideas and
lifestyles. On the other side of the controversy is the local perspective that opposes the idea that the area should be used for tourism, and promotes the notion that the site should be opened for the benefit of locals instead. Additionally, this perspective is more concerned about the preservation of the cultural heritage of the site.

The Tophane warehouses were still used until the mid-1980s for the storage of goods imported by ships and were still under the ownership of the Turkish Maritime Institution. The Ministry of Transportation made a decision to terminate this function of the warehouses in 1986 and they became abandoned soon after. In January 1986, the Minister of Transport at the time, Veysel Ayasoy, and the mayor of Istanbul, Bedrettin Dalan, decided to take Salıpazarı away from the Maritime Administration and transform it into a tourism area (Cumhuriyet, 17.1.1986). However, this vision did not become a reality until 1993, when the site was privatised. When the site became abandoned, its redevelopment became the subject of attention from two very different perspectives. As mentioned before, the local perspective advocated rebuilding the site for the sake of the public good, whereas the global perspective favoured the redevelopment as a tourism area in order to attract tourists and global capital. Both perspectives produced their own actors with their respective concerns.

The Tophane site was not only used for hosting cruise ships and industry; it had a significant role in the global arena as a stage for suitcase tourism as well. Position on the intersection point of flows of ships, goods, and passengers brought the site a multi-functional use. The suitcase trade mostly revolved around the import of goods from the American market that were being sold to customers from Russia and at the same time a place for the distribution of American life style to Russians. The closure of the Salıpazarı port had a very negative impact on the suitcase trade. At the end of the 1990s there were two articles in Cumhuriyet reflecting on the suitcase trade and how badly it was affected (Cumhuriyet, 20.7.1998) (Cumhuriyet, 14.8.1999). Ships carrying goods from the American market were forced to wait in Salıpazarı port for a long duration and were not given enough time to load their goods, which was a discouraging factor for the suitcase trade. During summer, passenger ships were given priority in the harbour, which worsened the situation. This lack of proper port facilities made them choose Thessalonica instead as
their main port. As a result of the shift in suitcase trade to other ports, the shops specialising in suitcase trade in Laleli were forced out of business, although other factors contributed to these developments as well, notably the 1980s economic crisis, the devaluation of the Russian rouble and safety conditions in the area.

The fact that the warehouses were located centrally and close to a wide range of urban facilities made them attractive for a variety of stakeholders. One of the important actors is the neighbouring Mimar Sinan University, which showed interest in using some of the warehouses on the site in January 1987 (Uysal, 1987). This explains the appearance of the Mimar Sinan University as an actor in the Actor Network and Concern diagram (Figure 44) in relation to the design and use of the site. The number of students at the university was increasing yet the amount of space available for use by the university did not follow suit, encouraging the university to make a proposal for the use of some of the warehouses (Figure 46). According to this plan three warehouses by the shore and the warehouse along the Meclis-i Mebusan Road were to be demolished, and a new road connecting Kara Mustafapasha Road with Kemeraldı Road was to be constructed. According to the proposed plan, Fındıklı Park would be an open air exhibition space for the use of the university. However, this proposal of the Mimar Sinan University could not be realised.

The Mimar Sinan University was far from being the only actor to produce plans for the use of the Tophane site. The Maritime Administration was planning to build a new passenger terminal instead of the warehouses in Salıpaşarı (Figure 47) (Cumhuriyet, 5.9.1990). The warehouses were subject to a bidding process in order to facilitate their transformation into a hotel, business, shopping and entertainment centre. The bidders were given until the end of November 1990 to submit their offers. The general directorate stated that the transformation was on the table for some time and they wanted a passenger hall suitable for Istanbul's image. The article underlined that in 1986, when Dalan was the mayor of Istanbul, the same site was planned to contain jogging tracks and a park so that the 101000m² of space could be open for public use. In the new transformation scheme however, the Maritime Administration did not impose any restrictions for the entrepreneurs interested in transforming the site. According to the call for bidding, the entrepreneur could make any changes in the buildings and the site. Next to the 1120 metre long shore a new
passenger terminal was planned for construction. The general directorate building of the Maritime Administration was to be redeveloped as a hospital, while the terminal buildings were to become offices and administration. This proposed reuse adhered to global ambitions and global concerns in the sense that the promotion of Istanbul's image as a global city was advocated.

Figure 46: Newspaper article about the new passenger terminal in Karaköy and transformation of the site (Source: Cumhuriyet, 5.9.1990)

Figure 47: The proposed plan of Mimar Sinan University for the Tophane warehouses (Source: Cumhuriyet, 30.1.1987)
4.4. Privatisation and Economic Gain against Cultural Concerns

Subsequent to the previous part in which the conflicting global and local perspectives are explored, this part examines the controversies surrounding the privatisation of the Tophane site. The objectives behind privatisation of the site run parallel to the global perspective, which maintains that the site should play a part in creating a global image of Istanbul. Opposed to this perspective is the local one that is more concerned about protecting the cultural heritage and other historical aspects of Istanbul. The contradiction between these two standpoints became more exposed with the privatisation and subsequent declaration of the site as a tourism area, embodied by the Galataport project and the bidding process.

The decision to surrender the Tophane warehouses to the mercy of private developers was followed by an official pronouncement made in January 1998 by the Council of Ministries, which designated Salıpaşarı and Tophane a tourism area. The pronouncement immediately received criticism and reactions from the media, as can be evidenced by the newspaper coverage of the period (1991-2002). The Head of the Chamber of Architects at the time, Oktay Ekinci criticised the decision to allocate Salıpaşarı as a tourism area in his articles titled "Tourism strikes shake Istanbul" and "Port: new victim to tourism". He underlined that other tourism areas that were developed previously had negative effects for the city, such as the disappearance of the city's green spaces, the destruction of the city's historical heritage, and the damage to the city's silhouette, all due to the construction of high-rise hotels within the green parts of the city. Such developments took their legitimacy from tourism encouragement laws, which not only ruined the greenery and historical heritage, but also created land speculation in Istanbul. Beyoğlu, Tophane, and Salıpaşarı areas for example were declared to be tourism zones for the use of HABITAT. This move was considered as an occupation of the site that was against the development aims laid out in the master plan and was also seen as anti-democratic. Ekinci stressed the fact that the Tophane site had been operating as the only suitable passenger port since the 1890s and that this area was to be turned into a waterfront recreation area in the 1960s plans. Even though this site was declared to be tourism area, aimed for use as a conference, exhibition and fair for the HABITAT conference, this decision did not meet the
needs for democratic engagement within the contemporary city. The Chamber of Architects argued that the Ministry of Tourism did not have the right to prepare a plan for the area and subsequently submitted an appeal to cancel the plan for the Tophane warehouses. In addition, they argued that this area possessed no specificity that would justify its designation as a tourism area; it was a site with public buildings belonging to the Maritime Administration that was being used as a terminal for cruise ships. Even in the 1990s master plan of Istanbul, there was no alternative location proposed for cruise ships. Moreover, tourism centres were supposed to be designated by the Ministry of Tourism. In addition, Ekinci underlined that even if there was a new plan proposed for the site, it should serve the needs of Istanbul citizens and obey the shore law (Figure 29).

The most controversial episode in the life of the Tophane site was probably the Galataport project, which was put forward in 2001 as one of the most significant and prestigious urban transformation projects of the country. Most of controversy associated with this project revolved around the opaque bidding process and the urban program proposed for the site. The Tophane site was earmarked for privatisation by this time and was transferred to the control of the Prime Ministry Privatisation Bureau. The design of the project was prepared by Tabanlioğlu Architects (Figure 49, 50, 51). The Galataport project attracted attention from both the national and international media. Forty articles specifically on the Galataport project were published in Cumhuriyet Newspaper alone during the period 2001-2010. In addition, several international journals published articles about the project such as Architectural Review (2002), Abitare (2007), Marina World (2004), Architecture (2005) as well as national architectural journals such as Arredamento (2001), Yapi (2003), Portfolyo (2006) and Yeni Mimar (2006). National newspapers such as Cumhuriyet, Hürriyet, Radikal, and Sabah published several articles about the project during the period. When the Actor Network Concern Diagram (Figure 44) is examined, a concentration of actors can be detected in this period. Alongside the main concerns ‘Design’ and ‘Usage’ the new concern ‘Bidding’ appears, a concern that was never discussed by actors before. This particular concern has created a huge amount of controversy and has led to an enormous increase in the number of actors involved in the Tophane site.
Tabanlioğlu Architects placed importance on the publicity of the project, and consequently were interviewed by several newspapers and architectural journals. They attended international development fairs and conferences related with the project. In the Dubai Cityscape International Real Estate Fair, Galataport Project and Istanbul Modern were awarded the 2005 Cityscape Architectural Review Awards (Hürriyet, 22.9.2005). According to the jury report, Galataport introduced transport and cultural assets to the contemporary city (Ekonomist, 20.11.2005). The report also highlighted that the proposals did not tend to have an aggressive development approach; instead they tried to unite the historical values of the site with contemporary urban development. Provisions for the development of a wide interaction area for the residents of the city were also included. The reuse of an existing warehouse for the Istanbul Modern was also praised because the renovation of an existing building was executed in a sensible way with high quality architectural values and without any additional structures.

In the Galataport project, it was proposed to continue the use of the port facilities at the waterfront; however, the size of the terminal needed for the cruise ships was kept minimal. Besides the terminal functions, hotels, restaurants, cafes, shopping facilities, exhibition and fair spaces, and an aquarium were proposed within the 150000 m² closed space and 100.000 m² open space (Radikal, 3.4.2004). The second-degree listed monuments such as the post office building would be re-functioned as a hotel. The warehouse buildings were subject to transformation without demolition, made more transparent, and reused for cultural or commercial purposes.

In order to keep the site lively during the evenings, the architects introduced some housing in the site as well. There was a new semi open promenade proposed to run between the two sets of warehouses parallel to the road and the Bosphorus. A new shoreline arrangement was suggested with canals surrounding the warehouses along the shore. One of the main objectives of the Galataport project was to highlight the historical monuments in the site such as Tophane square, Kılıç Ali Paşa Mosque, Nusretiye Mosque and the clock tower. The new square would create a better connection with surrounding neighbourhoods such as Beyoğlu and Galatasaray. A three-storey car park underneath the
square was proposed while the square itself was designated as an open-air festival space with high quality landscaping features.

The project was advertised in the media through an article titled "New face to Karaköy shore" (Figure 52) (Cumhuriyet, 8.10.2002) in which it was reported that the project had an investment value of 148 million dollars. The Karaköy and Salıpazarı shore area was to obtain a contemporary look with the Galataport project, introducing a fair, as well as a congress centre and art museum (Zeybekoğulları, 2002). In her article, Mine Zeybekoğulları stated that the General Director of Turkish Maritime Administration at the time, Erkan Arıkan, declared that in this 1.2 km long site Istanbulites were not able to see the sea in the current situation. Through the development of the Galataport project, this site would come into public use and the historical buildings around Tophane square would be highlighted. The American market that was located in the site would be removed. As all the buildings in the site were second-degree historical value, they would be subject to functional changes and restoration.

In addition, after completion of the project one thousand and four hundred people would be employed. Arıkan mentioned that the aim of this project was to create a port suitable for the image of Turkey. Besides, the project would allow Istanbul to receive a share of the economic spinoff from the cruise tourism industry worth 20 million dollars, by encouraging cruise passengers to spend their money in the city. The project contained two hotels, at least one of which could be administered by a luxurious hotel chain. International hotel chains such as Radisson SAS and West Cord Hotels were among the actors interested in managing the proposed hotels, while the shopping facilities attracted the attention of Sabancı Group and Carrefour SA (Sabah, 18.3.2002). Bidding for the Galataport project was to take place on 24th August 2005 in the Maritime Administration building (Cumhuriyet, 11.6.2005). The construction of the project was expected to take about three years, while the bid would transfer the ownership of the site to the investor for 49 years.
Figure 48: Newspaper article titled "Port: new victim of tourism (Source: Cumhuriyet, 28.4.1995)"

Figure 49: Plan of Galataport (Source: Tabanlioglu Architecture Archive)
Figure 50: Galataport Project (Source: Tabanlıoğlu Architecture Archive)

Figure 51: Galataport project 2001 (Source: Tabanlıoğlu Architecture Archive)
Among the opponents of the Galataport project were the Chamber of Architects, the Chamber of Planners, some academics, various civil societies and a number of politicians. The Chamber of Planners sued the project with the support of the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality. This cooperation between the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality and the Chamber of Planners was quite surprising since these two significant actors are usually in opposition to each other due to their divergent political positions. The clash between the Ministry of Tourism on the one hand and the Maritime Administration and Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality on the other is interesting as well. Normally, governmental bodies are expected to operate in a certain hierarchical order. Mücella Yapıcı from the Istanbul branch of the Chamber of Architects evaluated the process leading to Galataport from a wider political economic perspective:
Especially in the year 1999, before the earthquake, there was a report of World Bank related with Turkey. What was said was that if Turkey wants to be jointed with the global economy, it must place one or two cities in the global urban hierarchy. Because at that time there was, and there still is, a dominant belief in all academic and economic environments that you are either inside this economical circle or not. There is no life for you if you cannot join this economic chain or adapt to this economic structure. Therefore you have to adapt to the circumstances of the economy. And meanwhile, in the 2000s, there were laws prepared for the European Union adaptation process. Very interestingly, at this point the biggest restructuring occurred economically. And as we have an economic structuring dependent on the construction sector, the urban areas in the country started to be seen as big economic development opportunities. This is a big mentality change, which had started in the 1970s after the world economic crisis. The process of marketing Istanbul as world city started. Concepts like “selling” and “marketing” Istanbul started to be used ideologically and literally. (Interview with Yapıcı, 2012)

Privatisation of urban land was another aspect Yapıcı underlined. She argued that concepts like vision-mission were applied to cities and that the most important vision projects were being presented as mega urban transformation schemes that are indispensable for neo-liberal planning. This process was interrupted by the Marmara earthquake in 1999, but around 2003 these mission vision projects regained pace. Yapıcı also pointed out that in the 1980s the neo-liberal economic model started to dominate urban policy in Turkey. This was at the same time as political interventions by the army and other anti-democratic tendencies occurred within Turkey. She related this anti-democratic period with the preparation of privileged laws and related public improvements, urban policy and city planning. She considered the Privatisation Law and Tourism Encouragement Law as part of these laws. As for the emergence of Galataport, Yapıcı claimed that the Tourism Encouragement Law was the biggest stimulant, since right after the approval of this law the Karaköy-Tophane-Salıpaşarı area was declared to be a tourism zone on 15th December 1994. This decision was made in disregard to the Preservation Council, which designated the Karaköy-Tophane-Salıpaşarı as a protected area together with Beyoğlu region only one year before on 7th July 1993. As a result, any future plans for the site could be prepared without being bound by preservation laws. She stated that at the Mipim- International Real Estate Fair in Cannes, the mayor of Istanbul, Kadir Topbaş, presented 25 mega urban projects, one of which was Galataport. One year before Mipim, in 2004, the Prime Ministry Privatisation Bureau and the Ministry of Culture
Directory of Investment and Administration prepared a plan that designated the Karaköy-Tophane-Salıpazarı area as a tourism district. Since this area was a protected site the plans had to first go to the Preservation Council. Yapıcı referred to the decision of the Preservation Council on 20 September 2004. The decision was to reject the plan for the following reasons:

It will be taken into account if a plan can be prepared that makes the cultural entities on the slopes that are surrounding the plan visible in the silhouette. The preservation area should be taken into account, the monumental buildings, historical customs buildings should be emphasised. The cultural entities should be recorded. The shore and the back parts of it should be reconnected visually and functionally. The function and structure density should be reconsidered depending on the bearing capacity of the preservation area (Interview with Yapıcı, 2012).

The Preservation Council was considerate about the historical monuments, the silhouette of the shore, and the density and building heights in the site. According to Yapıcı, the Bosporus and the neighbouring area of Beyoğlu were not taken into consideration in Galataport. However the decision of the Preservation Council was eventually cleared. During the consultation period in June 2005 the Chamber of Architects submitted an objection to the Galataport plan. However, they did not get any reply to their inquiry, which provoked the Chamber of Architects to send this plan to court.

The process of privatisation, as clarified by a government officer from the Prime Ministry Privatisation Bureau, was anticipated to adhere to a build-operate-transfer model. The privatisation process was managed by the Turkish Maritime Administration, while the final decision would be given by the Privatisation Bureau (Interview with Privatisation Bureau Officer, 2012). The master plan of the Tophane site was prepared by the Ministry of Culture and the bidding was realised according to this plan. The final approval would be given by the Privatisation High Council, which consists of the Prime Minister and four other Ministers. The bidding of the project was conducted during the court process on 24th August 2005 and was won by a Consortium of Royal Caribbean Cruises and Global Group, which was cooperation between the two businessmen Sami Ofer and Mehmet Kutman.
Eventually the outcome of the Galataport bidding process was deemed invalid due to the fact that the Ministry of Culture did not possess the right to prepare a master plan for a site that is part of the privatisation programme. Instead, the juridical authorities ruled that it was the right of the Privatisation Bureau to prepare a master plan in these areas. Here again, it is possible to detect a conflict between two different government bodies, in this case the Ministry of Culture and the Prime Ministry Privatisation Bureau. The network of governmental institutions involved in the bidding process is quite complex, with most of them linked with and emphasised by the actor Prime Ministry Privatisation Bureau (Figure 26 and 29).

4.5. The Architect and Architectural Value

The architectural value and industrial heritage of the Tophane site and the warehouses contained within it was another omnipresent concern that generated controversy among a wide range of stakeholders. This controversy can be detected easily among the interviews, with some of the interviewees believing that the warehouses have high architectural value and need to be transformed properly, and other interviewees considering the warehouses to have no architectural or industrial value at all and favouring their demolition instead.

Akif Burak Atlar from the Chamber of Planners for example considered the warehouses to be part of Istanbul's industrial heritage, as can all warehouses, former dockyards, shipyards, old factories, and gasometers (Interview with Atlar, 2012). Atlar also indicated that there are very successful examples of reuse of such kind of industrial functions in the city centres of Western Europe. The Chamber of Planners proposed the implementation of cultural functions for the Tophane warehouses, which was in line with the global tendency of reusing such buildings and regaining them for public use. According to Atlar, the Santral Istanbul site located beside the Golden Horn, which is now Silahtarağa Campus of Bilgi University, was one example of a successful transformation of an industrial site and the consequent re-use of the buildings for public use. He claimed that the Tophane area is in need of a similar transformation, considering such an endeavour as a contribution to Istanbul.
An opposing argument brought forward in this controversy around the architectural value of the Tophane site and its warehouses states that these warehouses should not be considered as industrial heritage at all and that there is no need to maintain them in such a prominent site. One example of this view is expressed by Levent Çalıkoğlu, the curator of Istanbul Modern, who rejected that the warehouses possess any industrial legacy and insisted that no organisation could claim that these buildings should stay on that site because of industrial legacy. Although he considered the transformation of the warehouses into Istanbul Modern beneficial, since it has allowed the warehouses to serve as an oasis of art in its current function, enabling Turkish art to become more accessible to the public due to its central location. This fact alone made them valuable according to him (Interview with Çalıkoğlu, 2011). Çalıkoğlu was still hopeful that the Galataport project would be constructed due to the importance of the project for Istanbul, and insisted that he preferred for Istanbul Modern to be included in the development process.

The identity and significance of the architect responsible for the design and preparation of the warehouses is an important factor in this controversy. Some of the interviewees and sources attribute the design of the warehouses to Sedat Hakkı Eldem, who was a legendary architectural figure of the 1950s and 60s. However, the warehouses are not included in his professional oeuvre. A biographical study of Sedat Hakkı Eldem’s retrospective works, written by Sibel Bozdoğan, Suha Özkan and Engin Yenal, suggest that the first studies of Salıpazarı, containing warehouses and offices, were made as early as 1930 and taken up again in 1958 as part of the larger Tophane Area Redevelopment scheme (Bozdoğan, Özkan, & Yenal, 1987, p. 152). According to them, the Tophane Area Redevelopment project, which can be seen in Figure 21, was designed by Eldem. In collaboration with the Campax Construction Company, Sedat Hakkı Eldem worked on the design of the warehouses and offices that were built for the Turkish Maritime Bank. Although several other books have been written about his life and his projects, none of these books contain any data about the Tophane warehouses. This lack of documented evidence creates several questions. Can the Tophane warehouses be attributed to this famous architect? If it is his project, is there a reason why it is not possible to find this project in his oeuvre retrospectively? If he did not design the warehouses, why do some
attribute them to him? If they were designed by him how can their design be evaluated within the framework of Eldem's architectural style?

Tabanlioğlu Architects, who prepared the Galataport project and who were responsible for the transformation of warehouse number 4 into Istanbul Modern, were one of several interviewees who argued that the Tophane warehouses were designed by Sedat Hakkı Eldem around the 1960s. Because of this conviction, Tabanlioğlu Architects decided not to ignore the original design during the renovation of the warehouse number four, even though the warehouses were constructed temporarily (Interview with Tabanlioğlu, 2012). This placing of value on the alleged original design of Sedat Hakkı Eldem can be interpreted as respect for the architect himself rather than any respect for the design features of the warehouses. This interpretation is supported by declarations made by Tabanlioğlu before, in which she suggested that the Tophane warehouses do not possess any architectural value by stating: "I do not think they have any architectural value. I do not see something like these buildings in that area necessarily. They are just rectangular boxes. Sedat Hakkı Eldem was told to design warehouses and he designed them. The fault is on the ones who made him build warehouses there" (Interview with Tabanlioğlu, 2012).

Similarly to Tabanlioğlu, practising architect and academic Ersen Gürsel also argued that the warehouses were designed by Sedat Hakkı Eldem. He tried to clarify the design decisions taken by Sedat Hakkı by examining the Tophane Redevelopment master plan (Figure 21). According to Gürsel, the warehouses were inspired by the typology of the shore palaces such as Ortaköy, Galatasaray High School, Kabataş High School, Dolmabahçe Palace, and Mimar Sinan University of Fine Arts. This typology was used in order to achieve continuity in the Bosporus silhouette. According to Gürsel, Sedat Hakkı designed the Tophane warehouses purely for functional purposes without considering any architectural quality, assuming that these structures would be temporary and that they would be demolished later in time. Parallel to Tabanlioğlu’s argument, Gürsel also does not think that the Tophane warehouses have any architectural value. According to him, the warehouses are just storage buildings that were built temporarily, intended to be
demolished but remaining in the site instead. He considered the warehouses as erroneous objects that block the view of the Bosporus.

On the other hand, architectural historian and critic Uğur Tanyeli, who wrote a book about the works of Sedat Hakkı Eldem, claimed that the Tophane warehouses were not designed by Eldem, with the exception of the ones attached to the office blocks along Meclis-i Mebusan Road (Interview with Tanyeli, 2011). During the preparation of the book about Sedat Hakkı Eldem’s projects, Tanyeli had the opportunity to see the entire archive of Eldem and during his archival research he did not come across the drawings of the Tophane warehouses along the waterfront. This lack of documentation convinced him of the idea that the warehouses on the waterfront were not designed by Eldem. He argued:

Sedat Hakkı has no relation with the first piece (warehouses along the Bosporus) because when we were preparing the book about him we saw all the materials in his archive. I remember there was just a small brochure in it, probably prepared by the firm that constructed the warehouses. However I do not remember that this firm built the other part. Sedat Hakkı made an addition of narrow office blocks to the warehouses by the street side. They were built, probably at the end of 1960s or the beginning of 1970s. They were constructed much later (than the warehouses along the Bosporus) (Interview with Tanyeli, 2011).

Tanyeli witnessed the construction of the warehouses along Meclis-i Mebusan Road while he was a student of architecture in the neighbouring Mimar Sinan University. However, he does not seem to remember the construction of the warehouses along the Bosporus. Based on his personal experience he was quite certain that the warehouses along the Bosporus were not part of Sedat Hakkı’s designs for Tophane. He argues they were designed by another firm at another time:

Their project was prepared completely differently. The warehouses are not buildings that Sedat Hakkı could have designed either. From the inside they are totally different... I cannot be more sure about anything else than this. Sedat Hakkı has no relation with the warehouses... I know there are watercolours of the office block drawings. Beyond this there was nothing about the warehouses in Sedat Hakkı’s archives. I can guarantee one hundred percent that the warehouses were not designed by him. They do not belong to his work by any chance. They have a concrete structure which was not even possible to pour in Turkey those days. You
will see the brutal concrete when you walk inside. I can easily say they were built with a different construction technology than the one prevalent at the time (Interview with Tanyeli, 2011).

Uğur Tanyeli evaluated the architectural values of the warehouses as well. According to him, the warehouses are not the best buildings for that site since they are rather bulky, and the suggestion that Sedat Hakkı Eldem designed them did not add to their architectural value. Based on his memory, Tanyeli stated that the blind facades of the warehouses used to face the Meclis-i Mebusan Road during the 1960s before the office blocks were built between the warehouses and the road. Tanyeli considered them as being among the worst buildings of Sedat Hakkı and argued that Sedat Hakkı would be reluctant to create such architecture. Tanyeli did not possess information that shows how Sedat Hakkı was awarded this project and why he would have worked on the project. He did not think they are important iconic structures and emphasised that more iconic buildings are being demolished all the time (Interview with Tanyeli, 2011). Yet he was not in favour of their demolition.

The architect Doğan Tekeli confirmed Tanyeli’s impression that the warehouses along Meclis-i Mebusan road were designed by Sedat Hakkı Eldem during the Menderes Period. Like Tanyeli, Tekeli also witnessed their construction during this period. He was not certain who designed the warehouses along the Bosporus; however, he argued that they were built before (Interview with Tekeli D., 2012). Figures 22, 23, 24 seem to support the argument that the construction of the warehouses along the Bosporus was completed before the construction of the warehouses along the Meclis-i Mebusan Road. According to Tekeli, the offices along Meclis-i Mebusan road showed traces of Sedat Hakkı Eldem’s architectural style, whereas the ones along the shore do not seem to depict his style. Tekeli assumes that the offices designed by Eldem were not the results of an architectural competition, but instead were given to Sedat Hakkı directly as a personal project, as Eldem was working in the unofficial capacity of architectural advisor to Adnan Menderes, the Prime Minister of the time. When the warehouses are evaluated within the framework of the architectural style of Eldem, Tekeli classified them among the least successful of his works. According to him, the warehouses of Sedat Hakkı have some form of architectural quality however; he considered the office blocks along Meclis-i Mebusan Road to be
monotonous, which becomes especially apparent because of the dominant position of the warehouses in the silhouette of Istanbul.

Why the warehouses were not mentioned among the works of Sedat Hakkı Eldem was a question Tekeli raised as well. He answered the question by referring to Le Corbusier: “If an architect does not publish a building then he did not embrace it himself”. Le Corbusier’s phrase echoes Tekeli’s argument that the Tophane warehouses cannot be among the work highly regarded by Sedat Hakkı Eldem himself; in the case that he was the actual designer. Even so, according to Tekeli the warehouses do contain certain architectural value, depicting a concrete structure language of the Auguste Perret period. Yet he questioned the importance of this architectural language for the historical identity of Istanbul. Tekeli argued that there might be some architectural values attributed to the warehouses later, highlighting the buildings as being “pure, functional, close to modern architectural principles, purified from decoration, plain and honest” (Interview with Tekeli D., 2012). The warehouses represent functional and economical structures to him, without any eclectic qualities, buildings that he considers to be the result of an honest and sincere attitude towards architecture. The obscurity about the original architect of the Tophane warehouses was made even more obvious when bringing other interviewees into the picture. For example, Mücella Yapıcı, from the Chamber of Architects, gave a different name as the designer of the project. She argued that it was not a project of Sedat Hakkı, but instead was carried out by Orhan Şahinler commissioned by the public sector. However, Orhan Şahinler is not confirmed as the original architect by other sources, neither by newspaper clippings, nor by other interviewees.

Even after careful archival research, it is hard to conclude with absolute certainty that the Tophane warehouses were designed by Sedat Hakkı Eldem. The newspaper articles of the time do not mention him as the designer. Considering his fame as an architect during this period one would expect his name to appear in the newspaper coverage of the time, if he was indeed the designer of the warehouses. The contradicting arguments of the interviewees do not help to clarify the situation. Yet, for many, Sedat Hakkı’s alleged involvement legitimises the existence of the warehouses in the site, even though it is claimed they were designed as temporary structures. Due to this respect for Sedat Hakkı
Eldem’s architectural legacy, the warehouse number four was eventually transformed into Istanbul Modern with minimum architectural interventions being made, thereby retaining the industrial character of the site and the warehouses for contemporary users.

4.6. Opaque urban politics

The bidding process that was aimed at awarding the construction rights for the Galataport project can neither be considered as straightforward nor as transparent. Here again it is possible to detect a vast controversial discussion emerging from within intricate networks. Secret meetings between politicians and bidders, court cases, governmental interpellation requests, resignation of ministers and politicians, and press conferences are some of the significant events linked to the Galataport bidding process at the time. Representing more than just an urban transformation project, the Galataport bidding process turned out to be a political scandal. Some of the most severe reactions to the bidding did not only come from the professional chambers, such as the Chamber of Planners and the Chamber of Architects, but also from several civil societies and academics. There is a significant amount of newspaper articles concentrating on the controversial bidding process surrounding the Galataport project. The hugely controversial nature of the bidding process can be easily detected in the Actor Network and Concern Diagram (Figure 44) through the increase in the number of actors involved in the site when this concern was introduced. The fact that already twenty seven articles had been dedicated to the topic during the months of September and October 2005 in the prominent newspaper Cumhuriyet alone, many of them on front pages, shows how controversial and significant the project was for the media and for national politics as well.

Sudden alterations to the urban regulations can be regarded as one example of the opaque urban policies applied to the Galataport project. The changes made to the Shore Law just before the preparation of the Cruise Harbour Plan, was underlined by Mücella Yapıçı as an example (Interview with Yapıçı, 2012). The Prime Ministry Privatisation Bureau prepared this change in the legislation of the Shore Law through the introduction of a new definition of cruise harbour. According to this change in the Shore Law, it would
become possible to anchor ships that carry people travelling with organised tours in the shores and bays. In these locations, five star hotels, shopping malls, food and drink centres, office buildings, tourism and trade centres, and housing facilities would be allowed to be constructed. Also included in this law was a very interesting definition of "a tourism oriented structure which will lift the image of the country". Yapıcı criticised this definition as being extremely vague, and without any limitations attached to it and claimed that these alterations would make all the shores a potential subject of aggressive redevelopment. For instance, in yet another controversial redevelopment plan, the Haydarpaşa project, the proposal to replace a historical railway terminal by congress facilities was based on this law. Yapıcı noted that these alterations are now included in the legislation, although they were obviously against the Shore Law and law number 860. (Interview with Yapıcı, 2012). She emphasised how much importance was given to the controversy surrounding the Galataport bidding in the media.

Yapıcı argued that the resignation of AKP politician Abdüllatif Şener and of the Minister of Culture and Tourism of the period, Erkan Mumcu, were direct results of the controversy surrounding the Galataport project. What is more interesting was the involvement of the Metropolitan Municipality in the court case together with Chamber of Planners against the government. The reason for this could be that the Municipality interfered with this plan. Yapıcı claimed that Minister Abdüllatif Şener was forced to resign from his party because he announced in the media that the planning process had been halted. Based on the lawsuits that the Chamber of Planners and the Chamber of Architects had initiated, the State Council eventually decided to suspend the bidding process. When we have a look at the Actor Network diagram of Yapıcı, (Figure 53) who is the representative of the Chamber of Architects Istanbul Branch, it is possible to see the actors involved in the Galataport bidding process: politicians, government institutions, ministries, as well as the Preservation Board. In a very similar way the actor network diagram of Akif Burak Atlar (Figure 54), who is the representative of the Chamber of Planners Istanbul Branch, contains similar governmental institutions, ministries, municipalities, and the Preservation Board. The reason why both these institutions are very much connected to the actors involved in the Galataport bidding might be to do with the fact that both the Professional Chambers were
much implicated in this bidding process of the Tophane site through their filing of a court case against the Galataport bidding.

Figure 53: The actor network diagram of Mücella Yapıcı from Chamber of Architects

Figure 54: The actor network diagram of Akif Burak Atlar from Chamber of Planners
Resistance against these opaque urban policies can be traced mainly to NGO's, civil societies, opposition politicians, and other public bodies. For understanding the politics and mechanisms behind current urban transformation programmes, the overarching framework that is drawn by İlhan Tekeli is very important. The Galataport project and the shady bidding process associated with it received a tremendous reaction from public bodies and from the media as well. Critique by the media can be seen as a factor that contributed to the cancellation of the project and the bidding. September and October 2005 were the months in which the largest number of newspaper articles about the Tophane port was published, ensuring that the Galataport project developed from a controversy into a scandal that led to the resignation of several political figures. In an article titled "Legal cover to Galataport" (Cumhuriyet, 19.9.2005), the politician Erkan Mumcu claimed that the illegal bidding process of the Galataport project was the reason for his resignation from AKP. He argued that the project violated the Shore Law and that there were improprieties in the bidding process. He criticised the fact that all responsibility was given to the Privatisation Bureau through a specially prepared law that eliminated the local municipalities and Ministries from the decision making process. In other words, the ability to produce urban policies was taken from the representatives of Istanbulites and given to the central government itself. The opaque character of the Galataport bidding was emphasised by Oktay Ekinci as well. According to him, the Shore Law ensured that waterfront sites should be opened for the use of the public, however through the implementation of the Galataport project the public's right to use the site would have been denied. Instead, this site was sacrificed to privatisation and speculation (Cumhuriyet, 19.9.2005). Ekinci underlined the fact that through the implementation of this project the historical monuments on the site would have been diminished and the silhouette of Istanbul ruined.

Another example of opaque urban politics is private meetings conducted between the political establishment and their supporting business community. One of these meetings was widely publicised. This meeting was reportedly between businessmen Sami Ofer, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Economy, Kemal Unakitan, and was about the Kuşadası Harbour bidding process. This bidding was organised in a similar way to the Galataport bidding process (Cumhuriyet, 23.9.2005). In fact there were several articles about the
shady bidding process and the fact that the construction of the Kuşadası shopping mall by Ofer’s consortium was suspended since the project was constructed against the requirements set out by the Shore Law (Cumhuriyet, 19.9.2005). Ofer’s consortium partner Mehmet Kutman declared that if necessary, he would have a law prepared for the Kuşadası Harbour shopping mall so that its demolition would be prevented. Eventually, such a special law was prepared for the harbour and the shopping mall was legalised. On top of that, the Prime Minister Erdoğan made a very striking comment, in which he declared that the only way to accomplish a successful economy was through the conduction of merchant politics.

According to the opposition, the Republican People’s Party, the private meetings between the Prime Minister and businessmen and the subsequent preparation of specific laws constituted the offering of public resources for private economic gains. Likewise, the shady bidding process was mentioned by journalist Ümit Zileli (2005). He referred to the analysis of Dirk Verbeken, the Turkish representative of the economic branch of the European Union, who stated that in Turkey privatisation projects were set up to favour a selected few, not only in the private sector but also within the government. For example, the Ofer-Kutman consortium was awarded the construction of both the Kuşadası cruise harbour and the Galataport project with extremely relaxed payment plans. The consortium offered 3.5 billion Turkish liras, however, the majority of the payment would only be made after 39 years of use allowing the consortium to gain profit from these redevelopment project before the government would see any financial return.

The Galataport project can be evaluated as a reflection of the contemporary perspective of the government on the restructuring of cities, which focuses on massive redevelopment of the built environment. Tekeli considered such an urban policy to be quite odd for a conservative government, since conservative ideology can be seen as an un-obstructive ideology, as opposed to a destructive one (Interview with Tekeli İ., 2012). In contrast, the conservative Turkish government became a destructive ideology. Tekeli explained the reasons for this:

How did this happen? This is very much related with the development of Anatolian Tigers. This Islamic group in Turkey restructures themselves by using two
ideological components of the modern. This is a new ideological formation. What is included is development ideology, democracy, and conservatism. They made a synthesis of these three. Therefore Islamism started to consume immensely, there was a change of minds and they started to say that Muslims are worthy of wearing brand products; also of having high towers. (Interview with Tekeli İ., 2012)

Urban transformation tendencies related to this conservative ideology are another important aspect to pinpoint. For instance, Tekeli claimed that this ideology promotes grandiose destructive construction as part of the transformation of the built environment in such a way that makes modernism seem to be respectful to history. The way conservatives legitimise this urban transformation process, according to Tekeli, is the idea that Istanbul will be transformed into a world city and that the existing rundown buildings hinder the prosperity of Istanbul. So the legitimisation comes from aesthetics. He underlined here that there is a similarity to the use of aesthetics for the legitimisation of post-modernist urban policies. Moreover, such policies neglect the cultural reference of places in the name of the aesthetics of the future. From this perspective, the Tophane warehouses could be evaluated as having no historical reference. Tekeli emphasised the fact that there was destruction in the 1950s when the Tophane warehouses were constructed, and that the fame of Sedat Hakki Eldem acted as a legitimisation for this destruction, as he was the alleged architect behind the design of the new warehouses. Now it is hard to demolish the warehouses, because of their alleged connection to Sedat Hakki Eldem. Tekeli also highlighted the change in use of the site through the reuse of the warehouses by biennales, and more recently by the Museum of Modern Art, which makes the warehouses a difficult target for demolition. The site was eventually stabilised through the implementation of this project due to the coalition between the private sector and civil society. Tekeli rightly wondered why this site was not demolished and reused in line with this destructive construction tendency, with the involvement of strong actors, such as TOKI and the Ministry of Environment and Urbanism.

Why did Turkey not demolish this site and rebuild it? Turkey could have demolished this site and have rebuilt it but did not. The fact that a few mechanisms were effective might explain this. One is the civil society; professional chambers were creating sensitivity on the issue. And second with this sensitivity big capital tends to make social responsibility projects. Big capital is expected to do social projects. Managing the allocation of the land without buying it, in a very prestigious location,
gives an opportunity to conduct an activity which is harmonious with the world’s current values. Another thing is that for reuse and transformation areas they fix their eyes on squatter areas. They demolish these areas and build new buildings instead. However for Tophane it seems like they did not succeed. There is resistance here and behind the resistance lies some mechanisms like the social responsibility projects of big capital and public opinion created by NGO’s. When these mechanisms come together there occurs something more like gentrification rather than urban transformation. A gentrification which is not in the residential area however, a different kind of area (Interview with Tekeli İ., 2012).

Another assertion put forward by Tekeli was that the responsibility to prepare the project of Galataport was transferred from the local municipalities to the Ministry of Culture. This decision was against the Municipality's law (Cumhuriyet, 23.9.2005). The Prime Minister Erdoğan's attitude towards this transfer of power can be evaluated as highly paradoxical. After the decision to designate nineteen new areas in Istanbul as a tourism region in January 1998, when Erdoğan was the mayor of Istanbul, he stated that such a decision equalled land speculation facilitated by the government and that Istanbul was being sacrificed for the economic benefit of a selected few without even consulting the Greater Municipality (Cumhuriyet, 23.9.2005). Considering Erdoğan's remarks, his involvement in arranging the bidding for a tourism area is shockingly inconsistent.

Coming back to Galataport and the reactions to it, the Greens Turkish Coordination was involved in a demonstration against the project in September 2005 (Figure 55) (Cumhuriyet, 25.9.2005). They claimed that if the project was realised, the site would be closed to public use due to the construction of new luxurious hotels and shopping malls. The project would negatively affect the historical buildings on the site and the Istanbul silhouette as well. The leader of the opposition party of the time in 2005, Deniz Baykal, stated that the Republican People's Party should press for an interpellation of the government in answer to the controversy surrounding the Galataport bidding. He stated that:

People think that when they are in the government they can do anything. Politicians organise secret meetings with the bidders. They prepare laws according to the needs of the bidders, the economy minister is boasting with marketing the country. He attends secret meetings with the bidders, and if that is not enough the Prime Minister himself attends such meetings. He hid this from the public. But then he
was left with no other choice than to admit it. This is corrupt, stinky politics (Cumhuriyet, 26.9.2005).

After the speech of Baykal, the Republican People’s Party prepared an interpellation request for the Prime Minister Erdoğan, the Minister of Economy Kemal Unakitan, and the Minister of Transport Binali Yıldırım based on the misuse of their responsibilities during the Galataport and Kuşadası bidding processes. They were accused of rigging the bids and damaging the public interest (Cumhuriyet, 15.10.2005). Likewise, journalist Mustafa Balbay accused the AKP government of being biased during the bidding and marketing process, and of selling public property cheaply, thereby creating a new cohort of rich individuals (Balbay, 2005). He referred to the assembly interpellation and three bids won by the same consortium Ofer and Kutman. The accusation that the AKP government was being biased and corrupt during several bids was repeated in several other newspaper articles.

The shady bidding process preceding the Galataport project, in which the winners were offered relaxed payment conditions, was not the only subject of criticism. There were also architectural and planning objections to the project. The fact that the project included housing in the site, consisting of 200 flats of 200 m², was heavily criticised since housing by the shore was against the Shore Law (Cumhuriyet, 30.9.2005). Moreover, the Chamber of Architects issued a press release stating that the public should still be able to use the shore and criticising the fact that during the bidding the ownership of the project was awarded to a single company, thus leaving the decisions regarding access and use of the site in the hands of that one company (Cumhuriyet, 6.10.2005). This overreliance on the initiative of only one investor was another factor that made the Chamber of Planners decide to sue the project.
Figure 55: Newspaper article about the demonstration of Yeşiller (Greens) for the cancellation of Galataport (Source: Cumhuriyet, 25.9.2005)

4.7. Building for Water or Building for Land

The Tophane site is in a significant location due to its close proximity to the city centre of Istanbul and the historical peninsula, thereby having a large impact on the silhouette of Istanbul. In this sense, what is being seen from the water is in some respects more important than the functions accommodated within the site itself. Istanbul's silhouette is a very important concern, particularly for the Preservation Council, as they want to protect the silhouette of the city and evaluate the impact of all design proposals accordingly. The Galataport project did not get the Preservation Council's approval mainly because of its concerns that it did not take into account the silhouette of the Tophane shore. In other respects, the view from the site is also more important than the functions accommodated within it. Salıpazarı is an entry point to the city similar to Haydarpasa and Sirkeci. Ebru Omay Polat emphasises that in old Turkish films passengers arrived at Haydarpasa and took a look at the historic city from the other side of the Bosphorus (Yeni Mimar, January
The symbolic value is present at the Tophane site as well, providing visitors to Istanbul who arrive by ships with a welcoming view. The site has a breathtaking view of the historical peninsula; however, during the decades of use as a customs area the public access to the shore was limited. The cruise ships by the shore were another factor in preventing Istanbulites from enjoying the view. In this sense, the designation of the site as private property, in the shape of luxurious hotels and shopping malls, rather than as a public domain is an important issue.

The concern here was that the implementation of the Galataport project would create a new barrier in front of the sea and that the only access point from the Beyoğlu neighbourhood to the shore would be totally ruined (Oral, 2005). Oral referred to a paper submitted for the UIA conference by Ersen Gürsel’s group, which proposes alternatives for the area such as the creation of a public space for socio-cultural facilities, and suggests that the cruise terminal could be built in Yenikapı-Zeytinburnu instead. Their argument is that tall cruise ships would act as a visual barrier in front of the shore blocking the view of the historical peninsula. Due to all the barrier buildings along the shore, it would be hard for Istanbulites to make good use of the waterfront.

The Bosporus silhouette cannot be separated from its historical setting and cannot be alienated from surrounding cultural entities. The Preservation Board stated that the historical value of the preserved area and the Bosporus silhouette had to be considered, and that the customs building and the other monumental buildings in the site should be emphasised. Moreover, demolished cultural buildings needed to be identified and their restitution project should be prepared. The proposed project should not exceed the building height of the neighbouring Mimar Sinan University, Kılıç Ali Pasha Mosque, and Nusretiye Mosque (Cumhuriyet, 21.9.2005) Prioritising what is being seen from the water over what is being built in the site, the Preservation Board's decision to resist the Galataport project clarified that the project might be incompatible with these preservation principles. However, despite the decision of the Preservation Board, the Maritime Administration went ahead and conducted the bidding without any changes to the project as reported in the newspaper article "Preservation Board outwitted" (Cumhuriyet, 21.9.2005) (Figure 56).
The winners of the bidding process, Mehmet Kutman, and the Coordination Council Member Mehmet Türkmen supported the project in a press conference. Türkmen claimed that their aim was not to construct skyscrapers and close the shore for public use (Cumhuriyet, 1.10.2005). The historic buildings in the site, such as the customs building and the Maritime Administration building, were earmarked for preservation and restoration and it was proposed that they would be reused as five star hotels. Türkmen underlined that there would not be additional floors added to the buildings. Through the implementation of the Galataport project, the site would be modernised and opened for public use. The architects that were responsible for the design of the Galataport project, Tabanlıoğlu, were interviewed by the journalist Zeynep Oral (Oral, 1 October 2005). In this interview, the architects were given the chance to explain the project and to defend it against all accusations (Figure 57). As a reply to the ongoing concerns of the public, Tabanlıoğlu clarified that the area would not be closed to public use and that 70,000 m² of the total 100,000 m² would be made into public space and the remaining 30,000 m² would be build-up area. The decision was to keep 600m of the 1.2 km long waterfront suitable for the docking of cruise ships. If these ships were relocated in the future, it would be possible to walk from Karaköy to Tophane along the shore. Tabanlıoğlu clarified that there were no skyscrapers in the design and no proposed buildings higher than the surrounding buildings, such as the warehouses or the century old buildings designed by Italian, Greek and Armenian architects. Tabanlıoğlu explained that they applied a 'facadist approach' to the historical buildings in the site, meaning that historical buildings' interiors would be cleared, but their facades would not be touched. The warehouse structures would be preserved and they would be cladded with steel and wood panels and re-functioned. Tabanlıoğlu claimed that the warehouses were designed by Sedat Hakki Eldem and constructed during the 1960s. She had the idea to keep warehouse number 4 and adopt it as a Museum of Modern Art. Tabanlıoğlu complained about the rules and regulations for construction in the Bosporus (Interview with Tabanlıoğlu, 2012). She stated that if the design was according to one rule it might be contradictory to another and that there were new sets of rules every day. She believed the Galataport project's hold off was politically motivated because these kind of projects are mostly political all over the world, and nobody would care about it until the amount of investment was announced. Tabanlıoğlu
Architects made a lot of effort to organise meetings with NGO’s about the Galataport project and to promote it in the media. Making architecture a topic of discussion and making people aware of their built environment was a major concern for Tabanlioğlu.

4.8. Recent developments

The Galataport project was in the headlines once again at the beginning of the 2010 when new attempts were made to renew the application of the project through a new bidding process. Several actors showed their interests for the project, one of them being the director of Istanbul Modern, the Eczacibaşı Group. They made an agreement with Akfen Holding to register a new bid on the port (Haber Türk, 21.4.2010). Other significant actors that showed interest were Eyal Ofer, the son of Sami Ofer who won the controversial Galataport bidding in 2005, and the Minister of Economy of Kuwait, Bader Mişari el Humaidhi (Sabah, 3.3.2010).

The site is being transformed into a space for public use in the form of art activities. One of the warehouses has been transformed into Istanbul Modern, a museum of modern art. Warehouse number 3, next to Istanbul Modern, is used temporarily for art exhibitions, as well as for the Istanbul Biennale. The costume and decoration workshops of the Ataturk Culture Centre (AKM) are occupying one storey of one of the other warehouses. Another warehouse is currently functioning as the customs hall for cruise passengers (Figure 58, 59). Consequently, all the warehouses are partially used for temporary purposes by different actors, primarily for arts and cultural functions. Warehouse number 5 is being transformed by Mimar Sinan University Academy of Fine Arts into a Museum of Contemporary Art. The design of this Contemporary Museum was prepared by another famous architect, Emre Arolat. He considered the transformation of the customs port area into a contemporary art museum as a progressive step, given the fact that since its construction the area had been spatially secluded and without public access. In his design, Arolat kept the reinforced concrete structure of the warehouse building as a gesture to the famous architect Sedat Hakki Eldem, the alleged designer of the warehouses. The concrete structure of the warehouse is understood to be a prominent element in the
building in terms of urban memory. Within the structural grid, Arolat proposed to place new containers that house the art works. A network of ramps and bridges would be used to link the containers, thereby providing pedestrian circulation (Figure 60, 61, 62).

However, the expectation is that the site will be the subject of more dramatic transformation in the near future, putting an abrupt end to most of these activities. The insistence on transforming the site into the main cruise port, despite all the objections from civil societies, is a concern to some stakeholders, as previously argued. However, the curator of Istanbul Modern has emphasised his support for this transformation and his eagerness to have the museum as part of the redevelopment.

The procedure for transforming the site was explained in detail by an officer from the Prime Ministry Privatisation Bureau. The construction of the Salıpazarı cruise harbour is included in the existing master plans of the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality and Ministry of Culture's 2007-2013 Tourism Strategy and Action Plans. After the cancellation of the Galataport project, the Privatisation Bureau started to prepare construction plans. When the interviews included in this research were conducted, these plans were in their last stage of preparation. After the completion of these plans, the Privatisation Bureau will ask thirteen institutions for their recommendations, these institutions being the Ministry of Communication and Transport, the Ministry of Environment and Urbanism, the Ministry of Agriculture, the Turkish General Staff of Armed Forces, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Culture and related municipalities. When these institutions approve, the plans will be sent to the Preservation Board and after their approval the plans will be referred to the Privatisation High Council. Eventually, the plans will be published in the official journal of the Privatisation High Council, which marks the start of a consultation period of 30 days. When this period is concluded, the Prime Ministry Privatisation Bureau will organise the bidding. However, the officer underlined that, unlike the Galataport project, no concept project would be produced for the prospective transformation proposals. Instead, the Privatisation Bureau would formulate construction restrictions, and ratios for different uses, in order not to restrict any investor. There was some reluctance to announce the exact ratios, as the plan was not approved yet, however the officer mentioned as an example roughly 15% green space, 10% terminal facilities and
so on. These were the minimum ratios the design had to adhere to, but the developer would have some flexibility in allocating additional space for the proposed functions. Thus the programme for commercial activities and accommodation spaces would all be decided in accordance to these ratios, although the provision for these activities could be altered according to the developers will. The officer also underlined that these functions and ratios were all subject to the Shore Laws and that in the case of the cruise port, allowed structures would be shopping facilities and hotels for the use of cruise passengers. After the preparation of the developer's design, the approval of the Preservation Board and the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality would be needed. These are the stages before the realisation of the project.

The significance of the location of Salıpazarı port, opposite and in proximity to the historical peninsula, and its prestige as a port of entry were stressed by the officer from the Privatisation Bureau. It is one of the most popular destinations among cruise companies, which makes Salıpazarı port important in respect to tourism and advertisement of the city. The officer stressed that in the current situation the site is closed to public access and not very secure, but that after privatisation the site was expected to become open for public use. This evaluation remains controversial though, taking into consideration the proposed functions. Customs terminals generally do not allow public access, and luxurious hotels are not designed to be accessible to all, whilst shopping malls are places of commercial activity that are targeted towards the affluent consumer and therefore often have controlled access. In the prospective plans for the site, historical buildings currently in use by the government will be restored and re-functioned as hotels and for other uses, giving the site a very different appearance. The future of Istanbul Modern as part of the transformation process was also clarified by explaining that their contract allowed the museum to use their current facilities for a further 28 years. During the process of construction of the new scheme, the museum might have to relocate because of the need for structural strengthening of the warehouses it currently occupies. The harbour and historical monuments within the site would also be subject to structural strengthening.

A new bidding process for the thirty-year use of the Tophane site started in May 2013. The bidding was covered by the media with great attention; one article even considered
the new bidding as the rebirth of Galataport (Figure 63) (Milliyet, 17.05.2013). This time, the same actor involved in the previous bidding, Global Group, registered in collaboration with Özel Real Estate. Other interested companies involved in the bidding process were Alsim Alarko, Polimeks-Folkart, and Torunlar Real Estate. The site was eventually acquired by the Doğuş Holding for the sum of 700 million dollars (Milliyet, 16.5.2013). Much surprise has been expressed about the size of this sum, inspired by comparisons made with the 2005 bidding that awarded the use of the Tophane site for 3.5 billion Euros. The CEO of the Doğuş Group, Hüsnü Akan, declared that the project would emphasise Istanbul as a brand city and that the Doğuş Group planned to invest 350 to 400 million dollars for the development of the site. After the completion of the bidding the real estate values increased rapidly in the neighbourhood. The plan is anticipated to be completed within three years and is expected to be developed not only for tourism but also retail facilities (Milliyet, 28.06.2013) (Figure 64). Since 2005 the number of good quality hotels in the neighbourhood has increased rapidly targeting the international tourists arriving in Istanbul by cruise ships. The first act after the acquirement of the site was to remove the sheesha shops and restaurants located in the site, prompting the shop keepers to start a juridical battle as they did not want to be displaced (Milliyet, 25.4.2014). They are not the only ones resisting the new Galataport project. The Istanbul City Defence group argued that the Galataport project aimed to be realised in disregard of all planning conditions and preservation laws, and that Beyoğlu is to be transformed for profit only, without considering the quality of life. The group interrupted the official meeting of the Ministry of Environment and Planning in which the project’s effects were the subject of evaluation, and consequently the meeting could not be concluded (Milliyet, 20.8.2014). This event highlights the contested nature of the project and seems to indicate that the site will continue to be contested because of the involvement of a range of different actors with different interests and concerns. The protests and court cases against proposals for the Tophane site do not seem to be nearing conclusion anytime soon.
Figure 56: Newspaper article stating the Preservation Board's decisions about the Galataport project outwitted (Source: Cumhuriyet, 21.9. 2005)

Figure 57: Newspaper article "The future of port Galata" where Tabanlioğlu architects explain the Galataport project (Source: Cumhuriyet, 1.10. 2005)
Figure 58: Interior view of one of the warehouses used as AKM costume and decor ateliers temporarily (Source: Personal archive, photo taken 12 February 2012)

Figure 59: Interior view of one of the warehouses used for customs functions (Source: Personal archive, photo taken 12 February 2012)
Figure 60: Arolat Architect's warehouse number 5 transformation project night view (Source: http://www.emrearolat.com/2012/08/22/museum-antrepo-5/ accessed 14.11. 2013)

Figure 61: Arolat Architect's warehouse number 5 transformation project (Source: http://www.emrearolat.com/2012/08/22/museum-antrepo-5/ accessed 14.11. 2013)
Figure 62: Arolat Architect's warehouse number 5 transformation project view from Meclis-i Mebusan Road (Source: http://www.emrearolat.com/2012/08/22/museum-antrepo-5/ accessed 14.11.2013)

Figure 63: Newspaper article reporting the latest bidding for Galataport (Source: Milliyet, 17.5.2013)
4.9. Conclusions

In the last two chapters Site Life of Tophane Warehouses and Mapping Controversies, a thick description and a controversy mapping of the Tophane site were conducted which include narratives relating to the trajectory of the site. The way the site transformed from an artillery barracks into the first Ford Motor Company and the first free zone of Turkey were explored, as well as the subsequent transformations of the site during the Post Ford period leading up to the Galataport proposals. In addition, the controversies around the transformation of the site have been focused upon, particularly the controversies surrounding the Galataport project. The major dimensions of these controversies were discussed; thereby aiming to make the voices of the actors involved in these controversies heard and move these actors to the front of the stage. Related with the centrality of the site, the intense number of various actors in the controversies surrounding the site can be witnessed. The site is a complex whose outlines are never clearly defined.
The aim in the last two chapters was to show all the series of transformations experienced by the site, and clarify these transformations by presenting different types of visual data such as historical maps, actor network diagrams, newspaper clippings, and architectural drawings. In order to show these series of transformations, sometimes the related processes had to be dismantled into different elements such as actors, networks and their concerns. In other cases, transformations were shown by analysing the references provided by actors in order to grasp their multi-sited understanding of the site. The production and presentation of timeline diagrams has helped to clarify the outcomes of this analysis.
CHAPTER 5

RECLAIMING THE WATER

Water is not a passive, natural element in the Tophane site, but rather an important non-human actor playing a significant role in the trajectory of the site. The Tophane site is located along the shore connecting the Bosporus with the Golden Horn, and this strategic location enhances the role of water in the life of the site. The crucial role played by water became more apparent after interviews were conducted with the actors involved in the trajectory of the Tophane site, highlighting the fact that many actors refer to the location along the water when explaining the specificity of the site. This chapter will start with conceptualising water as a fluid actor and will make use of cultural geography literature to explain the link between architecture and flows, drawing on the assumption of fluidity of architecture rather than the solidity of buildings.

The chapter will tackle the following questions: What does the modernist, industrial notion of water entail? How did the environmentalist consciousness regarding water emerge? What factors contributed to a change from the modernist notion of water, and how can the contemporary understanding of water be defined? The focus of this chapter will be put on the significance of water as a non-human actor in Istanbul, and in the Tophane site specifically. The discussion will benefit from data collected from secondary sources, archival research as well as interviews conducted with the actors involved in the trajectory of the site or academics who have expertise on the topic.

How can the concept of flow best be described? Rob Shields claims that flows have a tempo and rhythm along with direction. Instead of being only processes, flows have content. This is the significance of the material quality of flows (Shields, 1997). According to Shields, flows have the advantage of being able to alter the idealist notion of processual change into the changing material itself. The definition of process is based on the notion of a definite line or path between a point of origin and a point of destination. In contrast, flows
denote pure movement without a point of origin or destination, just movement, fluidity and direction. He claims that flows are relational between objects or fixed points, but not in a positional or structural sense. Jacobs and Merriman argue that architecture can be understood as fluidity, rather than the solidity of buildings (Jacobs & Merriman, 2011, p. 214). Instead of conceiving architecture as an enclosure with openings such as windows and doors or as technologies like air-conditioning and communication lines, apprehending architecture as open and in terms of lines, shapes, forms, and continuity between interior and exterior helps to connect the built environment and its users with the world in different ways.

Set within a world of increasing global flows, Loretta Lees argues that architecture is an important way of tying up identities and of constructing a material connection between people and places. Architecture is more than representation; it is performative, it hosts continuing social practices through which space is continually shaped and inhabited (Lees, 2001, p. 53). Maria Kaika elaborates on this connection between flows and the urban by stating that the carriers of flows that form the urban are technological networks of water, gas, electricity, information and so on (Kaika, 2005, p. 28). Technology networks have a central role in the production of modern cities, as they are part of modernism’s pursuit to sanitise and rationalise urban space. She also underlines that although technology networks are important for the function of the contemporary city, they are hidden, opaque and invisible; disappearing underground, locked into pipes, cables, conduits, tubes, passages, and electronic waves. In previous times these networks were often visible, for instance water towers, dams, pumping stations, power plants, and gas stations, however, they became subject to historical changes in their material presence in the cityscape. Kaika describes these visual landmarks of technological networks as the iconic manifestations and spirit of, a technologically scripted image and practice of progress.

The dynamism and fluidity of spatial organisation are important factors contributing to the on-going development of the built environment. As well as the built environment’s dependence on technological networks of flow, its architecture can be regarded as a flow of spaces facilitating the movement of human beings. Historically, water has been one of
the most crucial manifestations of urban flow. In the following sections the continuous change of the notion of water over the centuries will be further analysed.

5.1. Industrial Notion of Water

Water has always played a significant role in cities since ancient times. Craig-Smith and Fagence argue that water has long attracted urban development. The presence of a river has been a common feature even among the earliest cities of Mesopotamia. Almost all the great cities of Europe have a close association with a river or sea. Water provided a source of drinking water, a means of transportation for building materials and food, a source of power, a means of power or a point of attraction. Even though significant changes occurred to the city with the arrival of the Industrial Revolution, its dependence on water was not affected. Most of the great industrial cities of the nineteenth century, such as London, New York, Buenos Aires, Cape Town and Sydney, were located near water. In the early Industrial Revolution ships were the main mode of transport thus navigable access became the major factor for economic viability. Even though the invention of the railway eventually rendered water inefficient as a means of transport for the internal distribution of goods, for the transportation of bulky goods between continents there has never been an alternative to water. A network of major trading ports emerged on every continent, which was utilised to extend the political influence of European powers in lands previously unchartered. Craig-Smith and Fagence claim that only now, in the time of post-industrial cities based on services, is there little practical need for close association with water (Craig-Smith & Fagence, 1995, p. 1). Instead, water is used as an attraction feature. Kaika explains the changes in the notion of water as:

The apotheosis of the "engineering era" -the process of modernising Western cities- ran from the late nineteenth century through to the first three quarters of the twentieth century. Modernity's Promethean project culminated during this period with large-scale infrastructure projects taming nature and making it work for the benefit of capitalist expansion. And water was central to it: rivers were harnessed from miles away to feed the growing urban population or dammed to provide electrical power for industry, while mountains were pierced to provide transport routes for people and trade. These projects heralded a new relationship between human beings and
nature, between nature and the city. Instead of being fearful and threatening, nature became tame and serviceable, a prerequisite for development. In turn, the city was reconceptualised as a realm outside the reach of nature's processes (Kaika, 2005, p. 107).

Nature and water became tamed for the service of human beings as a result of the modernisation of nature that Kaika dubs a "Promethean project". Water has been used in the industrial era for several purposes; to provide port facilities for the import and export of goods, to facilitate shipbuilding and maintenance, to supply the manufacturing industry, to provide drinking water through reservoirs, and to generate electric power (Craig-Smith & Fagence, 1995, p. 5).

Ports have been crucial not only for industrial purposes but also as a place for social change and confrontation. For example, Carola Hein puts forward that ports are essential for the movement of ideas, the facilitation of social change, and for the promotion of cultural phenomena including architecture and urban form (Hein, 2011, p. 2). Ports are the connection nodes in a multi-faceted network and they affect each other and the cities and regions nearby by developing an embodied legacy in the street layout, land-use patterns and building typologies of port cities. Hein argues that international maritime networks are exemplary for the establishment of dynamic, multi-scaled, and interconnected port cityscapes and that there are multiple forces influencing the creation of these cityscapes, such as technological requirements, elite preferences, working class needs, urban policy and globalisation. The trading areas and networks of a city might evolve and change; thus the local urbanites adapt and transform the built environment accordingly. Beautiful landscapes have been created on the riverside by joining mankind's creations to those of nature. Roy Mann considers the riverside as a unique and irreplaceable resource at the interface between the land, water, air and sun and highlights that some of the earth's most productive plants can be found there (Mann, 1973, p. 14). However, water was often used concurrently for the flow of drainage or for the purpose of sewage treatment, thereby creating severe pollution. According to Mann, the sources of pollution are located where human mankind works, lives, and releases organic and mineral wastes into the environment. He argues that before industrial civilisation developed sewer systems,
societies failed to grasp the problems of riverside use and abuse that resulted from increasing economic and technological growth. The increasingly rapid change caused wasteful consumption of the water's edge; thus short-term irreparable damage was inflicted upon riverside lands. The pollution of the shores is made worse by the construction of power generating plants, industries such as steel, pulp and paper and petrochemicals, sewage treatment plants, solid-waste disposal facilities, and ports. Mann states that the riverside will be increasingly affected by the existence of polluting structures, with damaging impacts on the ecological, recreational, and visual values of our fast-disappearing natural shorelines, unless a product is produced that increases pollution loading in the river or the pollution is treated (Mann, 1973, p. 15). It is a common and alarming task to correct the ecological mistakes of the industrial age and to clean up the derelict waterfronts. Mann underlines the importance of making use of ecological and landscape planning efficiently as a way to prevent the repetition of old mistakes. He mentions that some attempts to reuse abandoned warehouses with new functions have caused new obstacles to public access and use of the water's edge (Mann, 1973, p. 20).

Waterfronts demand the highest priority in the mission to conserve and protect the ecological system, as they are the last open links between the urban and natural worlds, the last remaining opportunities for urban dwellers to reinstate access to water. Mann states that riversides hold the biggest hope for starting a revival of confidence in the urban physical environment, more than any other catalyst, thus it is important to manage them well.

However, there is a growing public awareness of the ecological value of the water's edge. Sieber stressed that the cooperation between public, private and non-profit sectors works to improve and promote urban waterways as natural resources (Sieber, 1991, p. 125). The increase in environmental consciousness usually paves the way for waterfront revitalisation, for regeneration of urban waterways by developing parkland, offices and residential facilities. Sieber explains that this process is the result of the decline in trade, marine industry and commerce, and the rise in perceived importance of aesthetics and public health in public waterfront programmes. The rise in environmental consciousness is relevant in the Tophane case study, and especially tangible in the attempts made by several mayors of Istanbul to improve the cleanliness of the Golden Horn. By the end of
the 1980s, Mayor Bedrettin Dalan initiated a waterfront revitalisation project along the Golden Horn that included the reclamation of land. The main purpose of the project was to clean up this precious area, thereby contributing to the image of Istanbul as a global city. The project involved a relocation of the discharge units of the sewage system and the elimination of pollution sources such as industrial facilities (Günay & Dökmeci, 2012). This beatification project can be seen as a catalyst for the large scale Galataport project, which aimed to develop the global image of Istanbul even further.

Water has played a major role in the life of cities, either as a source of drink, a means of transport, a power supply, or as facilitator of trade. It is indispensible for industrial production. Although waterfronts have often been subject to severe pollution during the industrial era, the increase in ecological awareness has led to urban waterfronts regaining their important role in the city as an attraction point, a place for pleasure.

5.2. Public Use of Waterfronts

The notion and use of water has changed quite dramatically over recent decades. Water used to be a natural element extensively exploited for transport and industrial purposes, however, in more recent times water has become a place of pleasure, an attraction point, and an escape from everyday pressures. Citizens prefer to be near the water, to walk along it or to live in proximity to it. Sieber defines this new understanding of waterfronts as places of play, not work, and as places of “release from the common tensions of urban life and work” (Sieber, 1991). According to him, the new waterfronts are designed to encourage a continuous festival atmosphere that serves both tourists and the locals, a tendency that fits in well with the current redefinition of cities as enjoyable places to be. Sieber highlights that it is important to recognise that nature is being understood, interpreted and managed scientifically. According to him, the edge of extensive surfaces of water gains meaning as the external limit of organised urban life, even though the tendency leads to the sharpening of the boundaries between city and nature.
Parallel to Sieber’s understanding of the changing notion of the city and the water contained within it, Mari Balibrea claims that the city turns into a lucrative, luxurious, and fun commodity that can be easily consumed by the tourist (Balibrea, 2001, p. 189). The city turns into a leisure space that is commodified continuously. This process of commodification of the city is called "city branding" by Garcia, while Evans calls this "hard branding". The fact that the Tophane site is situated along the water influences the dynamics of the site. Both the strategies of creating a festival atmosphere and city branding have had an impact on the dynamics present in the Tophane case. If the site had been landlocked, different relations and dynamics would have been present. When the dynamic life of the site is followed we can detect the emergence of a mixture of leisure and work activities in the proposed Galataport project. In this project, it is possible to discover the incorporation of the cruise boat facilities alongside the introduction of a festival atmosphere through retail facilities such as a shopping mall, luxurious hotels, aquarium, and cafes. In this respect, the Galataport project can be considered as a proposal that aims to replace the remnants of the old, industrial interpretation of the waterfront with a contemporary one based on leisure and entertainment.

5.3. Notion of Water in Istanbul

The function of waterfronts in the contemporary city has shifted towards public facilities and leisure activities, a tendency that can be linked with the Tophane case by emphasising the specificity of water in Istanbul. The following part of the chapter is based mainly on data collected from interviews and analysis of the newspaper Cumhuriyet, as part of the fieldwork. In addition, secondary sources will be used for underlining the specific notion of water in the city of Istanbul.

Set within the context of constant change in the city, the Bosporus and Golden Horn seem to be the only constant elements of Istanbul. Ayşen Ciravoğlu claims that water makes Istanbul what it is; it is the only element in the city that does not change. The fascinating silhouette of Istanbul is presented from the Bosporus, the Golden Horn, Göksu River and
the Marmara Sea (Ciravoğlu, 2008). The urban life and the everyday practice are reflected on the water. The author elaborates on the specific notion of water in Istanbul:

Istanbul's change/transformation can also be read in the various states of water like rain, puddles, traffic, floods, tsunami, decorative fountains, wells, manholes, water basins and water shortage. The absence of water triggers water shortage, even the slightest drop of rain causes traffic jams and when it insists on pouring down the settlements located in the valleys are flooded. Water hides beneath dislodged pavement stones, it is the hero of a tsunami that is often expected to form after the earthquake which hasn't yet managed to hit; the othered children of the city cool off in decorative pools, children fall into wells and manholes when their lids are left open and finally, it is again the same water in infrastructural networks traversing the whole city. Yet, in the face of the never-ending internalised change in Istanbul, people always get nostalgic and can't help but say, "it wasn't like this in the past (Ciravoğlu, 2008, p. 348).

What makes Istanbul different from other coast cities is the existence of the Golden Horn that opens up into the sea. Gül Köksal underlines the fact that everything in Istanbul began in and around the Golden Horn, a sea arm that divides the city into three land masses. Civilisations that have settled in this geographic location made use of the Golden Horn as a naturally sheltered harbour, a strategic location, and an open passageway to the Bosphorus, the Marmara Sea and the Mediterranean (Köksal, 2008, p. 128). That is why it was the location for the trade port and ship building facilities of Istanbul. The Golden Horn contains an abundance of historical and archaeological remains from the Byzantine and Ottoman Periods. The Golden Horn Dockyards were founded in 1455, during the Ottoman period, on the northern shore of the Golden Horn. In addition to these dockyards there were other dockyards located along the Bosphorus such as the Şirket-i Hayrîye Dockyards and the Istinye Dockyards. Köksal stresses the multi-cultural and multi stratified structure of the Golden Horn, which can be witnessed in the presence of a diverse range of urban functions, such as trade, administration, education, religion, and entertainment. Until the mid seventeenth century, the Golden Horn was an area with very few houses, but after the eighteenth century the area started to be used for industrial purposes, as witnessed in the construction of industrial buildings on the shore. The Golden Horn hosted the second longest dock yards in the world after Venice (Köksal, 2008, pp. 128-29).
manufacturing activities occurring along the Golden Horn varied from ship building to brick production, from fabrication of fezzes to weaving. The dockyards, flour mills, ship iron workshops and military plants, Feshane (Fez factory) and the Cibali Tobacco Factory were built during the nineteenth century. Köksal claims that the functional continuity of the dockyards enables a lively production atmosphere and leads to surprising urban encounters; its place in urban memory is not limited to the past and strong enough to form a place in the memory of future generations (Köksal, 2008, p. 131). He reminds us of the plan prepared by Henri Prost for Istanbul in 1936, in which the industrialisation along the Golden Horn was intensified.

After the rapid industrialisation and urbanisation in the 1950s, the shore was covered with industrial buildings accompanied by squatter settlements. During the end of the 1980s intense transformation occurred along the Golden Horn shore. Köksal argues that the former mayor of Istanbul, Bedrettin Dalan, caused an uncontrolled erasure of industry in the area during a phase of tabula rasa transformations. Some examples of the radical transformation applied during Dalan’s period can be seen in Figure 65 and 66. From the 1990s onwards, redevelopment projects continued to be directed towards the Golden Horn. Feshane-i Amire was transformed into a multi-function venue and the Cibali Tobacco Factory was transformed into Kadir Has University, while the Fener-Balat neighbourhood experienced a rehabilitation programme. In addition, the Şirket-i Hayriye Dockyards were transformed into Rahmi Koç’s Museum Lengerhane, and the Silahtarağa Power Plant was transformed into Santral Istanbül, which is a Science Museum managed by Bilgi University.

In the specific case of the Tophane site, the significance of the warehouses as the visual remnants of a vanishing port was one issue mentioned by all the actors interviewed. However, when their unique location is taken into consideration, the actors questioned the initial decision to construct the warehouses there. Some of them claimed that the warehouses act as a barrier, an obstacle for Istanbulites to see, reach or use the waterfront and favoured the removal of the warehouses instead, while others supported the idea of preserving the warehouses as a link to the industrial past of the site. These conflicting aspirations highlight how significant water, and the associations attached to it, is for Istanbulites.
Figure 65: Bedrettin Dalan former mayor of Istanbul visiting a construction site. (Source: www.sihirlitur.com.gazete.sayfa6.html_accessed 26.07.2014)

5.4. Conception of Water in Tophane Port

The Golden Horn and the Bosporus have always played significant roles in the life of Istanbul. The location of the Tophane port at the intersection of these two waterways makes the site vitally important as well. The importance of the Tophane port in the history of Istanbul was mentioned by academics, who have expertise on the urban history. It is a site situated just opposite the historical peninsula, facing historical wonders like Topkapı Palace, Hagia Sophia, and Hagia Irene.

This section will discuss three aspects of the conception of water in the Tophane port. The historical use of the Tophane site as a port of Istanbul will be the first aspect that will be considered. This aspect was quite controversial among the actors, as some of the planners did not support the fact that the site is nowadays being used as cruise port. The private and public use of the Tophane site is the second aspect that will be further discussed. All the interviewees supported the idea that the site should be accessible to public use. Some actors argued this could be achieved by the privatisation of the site, while others did not support privatisation and claimed that once it is privatised the site would become closed to the public. The views from the water and the views of the water is the third aspect that will be further elaborated in this section. The site is very prominent in Istanbul’s silhouette as seen from the water, and has stunning views of the Bosporus and historical peninsula. However, historically it has been closed to public access due to its customs function, while the cruise ships that are anchored along the shore nowadays are considered to prevent Istanbullites from enjoying these views as well. Over the years this situation has generated a lot of criticism. With the implementation of Istanbul Modern, it has become possible to catch a glimpse of the stunning views.

5.4.1. Use of the Tophane Port

Tophane has been used for a long time as a port for Istanbul for freight ships carrying goods to the city, or more recently, as a port for cruise ships carrying tourists. These port activities have had a significant impact on the spatial organisation of the site. The arrival of
goods in the port necessitated the construction of the warehouses and insurance facilities. Cruise tourism requires customs facilities. The importance of the port has been underlined by many of the actors by emphasising its historical significance. However there were also many opinions questioning the suitability of the site as the main port of Istanbul. Doğan Tekeli mentioned that the emergence of the steam ship during the Tanzimat period (1839-1855) and the changes from caravan trade towards ship trade were the reasons why Tophane was chosen as the location for a port. Subsequently, there was a need for a lot of space for storing the goods arriving in the harbour (Interview with Tekeli D., 2012), a need that triggered the demolition of the artillery barracks and the construction of warehouses. Subsequently demand for larger port facilities eventually rendered these warehouses useless. According to Doğan Tekeli, the integration of the now abandoned area into the city life in a vivid way is important, as the site possesses a precious waterfront, close to the centre and facing the historical peninsula. However, he underlined that this renewal has to have two features; firstly it should be legal, according to regulations and secondly, it should have a good design quality. In addition, the transformation has to be consistent with the vision of the city presented in the master plan (Interview with Tekeli D., 2012). Tekeli argued that the area has to contribute to city life, but that not every warehouse can be transformed into a museum. He provided the shore of Stockholm as an example of successful use of a shoreline, where hotels and other big buildings are visible in the silhouette without dominating it.

The importance of the port and the nearby historical monuments for Istanbul’s urban history was underlined by Ersen Gürsel as well. He stated that Tophane has been in use as a port since Roman times and that during late Ottoman and Republican periods the site continued to function as such. The reason for this particular site being so important is that it is located in the centre of the city and that it is a suitable place to anchor, a port which naturally allows high-loaded ships and freight ships to approach. He argued:

In 1895 this port was constructed, however, until that date this area was used as a port. In 1453 Tophane-i Amire was constructed to produce artillery. These were brought from the foundry straight onto the deck of the ships. This means that ships used to come here ever since 1453. In 1580 the mosque was constructed here, followed by the Tophane Pavilion and clock tower. When you investigate the site,
you can detect an architectural history covering 500 years (Interview with Gürsel, 2011).

The historical importance of the port is not the only reason why this site is so significant for Istanbul. It is the only cruise ship port of the city and during the troubles in the Middle East it was used extensively, being one of the most preferred destinations in the cruise routes. Tophane port is a prestigious gate to the city, located opposite the historical peninsula, and it is easy to access. A report prepared by the Privatisation Bureau emphasised the importance of the Tophane port for maritime trade (Privatisation Bureau P. M., 2012). It is one of the most important historical focal points of Istanbul. At the same time, its historical function as a gateway to Istanbul meant that this area was a customs area with strict access controls. Inhabitants of Istanbul were not able to use this space and could not experience the historical peninsula from this point.

As the warehouses are located in such a unique location, the initial decision for the construction of the warehouses in this area was criticised by most of the interviewees. Academic Uğur Tanye stated that there was no reason to build the warehouses in a site that is so centrally located within Istanbul and that the decision to transform this area into warehouses indicates that any future changes in maritime trade were not taken into consideration (Interview with Tanyeli, 2011). The only reason why the warehouses were constructed there is that a port already existed alongside half completed warehouse structures. Tanyeli evaluated this as a cheap solution based on the assumption that construction would be straightforward as the area is governmental property. He argued that it was clear at the time of construction that the Tophane port was not a good location for the construction of new warehouses. Eventually, the functioning life of the warehouses was relatively short, just less than two decades.

The eventual abandonment of the Tophane site and the subsequent use of the area as a place to anchor cruise ships has led to renewed discussion about the suitability of the Tophane site as a port. There are several factors that make the Tophane site problematic for the use as a port for cruise ships. The site is centrally located in the city, which means that there is limited public infrastructure available for the transport of huge numbers of
cruise passengers. In addition, the port is only capable of handling two cruise ships at the same time due to the limited length of the shoreline. The lack in available space also means that there is a limit to the amount of supporting facilities that can be provided on the site. However, the most articulated concern brought forward in opposition to the presence of a cruise port in the Tophane site was that the silhouette of the city and the views of the water and the historical peninsula were ruined because of sheer size of the anchored cruise ships.

5.4.2. Public use or Private use

In addition to the question of whether or not the Tophane site is a suitable location for a port, another important issue that has been raised over and over again is whether the site should be made accessible to the public. The use of the Tophane site has always been a controversial issue for many actors, particularly whether it should be programmed for private use such as a cruise terminal with luxurious hotels and shopping malls, an urban programme that could boost the local economy, or for public functions that are accessible by all citizens. Governmental organisation representatives usually support the privatisation of the site, whereas professional chambers and academics tend to be against this idea, supporting public access to the site instead. Yet, in response to this opposition to privatisation, government officers claim that the port would be made accessible to the general public by going ahead with privatisation.

The importance of the port for Istanbul was underlined by an officer from the Privatisation Bureau, who stated that the Bureau cares a lot about the advertisement and tourism prospects of the Tophane site and stressed that it is a location currently closed for public use (Interview with government officer, 2012). However, according to the officer, after the privatisation of the Tophane site it would be made open to public use and the image of the site would change entirely. Through the completion of the Salıpazarı Cruise Harbour Project, the historical buildings in the area such as Kılıç Ali Pasha Mosque, Galata Tower, Tophane Fountain, Tophane-i Amire building, Tophane clock tower, Nusretiye Mosque, Cihangir Sultan Mosque, and Sokullu Mosque would all be incorporated within the ongoing projects of the Big Golden Horn and Taksim Pera projects that include the shoreline near
Ortaköy Mosque and aim to contribute to the magnificent silhouette of the historical peninsula. In a report prepared by the Prime Ministry Privatisation Bureau, it was stated that currently the port is having difficulty with coping with the advances in technology, even though Salıpazarı port was facilitating the arrival of hundreds of ships and thousands of passengers (Privatisation Bureau P. M., 2012). Through privatisation of the site, it was thought that the site could be made compatible with advancing technologies, that the appearance of the square could be improved, and that the use of the waterfront could be encouraged by opening up the customs area to public use.

However, when the newspapers of the time are examined, it can be detected that the idea of privatisation was not supported among journalists. An article titled “Salıpazarı Murder” (Salıpazarı Cinayeti) reported on the possibility that the warehouses would be privatised and transformed into luxury hotels and shopping facilities, rather than being knocked down and turned into a park for the use of the citizens (Erksan, 1998). In this article, journalist Metin Erksan did not support the idea of privatisation and even compared this proposal to murder of the neighbourhood.

As a representative of the Chamber of Planners, Akif Burak Atlar was involved in a consortium that looked into the privatisation of the Tophane site through the implementation of the Galataport project. He explained that the Chamber of Planners was of the opinion that the site had to have more public use and open spaces, that the relation of the site with the shore had to be strengthened, and that public use or cultural facilities would suit the urban tissue better. As an alternative to the proposed cruise terminal, they suggested developing a culture and art corridor stretching from Karaköy to Beşiktaş, with the Galataport area supporting this corridor. Atlar acknowledged the fact that cruise ships made use of the Tophane site, and that there was a need for a cruise port for Istanbul, however, he supported the argument brought forward by many other interviewees, that the location of the main cruise port had to be somewhere else, and that Tophane was not a suitable location for a main cruise port. He clarified that, in his opinion, the implementation of a cruise terminal would introduce an intensive function between the historical peninsula and Beyoğlu district and that the resulting increase in traffic would negatively affect both sides, potentially causing real estate values in the area to drop.
Drawing on the concerns of the Chamber of Planners about the site, Mücella Yapıcu put forward the concerns of the Chamber of Architects regarding the conservation and preservation of the site. (Interview with Yapıcu, 2012). She emphasised that the area is a protected site, and that the silhouette as seen from the Bosporus is considered to be the most important asset of Istanbul. The Galataport project should not be prepared without considering the Bosporus and Beyoğlu as valuable backgrounds. Yapıcu stressed that the shore laws were very clear in this respect. According to the shore laws, it is only possible to erect structures along the shore that are related with port functions; otherwise the shore is to be opened for public use. If a port is to be constructed, there are indispensable functions to be provided as part of the port, like a passenger hall, customs area and maybe a small hotel. However, The Prime Ministry Privatisation Bureau introduced the definition of cruise port in the law, an addition that would allow the construction of five star hotels, shopping malls, food and drink centres, office buildings, tourism and trade centres, and housing, as well as “a tourism oriented structure which will lift the image of the country”.

After the announcement of the Galataport project, there were reactions from different groups and organisations such as the Chamber of Architects, the Chamber of Planners, the Greens Turkish Coordination, and the Tophane initiative. The central location of the Tophane site and the fact that it is situated along the shore, facing the historical peninsula, made the prospect of privatisation even more questionable. This area was considered as too important to be used for industry and was judged to be better off as an area open for public use by Istanbulites. In their report, the Chamber of Architects claimed that if the Galataport project was to be realised, one of the most important waterfronts of Istanbul, the Karaköy-Tophane- Salıpazarı waterfront, would be transformed into a 1200 meters long shore line occupied by hotels, entertainment facilities, commercial buildings, and cruise terminals. Any building constructed there would be in between the historical fabric of the city and the water, which would obstruct the relation between the city and the public use by the citizens of Istanbul (Chamber of Architects, 2005). In addition, they argued that a built fabric would be added in the shore line that does not match with the historical fabric of Istanbul and that would overshadow the Istanbul silhouette. As a result of the lawsuit filed by the Chambers of Planners and Architects the Galataport project was cancelled.
Atlar clarified that the plan was cancelled because the court decided that the Ministry of Culture was not eligible to prepare a plan. Atlar expressed the concerns expressed by the Chamber of Planners over the Galataport proposal:

The Privatisation Bureau is one of the institutions that received authority to prepare plans through the issuing of new laws. Now they are preparing a plan for this area. When we have a look at the cancelled plans, there was an intensive programme of touristic and commercial functions proposed for that area. It was a plan that included apart-hotel functions, and suggested that the site was to be used as the main cruise port. We had certain essential objections. The initial argument was that the project area of that site was not sufficient for accommodating a cruise port. Secondly, we assumed that the proposed functions such as tourism, commerce, shopping mall, hotel, and apart-hotel might cause a problem for the site. We still have the same concerns. The infrastructure of the area is not sufficient for such an intensive use. The site is too short to be used as a cruise port. Additional touristic or commercial functions might change the urban tissue and perception of the Salıpazarı district and the Karaköy Tophane neighbourhood might become under pressure of speculation (Interview with Atlar, 2012).

Drawing on his personal history, Akif Burak Atlar provided his experiences as a user of the Tophane site when he was a student of the Mimar Sinan University, located adjacent to the site. He used to walk from the ferry pier to Mimar Sinan University, thereby passing the site. The site was totally closed to public use and the buildings could not accommodate the functions of the site efficiently. He evaluated the opening of Istanbul Modern as positive, arguing that it caused the opening up of that area for public use through the provision of a suitable function (Interview with Atlar, 2012).

The architects responsible for the design of the Galataport project argued that the implementation of the project would be positive for Istanbul and its residents. Early on in the design process, the architects were convinced that the Tophane site had to include a cultural attraction point, in order to present the project as a cultural achievement. Tabanlioğlu claimed that the reason behind the choice of culture as narrative was the unique location of the site on the intersection of the Golden Horn and the Bosphorus, just opposite the historical peninsula, and the fact that the site served Istanbul as a significant port throughout its history. She argued that, although the project could not be composed of
shopping facilities only, such facilities were a core component of the project. The architects believed that a cultural facility would act as a significant attraction point. As a result, Istanbul Modern was realised as this cultural attraction point, thereby being dubbed “the baby of Galataport” (Interview with Tabanlioglu, 2012). Tabanlioglu argued that there was a need for a public space in Tophane:

There is a big square in the area and it is important to revive that square because unfortunately there are not public squares in Istanbul. This lack of places where people can come together is a big problem... If we think about the cultural axis in Beyoglu on the one hand and the cultural waterway leading to Golden Horn on the other hand, this area is just at the intersection of these two; a location below Beyoglu, and the beginning of the Golden Horn. It would be great to create a public square that is surrounded by social, cultural and commercial facilities where people can come any time and mix with inhabitants. We do not want cities to be places that are left empty certain times of the day. There are places that are loaded with social facilities but they become empty during the night since there is no residential function created (Interview with Tabanlioglu, 2012).

The urban programme proposed by Tabanlioglu for the Galataport project included a cruise port half the size of the existing port and the opening up of 600 metres of the shoreline for public use, with the remaining shoreline preserved as the customs area. At the same time, the project they proposed sought to create a public place combined with hotels and shopping facilities. One of the warehouses would be transformed into a cultural facility in order to continue the Golden Horn as a cultural waterway.

In spite of its central location and its close relation to the sea, the Tophane site has been closed to public use for a long time. The site has been used as a location for industrial functions throughout most of its history. These functions include artillery barracks, in the beginning of the 20th century, the Ford Motor Factory in the 1920s to 1940s, and later warehouses. Despite the dynamics created by the flows of goods and people generated by its location, the site and its waterfront have never been associated with public use in the spatial memory of the city. However, the prospect of its transformation seemed to have generated a consensus that the site should be made accessible to citizens and become a public space. Opinions were divided on how to achieve this transition from private to public
land, with some claiming that privatisation would achieve this aspiration, while others rejected this option altogether.

5.4.3. View of the water and view from the water

The views of the Bosporus and the historical peninsula from the Tophane site and the view from the water towards the Tophane site are issues widely discussed among the actors and the media. These issues seem to have become subjects of discussion only quite recently, as it is not possible to detect similar issues being discussed in the media during the construction of the Tophane warehouses in the 1950s. This depicts the change in the notion of water from an object of function to an object of pleasure. The fact that the warehouses were closing the access towards the Bosporus, in that way obstructing the view of the historical peninsula, as well as the fact that cruise ships anchored in the shore were hindering the view to or from the Bosporus were the main points of criticism in recent years. The restricted character of the Tophane waterfront was already emphasised in 1996 by the journalist Orhan Bursali. He placed emphasis on the argument that Istanbulites needed access to the sea (Bursali, 1996). In his article, the project Port Park, proposed by the Tophane Initiative, was also discussed. As part of this project, a waterfront pedestrian walkway was to be developed in the Tophane area, along with facilities like a fishing port and fish market, an aquarium, a water ecology research centre a civil maritime museum, and a station for an urban water transport system. The plan also proposed the construction of a cinema and theatre, waterfront residences, conference halls, cafes and restaurants, bars, workshops, studios and exhibition halls, as well as artist residences. According to Bursali this proposal would create a twenty-four hour active waterfront area fitting the image of a world city, and could reclaim the site for the benefit of Istanbul’s citizens, not just of private developers.

According to Tabanlioğlu, more attention should be paid to the silhouette visible from the Bosporus. She underlined the importance of the vistas from the Bosporus and questioned the existence of the warehouses at the Tophane site, claiming that these kinds of structures should only be situated in industrial harbour cities:
The warehouse is not facing high sea; it is facing a different continent. Another continent is facing this continent, and it is the ending point of the Golden Horn. It seems to me that the warehouse should not have been built like this from the start. It was constructed temporarily then it became permanent, and even if it was temporary, it is not a correct formation. There should not be a warehouse area in such a location in any city. They could have built the warehouse area in Zeytinburnu or somewhere further out. I don’t think it is logical to make a warehouse area in the city, neither a customs area. That site is part of the city; they closed 1.5 kms of waterfront and designated it as customs area. Is there no other place to allocate this? People cannot enter the city from there. This is not the appropriate location for warehouses (Interview with Tabanlıoğlu, 2012).

The physical condition of Tophane’s shoreline as seen from the Bosphorus was not only emphasised by Tabanlıoğlu. Architect Ersen Gürsel conducted research about the Tophane site as part of a study group composed of social scientists, historians, urban planners, architects, photographers, and cartoonists in order to be able to explain the Galataport project to the media. According to Gürsel, the aim of this research was to produce ideas about how this site should be evaluated within the context of Istanbul. The results of the research were eventually published in a paper that was presented during the UIA congress in 2005 in Istanbul (Interview with Gürsel, 2011). In this paper Gürsel and his study group suggested alternatives for the site, such as the creation of a public space accompanied by socio-cultural facilities. Also, it was suggested that the cruise terminal could be built in Yenikapı - Zeytinburnu instead. According to them, tall cruise ships were acting as a barrier in front of the water, thereby blocking the views. According to the paper, Istanbulites do not make good use of the waterfront at present, since it is hard for them to reach the water due to all the barrier buildings along the shore. During a conversation with the mayor of Beyoğlu Municipality it became clear to Gürsel that nothing of Beyoğlu’s shoreline actually belonged to the Municipality, even though Beyoğlu Municipality possesses the longest shore in Istanbul. Not one single public entry point to the waterfront could be identified, as the whole length of the waterfront was blocked with walls and fences. It is only possible to experience the beauty of Istanbul from the café of Istanbul Modern. Gürsel elaborated on the obstacles along the shore:
When we look from the water to the shore all we can see are walls. Even though the shore is 2500 metres long in Beyoğlu, there are only walls. In this image we produced, we erased the walls so that people can perceive the shore. When they read the paper, people understood that the shore of Beyoğlu municipality is an important one. This site measures 30,000 m². There is nothing much I would say about Sedat Hakkı's warehouses except that for years we looked at the warehouses from a distance, but now it is possible to approach them. We experience them as shadows blocking the view of Bosporus and find them inappropriate (Interview with Gürsel, 2011).

The image referred to by Gürsel shows the barriers and obstacles in front of the waterfront in quite a striking way (Figure 67). It is a series of photos taken from the Tophane site before the transformation of the warehouse number four into Istanbul Modern. However, since the site continues to be used for customs, the images of today are not very different from them. The image shows the fences, walls and buildings that form a big barrier in front of the shore. This barrier prevents Istanbulites from reaching or even seeing the water. Gürsel's study group aimed to show the potential attractiveness of the waterfront by erasing these obstacles and placing trees instead, resulting in an impression that can be seen in Figure 68. These two images also show how the views of the water as well as the views from the water are obstructed by fences, barriers, walls, buildings, or cruise ships.

This image was published by several newspapers of the time. One of the newspaper articles referring to this image expressed concern that the Galataport project would add more barriers in front of the waterfront, as can be understood from the title of the article "New walls will be put up by Beyoğlu Sea" (Başlangıç, 2005). Similarly, journalist Zeynep Oral referred to the UIA paper produced by Gürsel's study group, and reiterated Gürsel's concerns that with the implementation of the Galataport project the only opening of the Beyoğlu district to the water would be totally ruined (Oral, 2005). Oral argued that a new wall would be created in front of the sea with the implementation of this project (Figure 69).
Figure 67: Barriers, fences and obstacles in front of the waterfront in Tophane port. (Source: Ersen Gürsel personal archive)

Figure 68: The silhouette of Tophane site with cruise ships (below) blocking the view, and above the created image with the greenery instead of warehouses. (Source: Beyoğlu Newspaper 1-7 July 2005 Celal Başlangıç)

Figure 69: Article of Zeynep Oral referring to Ersen Gürsel and the study group’s proposal (Source: Cumhuriyet, 23 July 2005, Zeynep Oral, Far from the sea, [Denize çok uzak])
The problematic tendency of cruise ships anchoring in the port to obstruct the entire view of the Tophane site was raised by Tabanlioğlu as well. Neither the waterfront nor the back of the site was visible when cruise ships were anchored in the site. She suggested that the cruise ship terminal should be removed from the city centre altogether. Mücilla Yapıci also stressed the problem of cruise ships blocking the view of the historical peninsula and cutting the continuity between Galata/Beyoğlu and the sea. However, she evaluated the warehouses as visual burdens as well, claiming that they ruined the silhouette of the shore (Interview with Yapıci, 2012). She underlined that during the construction of the warehouses, a lot of discussions were generated about the widening of the Meclis-i-Mebusan road and other public improvements, triggered by the belief that these improvements were ruining the historical monuments and destroying the character of the shore. The destruction of monuments led to serious deterioration in Tophane. Yapıci claimed that it is unfortunate that even though they were constructed for temporary storage purposes, the warehouses eventually remained on the site. Moreover, Yapıci argued that according to the shore laws these buildings should have been removed, as they have lost their function as warehouses. She did not accept the permanency of the warehouses. This change from temporality into permanence is an important process to take into consideration. Within the context of this case study, it appears that structures that were considered to be temporary became permanent, while structures that were considered to be permanent changed function. Although it was claimed that the warehouses were built temporarily by some of the actors, after careful analysis of the newspaper clippings of the 1950s and 1960s no statement that they were designed for temporary use could be found, and neither any rejection nor criticism towards the construction works.

Even though there has been a lot of criticism towards the existence of the warehouses in the Tophane site, the transformation of warehouse number four into Istanbul Modern has been widely accepted and praised. Yapıci considered the existence of Istanbul Modern as a legitimisation for the Galataport project:

I am against all the buildings there, in my opinion there should be none of them there, that area should be cleared. The historical values, whatever they are, should be preserved and, as the end point of Beyoğlu Peninsula, this site has to be open to public use. I am conducting the discussion from this point of view... As an architect,
those ugly buildings have always irritated me... They cannot make them look nice to me by refecticing these buildings with domestic functions. But until they are removed, who can refuse to have them being used for cultural purposes? On the other hand this provokes the existence of the buildings there. In fact, a cultural function leads to the acceptance of these warehouses and paves the way for the Galataport Project. It is unconsciously taking part in the legitimisation of a project that is aimed to be executed here (Interview with Yapıcı, 2012).

Tabanlıoğlu underlined that the opening of Istanbul Modern at a publicly accessible point paved the way for the historical peninsula to become visible from the Tophane site. It became possible to enter the site and see Istanbul from there, something that had never been possible before. She argued that Istanbul Modern became a place where Istanbulites and visitors to Istanbul could access. Similar praise for Istanbul Modern came from the media. In his article, Metin Erksan stressed the unique location and spectacular views:

Istanbul’s glorious image can only be experienced from Salıpazarı. The Istanbul silhouette is made up of minarets and lead domes. When viewed from Salıpazarı, the entire identity of Istanbul silhouette can be seen. The historical peninsula with its Roman, Byzantium and Ottoman history appears on the horizon. Topkapı Palace, Sivri Tower, Hagia Eirene, Hagia Sophia, Sultan Ahmet Mosque, Çemberlitaş, Çemberlitaş Mosque, Nuru Osmaniye Mosque, Beyazıt Mosque, and Süleymaniye Mosque are all visible. Istanbul, the city of minarets and lead domes, can be seen from Salıpazarı. This image is Istanbul. This image cannot be seen anywhere else in Istanbul (Erksan, 1998 , p. 2).

In a similar way, journalist Zeynep Oral underlined how Istanbul Modern revealed the stunning vista of the historical peninsula of Istanbul in her article "A view that is not found anywhere else" (Oral, 2005). According to her, the location presents a view of Topkapı Palace, Hagia Sophia, Sultanahmet, and the intersection point of Golden Horn, Bosporus and Üsküdar. In another newspaper article, Nilgün Cerrahoğlu described the positive aspects of Istanbul Modern and her experience of the waterfront from the terrace of Istanbul Modern:

Istanbul Modern plays with time. Just opposite, the magnificent history of Istanbul represented in Topkapı Palace and Hagia Sophia becomes apparent. You come
across this view while being in between the walls exhibiting the modern contemporary Turkish art of the twentieth century. This is a unique view bridging the past and the future. The building of Istanbul Modern does not stand out like the Guggenheim Bilbao. It is an 8000 m² warehouse building transformed by Tabanlioğlu Architects. Its spacious, white and minimalist features give the feeling of lightness and provide a calming backdrop, letting you believe that you are experiencing this time travel just by yourself. One other feature that makes Istanbul Modern unique is the sea. When you go up to the 100 metre wide terrace, you experience the waves, seagulls, fishing boats, and ferries. Not only the history but also the sea is carrying you to another dimension. You do not know where to concentrate your look, at the inside or at the view outside. Museums that give you the experience of time and space interaction move beyond just being a museum, they become living spaces and symbols of the city. It is a place where people not only come to see art but also to meet up with their friends, to chat and to spend a couple of hours in a nice space (Cerrahoğlu, 2005).

The amount of articles paying compliments to Istanbul Modern and its stunning views of the historical peninsula reaches overwhelming numbers. This positive response to the opening up of the views of the water shows how the notion of water has changed over time. It indicates the extent in which water has become an object of pleasure, and how much it is desired in the everyday lives of the citizens. Almost all the actors supported the idea that the Tophane site should be accessible, that it should be reclaimed for the general public, so that everyone can enjoy the views of the Bosporus from there.

This chapter started off with an investigation into the conception of water as a fluid actor and a description of the characteristics of flow. Benefitting from cultural geography literature, an association was made between architecture and flows. The chapter aimed to present an analysis of the modernist, industrial notion of water and the more recently emerging environmentalist consciousness towards the pollution of water. The focus was placed on the change from the modernist notion of water as a utilitarian tool towards the contemporary notion of water as an object of pleasure. The specific notion of water in the case of Istanbul, and particularly in case of the Tophane port, was discussed with the help of data collected from archival research and in-depth interviews. The unique location of the Tophane site was an important aspect of this discussion. The controversial use of the waterfront as a port for cruise ships and the fact that the site is currently closed to public
use were two important aspects of the discussion. The intention behind the discussion was to draw a link between the conception of water and the public efforts to reclaim the waterfront. Water has played an indispensable role in the trajectory of the Tophane site. It has not just been a passive natural element, but instead has acted as an active and direct non-human agent in the transformation process of the Tophane site.
CHAPTER 6

UNDERSTANDING THE MULTI-DIMENSIONALITY OF THE TOPHANE SITE THROUGH LAYERING

In this chapter, the focus is put on the story behind the transformation of the non-human actor warehouse number four into Istanbul Modern. The different dimensions of the transformation process will be analysed through the description of four different layers of transformation. The first layer "Building a Bridge with Europe" is about the importance attributed to Istanbul Modern and its collection in the context of economic and cultural integration with Europe. The second layer of transformation is "Reuse", which focuses on the reuse of abandoned industrial buildings and the controversies surrounding it, thereby concentrating on the Tophane warehouses. The third layer of transformation is "Architectural Translations", which itself consists of three sub layers: urban memory, minimum intervention, and public space. The last layer of transformation is "Cultural Life", which evaluates the significance of Istanbul Modern as the catalyst for the transformation of the site into its artistic and cultural functions.

In order to understand the site, we need to decipher these different dimensions, or layers through the use of the concept of layering. Layering is not only conceptually very interesting, but also in this case it is a way of understanding the complexity of the site. Layering in architecture can be associated with the archaeological term "palimpsest" which is originally a parchment that had been scraped so that it could be reused. However, writing on top of another text produces numerous layers of information, preserving the historical importance of the previous texts as well. In the context of architecture, palimpsest describes the accumulated changes of an architectural design and its site, in that way creating a condition in which the layers of complex forms are integrated within a structure. Such a structure does not indicate a simple meaning but it continuously stimulates new readings through stratified layers while simultaneously keeping the original text's singularity.
When being reused for a new function, buildings can maintain their original singularity. Derived from the palimpsest analogy of place, Min Koo claims that place is not a fixed physical entity but an organic one that is continuously transformed (Koo, 2009). Ke Lang Tren refers to the term palimpsest as a condition where layers of previous work can be seen simultaneously, creating rediscovery and reinterpretation. It can also be interpreted as an artefact that embodies a history and memory (Tren, 2011, p. 8). According to Tren, this metaphor allows architects, planners and designers to analyse the layers of history embedded within a site to understand not only what came before but also how to create a sense of place when moving forward. Mark Alan Hewitt aims to examine the continuous transformation of the physical entity by referring to the term "intermediary object" described earlier by Christian Norberg-Schultz (Hewitt, 1994, p. 201). The perception of an object is never complete according to this understanding. In the sense of the observation of the layered strata of history and material, archaeology's every attempt of understanding will only result in a partial reading of the situation. This recognition of the multiplicity of layers and a reformulation of the design task would create a further "intermediary" state that results in a richer and more complex intervention on the artifactual site. Hewitt's theory regards buildings and sites as ever-changing living beings that exist in a "morphologically continuous, temporally fluid system undergoing a large metamorphosis of which the designed changes are only a small part" (Hewitt, 1994, p. 200). Following on from this approach we can argue that sites and cities are also living entities subject to continuous change. Urban studies literature uses this notion of layering in terms of reading the city as "a timely layered palimpsest" (Koo, 2009, p. 831). The reason for the use of this term is that a city is a stratified structure that has accumulated several layers of change throughout the centuries. The identity of the timely layered palimpsest can be identified by the experience of the urban fabric, built layer by layer, transmitting the legacy of each successive generation (Tren, 2011, p. 10).

Layering can be interpreted as a possible way of thick description. By investigating the different layers of a particular case, elaborately, and consequently juxtaposing the layers on top of each other, it is possible to understand its multi dimensional nature as well as its complexity. In addition to the widespread use of layering in the context of heritage and
conservation, in this chapter I would like to expand this limited use of layering beyond simply heritage and conservation by including other layers mentioned previously. The originality and contribution of this chapter is derived from this expansion of the use of the concept. The use of layering as an analytic tool manifests its complexity in many different ways: The Tophane case shows that layering can occur in different dimensions, specifically in European integration, reuse, architectural translations, and public cultural life. The concept of layering will be used as a lens that allows us to examine the case in a more complex manner. The basis for this analysis will be the data collected during the case study, namely newspaper clippings obtained from the Turkish National Library's archives, a wide range of documents obtained from Tabanlioğlu Architects archives, and articles from Istanbul Modern's website. Moreover, information obtained from interviews conducted during the case study will help to develop the arguments.

6.1. Building a Bridge with Europe

Straight from its very conception, Istanbul Modern has been seen as a key to westernisation efforts and as a tool for integrating Turkey with Europe. The Eczacıbaşı family had long tried to form a museum of modern art in Istanbul. Nejat Eczacıbaşı attempted to transform the Feshane building into a museum in 1987. Feshane was Istanbul’s first industrial building along the Golden Horn and was used for the production of fezzes for the Ottoman army. Renovation works were initiated on the building, however, disagreement with the local authorities arose and the Eczacıbaşı family was not able to overcome the bureaucratic obstacles. Instead, the family continued assessing other buildings for establishing the museum, but no sufficient building was found until they came across Tophane warehouse number four, at that time used for the Istanbul Biennale. The Eczacıbaşı family subsequently applied to the Ministry of Finance to rent this warehouse. It took a very long time to come to a decision because of the controversies surrounding the site. After eleven years of discussion, the Ministry finally allocated the warehouse for the use of the Eczacıbaşı group. The project gained momentum with the involvement of Minister Egemen Bağış and the Prime Minister Tayyip Erdoğan.
The fact that the opening date, which was originally scheduled to April 2005, had been brought forward to December 2004 in order to fit with a European Union Meeting on Turkey's potential accession to the EU shows the strong will that existed to use the building for highlighting Turkey's cultural progress and modernity. The Prime Minister Erdoğan specifically requested Istanbul Modern to be completed before his visit to Brussels in December 2004, for the purpose of showcasing the European Union integration process. Erdoğan believed that such a museum would be an excellent way to demonstrate that Turkish culture had long embraced western traditions. He insisted that it open before meeting with the European Union officials on December 17th, in which leaders would vote to open membership talks with Turkey (Sachs, 2005). As a result, a transformation project was launched at a fast pace. The chair of the museum board at that time, Oya Eczacıbaşı, was interviewed about the transformation process by several newspapers. For her, Istanbul Modern had a significant role to play for integration with the west as well:

It will be seen how close we are to the West through the artworks that will be exhibited in this museum. It will be revealed that Turkey is the only country in the region that is investing in arts. This country is an open air museum yet it is educating contemporary art, which will ensure future investments in the arts... Turkey's progress continues in every platform. This museum is the proof of Turkey being part of Europe. The art works are realised as a result of close contact with the West (Interview with Eczacıbaşı, Akşam, 9. 12. 2004).

Investing in the arts, educating the younger generations with modern art traditions, and producing art works according to western artistic standards were some of the ambitions stated in the museum's vision. Moreover, in order to achieve an international identity for the museum, the Turkish authorities chose the Spanish curator, Rosa Martinez, a fact evident from an interview with her in the Wall Street Journal (Interview with Martinez, Hürriyet, 11. 3. 2005). According to Martinez, the Turkish Prime Minister's request for the completion of the museum before his visit to Brussels was made because the museum was perceived to be a showcase for showing the richness of Turkish art to the European Union. In order to finish the museum on time, the work was executed very fast. In another interview, Rosa Martinez also declared that she considered Turkish art to be eager to
achieve a similar artistic level as western art. It was possible to see all sorts of different art movements in Turkey and Turkish artists applied their own interpretation to these artistic tendencies (Sachs, 2005). The museum was much needed as a stable institutional base acting as a bridge to Europe, even though Turkey already had an established tradition of painting and a thriving private gallery scene. According to Martinez, the interaction between the centre and the periphery of Western art was very important and Istanbul Modern wanted to facilitate this dialogue and provide it with continuity.

At the opening ceremony of Istanbul Modern, the museum hosted some important political figures including the Prime Minister and other ministers. A short documentary project about the making of the museum and its location was shown and the opening ceremony itself was broadcast. The opening ceremony was described by Time Out magazine as having "an existence of an aura of pride and prestige in the air" (Paynter, 2005). There was much international interest and celebration of the opening of the museum as well. The French President Chirac, German President Schröder, and British Prime Minister Blair all sent messages to congratulate the Turkish people on the opening of the museum. In Schröder's message it was stated that Istanbul Modern was following in the track of museums that exhibit famous art collections, such as New York MoMA, London Tate Modern, and Paris Pompidou Centre. This statement could be interpreted as a sign of pride in a shared European cultural geography (Yıldız, 2004). Chirac's message stated that Istanbul Modern provided a good opportunity to highlight Istanbul's international, and particularly European side. The Turkish Prime Minister Erdoğan made a speech about the significance of Istanbul Modern:

I do not think we have enough artistic activities in Istanbul that are present in the developed cities of the world. We are planning to add many more museums to this series, we are working on it. Every completed result will carry Istanbul to a different level in the world. For all of us, Istanbul Modern is a late rendezvous. This beautiful work of art I believe is going to be a monument in the future of Turkey. It will find its place in the neck of this beautiful city as a jewel. (Erdoğan, Yeni Şafak. 12. 12. 2004).

According to Erdoğan, Turkish politics and established arts were entering a new era in which Istanbul Modern had a significant role to play. The importance of such an initiative
goes far beyond its own walls (Paynter, 2005). Even though museums have a vital role in preserving and generating culture all over the world, the result of the added responsibility for integration with the west, and for bringing together Eastern and Western cultural traditions remain ambiguous. However its contribution to the dynamism in the site cannot be discounted. In addition to the symbolic importance attributed to the museum by political figures, its collection was an indicator of modernisation and worked as another way of achieving integration with Europe.

Initially, the collection of Istanbul Modern was a mixture of art works in ownership of the İş Bank, the Sculpture Museum, the Nejat Eczacıbaşı Foundation and other collector families. From 2007 onwards, the museum owned its own collection, which is now composed of the art works of the Nejat Eczacıbaşı Foundation. In the first years after its opening, Istanbul Modern was a private business administered by the Istanbul Culture and Art Foundation, but later on it had formed its own foundation and its own decision-making organs. Çalıkoğlu claimed that Istanbul Modern had been able to totally transform the concept of museums in Turkey (Interview with Çalıkoğlu, 2011). According to him, the traditional museum concept is classical, heirloom, archaeological and more ethnographic, which does not appeal to the general public. In contrast, Istanbul Modern represents a museum that is lively, a place where contemporary artists' works are exhibited, and an institution that is dynamic constantly reinventing itself through the regular renewal of its collection. This reinvention is also evident in the mission and vision of Istanbul Modern, which have been reformulated several times since the opening. Çalıkoğlu underlined that Istanbul Modern not only represents a new building, but also a new museum management model, operating policies, education policies, methods of exhibition, curatorship and marketing. As a result, Istanbul Modern is capable of hosting up to 4000 visitors a day, which according to Çalıkoğlu shows how successful and efficiently managed the museum has become.

The importance and the vision of Istanbul Modern were stressed by several journals and newspapers. Istanbul Modern's breathtaking views of Sarayburnu and Haydarpaşa as well as the historical peninsula and its distinguished collections were other positive aspects that almost all articles mentioned. The museum was considered to be a suitable answer to
international museum standards through its exhibition of modern Turkish art and other contemporary arts. Istanbul Modern was intended to act as an international cultural bridge by increasing the production of arts, and by boosting the levels of creativity and art education. Its artistic success can be evidenced in the articles and the newspaper coverage of the period. For instance, Bouquet Magazine considered Istanbul Modern capable of setting the arts agenda, and as an important centre for the education of youth through its provision of art education to 20,000 students in its first year alone (Bouquet Magazine, 2005). This fact was thought to represent a dedication of effort and space to education, which is a good example of its progressive vision.

After the opening of Istanbul, the museum generated a vast amount of media attention. Distinguished international newspapers such as The New York Times, Financial Times, Los Angeles Times, Wall Street Journal, Le Figaro, Le Monde, The Art Newspaper, Time Out, architectural journals such as Architect's Journal, and many others published articles celebrating the opening of the first museum of modern art in Istanbul. It is common to see comparisons being made between Istanbul Modern and international examples of modern art institutions such as: Tate Modern, Centre Pompidou, and Guggenheim Bilbao, which evidences the museum's significant role for the process of integration with Europe. The curator of the opening exhibition, Rosa Martinez, was interviewed by several newspapers. Martinez emphasised the advantage of the location of Istanbul Modern along the Bosphorus waterfront and compared Istanbul Modern with Tate Modern in terms of its view and its culinary qualities (Woodward, 2006). According to her, the view on the domes of Topkapi Palace and the Bosphorus from Istanbul Modern, facilitated by a long terrace, is better than the view from Tate Modern. The quality of the gastronomic facilities of Istanbul Modern she considered to be better than Tate Modern's as well (Woodward, 2006). Providing a refreshing alternative to the historical treasures and grandiose mosques of the city, Sarah Woodward recommended a visit to Istanbul Modern (2006). After having seen the collection, she suggested enjoying the view of the Topkapi Palace and historical peninsula from the terrace and listening to the sounds of the city provided by the mosques or the commuter ferries. According to Woodward, there is no better interaction of modern and old than in Istanbul, a statement that resonates very well with the notion of Istanbul as an
urban palimpsest bringing together old and new civilisations, artefacts, and cultures in one city. While it is possible to identify the different layers, the city remains a coherent entity.

One of the key characteristics attributed to Istanbul Modern is that it is an important indicator and statement for the future direction of Istanbul, thereby creating a new image for the metropolis. November Paynter's article in Time Out magazine depicted this characteristic very well (2005). She considered that Istanbul Modern had changed the image of the city, and encouraged local and international appreciation of more than the city's historical heritage. Istanbul wanted to create an image of being a hip, dynamic part of the twenty-first century Western world. Istanbul Modern acted as the showpiece of this 'new' Istanbul, a statement that is acknowledged by Antony Sattin in his article in Traveller Magazine (2006). Sattin rightfully thought that the name Istanbul Modern echoes with Tate Modern. The converted warehouse could have been taken straight from New York and the gallery spaces of Istanbul Modern reminded him of the Pompidou Centre. The minimalist cafe and art on show appeared to him to have been staged to create the message that Istanbul is modern and part of the western world. Sattin acknowledged the hopes that Istanbul Modern might help to define Istanbul's new image in much a similar way in which the Guggenheim museum changed perceptions of Bilbao. Istanbul was described as a ‘cultural dessert’ by Fiachra Gibbons from the Guardian before the addition of Istanbul Modern (Gibbons, 2010). As the European Capital of Culture 2010, the city has witnessed a boom in the number of private museums that have been built. According to Gibbons, this boom was accompanied by a fierce competition among the Turkey's richest families to assemble the best and most expensive collections of art.

The transformation of the Tophane's warehouse number four into a museum of modern art has had a very prominent impact on Istanbul, the cultural life of the country, and even Turkey's integration process with the European Union. The Museum became a symbol of Turkish modern art. The significant amount of media interest from national and international journals and newspapers that was attracted by the opening of the museum highlights the perceived impact of Istanbul Modern on the international art scene and attributes the museum with a significant role within the European integration process. This huge responsibility for building a bridge with Europe has been very much orchestrated
from the very start of the transformation process though, which is reflected in its selection of curator, and the collection of the museum. This bridging role of the museum is the first layer of the transformation process. The second important layer is the reuse of the warehouse space, which will be discussed in the following chapter.

Figure 70: Article titled Istanbul Goes Modern (Source: Time Out, 1.2004)

Figure 71: Istanbul Modern's opening ceremony with the attendance of the Prime Minister Erdoğan (Article titled "There is nothing missing in Istanbul" Source: Sabah, 12.12.2004)
6.2. Reuse

As part of the shift from Fordist production to flexible accumulation, technological change often resulted in the abandonment of industrial buildings. Certain urban functions such as factories, power stations, and warehouses needed to relocate from the central parts of the city to more desirable locations, leaving these types of buildings available for reuse for other functions. The idea to reuse abandoned industrial buildings for various functions, and particularly as museums, has expanded rapidly all over the world in recent decades. Revisiting Stewart Brand's (1994) arguments about the constant change in the built environment as a result of changing cultural currents, real estate values or usage of buildings, it is reasonable to state that architecture cannot be considered as stable or permanent. Constant changes create alteration in the building's layout, skin and appearance. According to Brand "old buildings embody history, it is possible to glimpse the world of previous generations in old buildings" (Brand, 1994, p. 90). Brand emphasises the tendency to buy derelict factories, warehouses, terminals, and enclosed docks by creative developers for the purpose of redevelopment. The reason for this tendency is that warehouses and factories are exceptionally adaptable. They have raw spatial qualities and a clear structural system with good natural light and ventilation as well as high ceilings. The bearing structure is built strong enough for accommodating storage and heavy machinery. According to Brand there is no other building that matches the adaptability of an old brick warehouse, a typology that can welcome any use for creative occupants (Brand, How buildings learn : what happens after they’re built, 1994, p. 109). In addition, rehabilitated buildings sometimes help to revitalise an entire neighbourhood or even a whole city, by creating a vivid part that attracts new investments and tourists.

Reuse is another significant layering that is present in the transformation of the warehouse number four into Istanbul Modern. In this section, the focus will be on the concept of reusing abandoned industrial buildings as museums and how the Tophane warehouses are evaluated in terms of their industrial heritage values. Interviewees predominantly evaluated reuse as a positive phenomenon, taking numerous examples from around the world or from Turkey into consideration. However, there also were hesitations among interviewees on certain aspects of re-use. The main controversy emerging in the reuse discussion can
be summarised as how much of the old use should be kept visible, in other words whether to allow previous uses to 'speak' or to treat the building as a blank canvas by inserting an entirely new use. Apart from this controversy, some interesting examples of reuse were given by the interviewees such as the shipyard in Azapkapı mentioned by Doğan Tekeli (Interview with Tekeli D., 2012). Allocating these dilapidated buildings a new use as museum in order to enrich the cultural life of the city was considered as a positive tendency by him. It is also possible to transform them into lofts or hotels or luxurious apartment blocks, however, these functions would not bring much of a cultural benefit to the city life. Tekeli also referred to Philadelphia, where there were kilometres of abandoned industrial sites that were mostly built in the 1950s, with structures of three or four storey high and quite similar to the Tophane warehouses. These abandoned industrial sites were in a terrible condition however, thus creating huge problems for the local urban environment. Due to their scale, it was not possible to transform all of them into museums or culture centres. The initial and the most important thing to do for such sites was to decide whether or not to preserve and re-function these buildings. Parallel to architect Doğan Tekeli’s arguments, academic İlhan Tekeli mentioned that it is important to reuse abandoned industrial buildings and gave several examples, such as the Izmir Gas Factory, which was transformed into a cultural centre, the Izmir Electricity Factory, which was transformed into Yaşar University, and the Cibali Tobacco Factory in Golden Horn Istanbul, which was transformed into the Kadir Has University. However, Tekeli also raised his concerns about re-use, which are based on his impression that reuse wipes out any traces of the old use. Instead, he supported the idea that reuse should allow the previous life of the building to be visible:

This reuse issue is good but there remains a question. How far can we legitimise this? As you can see now in Cibali there is Kadir Has University. Its restoration was awarded. However what is left from the Cibali Tobacco Factory? What is left as a material? When I visit that place do I have any reference to the Cibali Factory or the working class? It seems like it is something that the designer takes as a shell and redesigns it. However we do not have a framework of evaluation on the restrictive degree of the shell. What is successful about this? In a successful project, you go and visit and it is nice and all right, according to contemporary tendencies, there is a slight relation with the history. However, what should be the level of the relation with history and what should be the essence? I cannot see a clear answer to this question. Yet in Cibali it is beyond restoration, it is more of a rebuilding. In some restoration projects it is more important to emphasise that it is a restoration. They
get rid of the plaster of the buildings, it looks naked. Now this presents a problem. This problem should be rethought deeply. It is the problem of the discipline (Interview with Tekeli İ., 2012).

The criticism raised by İlhan Tekeli is significant to consider. What is left from the former use of the industrial building? Is there any reference to its former function? Is there any reference to the former daily life of its workers? I believe these questions define the essence of the discipline of preservation and might be used as assessment criteria for the reuse of industrial buildings. It is not straightforward to find a ready-made transformation model that is able to address these questions satisfactorily. Reuse of an industrial building with a completely different function would not give any reference to its previous use or social life. When re-using industrial buildings as museums, some advocate a rather strict approach by arguing that the old function should be kept visible and allow the previous uses to 'speak'. Others, however, see disused buildings as blank canvases and suitable for all sorts of functions. According to Brand the idea of "form follows functions" is completely invalidated in the case of reuse (Brand, 1994). He claims that a building becomes more interesting when it leaves its original function behind.

Mücella Yapıcı, for instance, advocated a stricter approach to transforming industrial buildings. If such buildings are to be designated as museums, the only acceptable form of reuse would be a museum related to its original function. Yapıcı opposed transformation if industrial buildings are to be re-used for a function entirely different from their original purpose (Interview with Yapıcı, 2012). Another objection to transforming surviving industrial legacies into museums is based on her consideration that museums are sterile and cold. She also underlined that the idea that industrial legacies should be protected is relatively new, based on the realisation that industrial legacies serve as a witness of periods and societies that are not possible to experience any longer. The transformation of a Ruhr Valley factory, Emscher Park, was given as a good example by Yapıcı. In this project, the walls of the factory were not demolished but transformed into a climbing wall instead, thus preserving the industrial legacy without spoiling it. Yapıcı argues that transformation projects in Turkey have mostly been executed in a violent way. She clarified
that she did not support the idea that art, history, and culture can be considered as commodities for the promotion of neighbourhoods or cities.

On the other hand, the architect Melkan Gürsel Tabanlioğlu adopted a less strict approach on the reuse of industrial buildings and stated that the spaces of existing warehouses and industrial buildings are usually very suitable for contemporary art exhibitions. She argued that the reuse of such buildings both protects against the loss of urban memory and at the same time makes the urban environment more exciting. Another aspect to evaluate the reuse of abandoned buildings on is the concept of sustainability. Reuse of buildings cuts the use of materials and energy and thereby lowers the environmental costs. Considering this sustainability argument, Tabanlioğlu argued that all abandoned buildings should be transformed in a proper way (Interview with Tabanlioğlu, 2012). She emphasised the advantage of sustainable construction for saving energy through the reuse of material, thereby combating the energy shortage in the world today.

The second layer that exists in the transformation of warehouse number four is reuse, which discussed the reuse of industrial buildings, thus focusing on the Tophane case. The question of whether or not to consider abandoned industrial heritage as a blank canvas and to what extent the original function of industrial heritage should be kept visible was raised and elaborated on through the voices of different actors involved in Istanbul Modern’s transformation. The third layer of transformation that can be detected in Tophane is architectural translations and will be further elaborated upon in the following part.

6.3. Architectural Translations

The transformation from warehouse into museum is a milestone in the trajectory of the Tophane site. Architectural translations form another significant layer of the transformation of the warehouse number four into Istanbul Modern. In this section, the focus will be put on the architectural realisation of the transformation process, thereby trying to discuss the following questions. What were the architectural concerns and goals of the designers during the transformation? What is the contribution of the architectural layers to the site?
How was this project reflected upon and evaluated by the actors and the media? The Architectural Translations consist of three fundamental design elements and these are urban memory, minimum intervention, and public space.

The idea of transforming the industrial building into a museum originated from the time the warehouses were used for the biennales. The Istanbul Culture and Art Foundation (IKSV) rented the warehouses for a few months in 1993 and again in 2003. During these periods the warehouses housed the Istanbul Biennale. There were several public and private actors involved in the transformation process, among which the most significant are the Istanbul Culture and Art Foundations, the Eczacibaşı Foundation, the Eczacibaşı family, Oya Eczacibaşı, Tabanlıoğlu Architects, the Maritime Administration, the Prime Ministry Privatisation Bureau, the Prime Minister and the curators. A practising architect and a member of the Istanbul Culture and Art Foundation (IKSV), Doğan Tekeli, was involved as an actor through his preparation of a proposal for the transformation of the warehouse into the museum. A fact not previously mentioned in the media, it was only during the interview Tekeli mentioned his involvement in the process (Interview with Tekeli D., 2012). IKSV judged Tekeli’s project proposal to be too expensive, so they approached Tabanlıoğlu Architects to come up with an alternative design instead.

The institutional procedure preceding the transformation started with a request for transformation from the Eczacibaşı Foundation to the Prime Ministry Privatisation Bureau. This request was approved by the Bureau and by the Privatisation High Council, which consists of the Prime Minister himself and four other Ministers appointed by the Prime Minister: the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Economy, the Minister of Transport, and the Minister of Environment and Urbanism (Interview with government officer, 2012). Contracts for the lease of warehouse number four were prepared and signed by the Eczacibaşı Foundation and the Maritime Administration, the owner of the building. The tenancy agreement of Istanbul Modern covered 29 years. In a similar manner to warehouse number four, the other warehouses were rented out by the Maritime Administration for several purposes such as film shoots, commercial purposes and exhibition spaces, however these tenancy agreements were usually for shorter periods and therefore do not require permission from the Privatisation High Council.
The involvement of Tabanlioğlu Architects started with the request by Oya Eczacibaşı to prepare a plan to transform the warehouse that was used for Istanbul Biennale into a museum. Initially, this transformation project was thought to be only temporary. In an interview about Istanbul Modern, Tabanlioğlu Architects stressed that they believed in the idea of transformation even though they did not know how permanent the building would be (Selections, 2011). The director Oya Eczacibaşı herself believed in the project too and continued to work with utmost determination. Even though these two significant actors were committed to making the project a success, there were doubts raised during the process of transformation. Tabanlioğlu explained these fluctuations during the transformation process:

The design process of Istanbul Modern was very exciting and variable. The entire process developed out of the changing daily circumstances. In the morning we did not have money; in the evening we found a sponsor. One day before we did not have time and the museum was temporary, the day after the Prime Minister visited then it became permanent. Everything started with Oya Eczacibaşı's initiative to transform the warehouse, which was used during Istanbul Biennale, into a museum so that Turkey would gain a contemporary art museum. She told us to do the project and we became very excited about it. The project started with a limited budget and a core staff. The building was thrilling with a strong identity. It was in the middle of an open air museum. The historical peninsula was opposite; Tophane-i Amire was behind. We were busy with the Galataport project for a long time so we were very familiar with the site (Tabanlioğlu I. w., 2005).

Despite the facts that there was no designated budget or guarantee that the museum would be permanent, Tabanlioğlu Architects fully supported the project and were motivated to deliver a good end product. The design of the building is coherent to their design approach, which is deeply concerned with the social impact of architecture. The priority in their designs is user friendliness. Tabanlioğlu Architects explained that such a design motto requires them to evaluate the context, process and the potential users of their design (Tabanlioğlu, High Rise Buildings, 2007). The site for Istanbul Modern was well known by Tabanlioğlu Architects, which meant that they were well aware of the historical importance of the site, situated opposite the historical peninsula and next to
Tophane square, and its prominence in Istanbul's silhouette. They considered the site to be the "first blossom" (Interview with Tabanlioğlu, 2012) of the wider Galataport project, which could be realised by providing an attraction point, such as a museum. According to Melkan Tabanlioğlu, a prominent part of the Galataport project was a cultural facility and such a facility was realised as Istanbul Modern.

The transformation was eventually executed within just eight months, due to the importance that was placed on finishing the project in time for EU membership talks, as discussed before. Despite the hasty execution, the transformation was well organised and well directed under Eczacıbaşı's leadership. The importance of the Eczacıbaşı Family for the transformation process, both as professional managers and as dedicated team players, was also emphasised by Melkan Gürsel Tabanlioğlu.

Considering the benefits of Istanbul Modern for the site and for Istanbul, the transformation process has mostly been considered positively among the actors. The central location of the museum was often acknowledged together with the fact that the warehouses present splendid places for the exhibition of modern art, made possible through their adaptability for re-use. The need for an accessible museum of modern art in Istanbul was felt widely, and many actors believed that Istanbul Modern met this need through its convenient location.

As part of the focus on architectural translations there are three main layers or dimensions that will be further elaborated upon. These dimensions represent the fundamental design elements of the project. The first dimension to be discussed in the framework of architectural translation is urban memory, the second dimension is the concept of minimum intervention, and the third dimension is public space.
6.3.1. Urban Memory

Urban memory has been mobilised as a key notion in architectural heritage and urban studies literature. The extensive use of urban memory in architecture and urban studies should not be neglected. Several authors wrote about urban memory such as Marc Crinson, *Urban Memory: History and Amnesia in the Modern City* (2005); Susanna Küchler and Adrian Forty, *The Art of Forgetting* (2001), Andreas Huyssen, *Present Pasts: Urban Palimpsests and Politics of Memory* (2003); Rose-Redwood, Alderman, and Azaryahu, *Collective Memory and the Politics of Urban Space* (2011). In this section, urban memory is limited to its specific use in relation to the empirical data provided.

Urban memory is a major aspect of the reuse of the warehouses. The importance of the warehouses for the consistency of the urban memory was a controversial issue. This can be traced from the arguments of some of the interviewees. Akif Burak Atlar, for example, indicated that transformation of abandoned industrial buildings facilitates a process of urban memory, and that museums are the ideal re-functioning for these buildings (Interview with Atlar, 2012). In a parallel way reuse of the warehouses as a museum was a rational decision according to Uğur Tanyeli, since the site was supposed to be made accessible to the public, and through the opening of Istanbul Modern, this had been achieved.

It seems like a very appropriate place and the best function that the area can have. That area has to be transformed as a warehouse site. There are so many examples of this in the world that it is the easiest thing you can justify. As you know generally there is not much architectural endeavour to realise the transformation of these buildings. The buildings are reused almost as they were found. And this is a very good thing. They can transform quite easily and more importantly can transform flexibly. These transformations can be realised flexibly contrary to other kinds of transformations. Others become a product of your architectural imagination like what happened in Sulukule. It became an architectural project for realisation of the vision for the entire country. However this is the best function these could ever become. There is also no social cleansing in these projects. Thereby I think it is very good (Interview with Tanyeli, 2011).
The prestigious location of the warehouses made the site very attractive for private developers, evidenced by the fact that most of the old buildings on the site have been bought up by tourism developers and speculators. According to Tanyeli the ownership pattern changed entirely and it is now impossible to find real estate owners other than speculators in the area.

On the other hand, the importance of the warehouses for the urban memory of the city remains unclear for some other actors. They were less positive about Istanbul Modern even about the warehouses’ existence in the Tophane site. Ersen Gürsel for example claimed that it would have been better to demolish warehouse number four in order to construct the Tophane square (Interview with Gürsel, 2011). In his opinion, regaining that place as public space is more important than preserving and transforming the warehouse. Mücella Yapıcı supports this opinion as well (Interview with Yapıcı, 2012). According to her, the transformation process legitimises the larger Galataport project and she argued that the warehouse housing Istanbul Modern could rather have been demolished since it was temporary and had lost its function, and that the site could have been designed as open public space as a contribution to the city. Yapıcı also emphasised that people have to pay a lot of money to enter the museum, which prohibits full public access to the building and the site. The urban memory was the first layer constituting the architectural translations. The second layer is minimum intervention, a notion that is significantly reflected in the architectural design decisions in the transformation project of warehouse number four into Istanbul Modern.

6.3.2. Minimum intervention

Minimum intervention is one of the key aspects of architectural transformation. Through the use of minimal intervention warehouse conversions maintain the character of the warehouse building. The character of the warehouse remains intact so that the building does not distinguish itself from other the adjacent warehouses, thus remaining coherent with the entire character of the site. This aspect can be considered as a way of contributing to the sustainability of the site.
As opposed to the recent iconic museum buildings around the world such as Guggenheim Bilbao, the Berlin Jewish Museum and many others, Istanbul Modern is a modest interpretation of a warehouse conversion with minimum intervention, which was one of the key aspects of architectural design in the Istanbul Modern project. The architects chose to use pure and neutral materials and architectural details. Architectural interventions on the building have been kept to a minimal. The warehouse block has maintained its structural essence; its original structure was appreciated and preserved in order to make the exhibited artwork stand out. Tabanlioğlu has described the design decisions:

Our priority in this transformation was to keep the character of the building. Our aim was to create spaces within the warehouse that could exhibit the art works in the best way, and to create the experience that the exhibition goes on outside the museum. In this project we chose to be plain, instead of a lot of materials we decided to use pure, neutral materials and details to emphasise the power of the space. The museum had to be a gathering point that is why we located the restaurant, library, cinema and exhibition spaces in this way. After eight months the museum was born and honoured us as the architect and Istanbulite (Tabanlioğlu I. w., 2005).

The chosen colour scheme was rather minimal as well. Two colours were applied throughout the building; the walls of the exhibition halls were painted white and the rest of the building was coloured grey. This uncomplicated atmosphere created with the colour scheme aimed to place the emphasis on the artworks rather than dominate the exhibition. The main entrance to the building is located on the first floor and is reachable through a staircase along the facade. The permanent exhibition area is located at the first floor and its white walls, ending at 60 degrees, and adjacent columns ensure alternative routes to the viewer; Tabanlioğlu argued that this was designed to provide exhibition comfort (Tabalıoğlu, 2005). On the first floor the educational ateliers, meeting rooms, the museum shop, and additionally a restaurant decorated with modernised Ottoman motifs were fitted in. The ground floor was designed for temporary exhibitions, a library, photography exhibitions, a press zone, theatre and offices (Figure 72-76). Rather than closing the museum to natural light, the architects opened up the northwest facing facade with wide windows capturing the wonderful view of the Bosporus and the historical peninsula through an intervention dubbed "open-air museum" by the architects. Tabanlioğlu underlined that
the opening up of the facade with superposition was an important design concept of the project (Figure 77, 78) (Interview with Tabanlioğlu, 2012). Although there is a maximum control of natural light, the architects wanted visitors to experience the changing light reflecting on the art works, which would lead to interaction between the visitors, the museum's surroundings and the exhibited work. Tabanlioğlu pointed out her office's attitude towards the renovation of the warehouse, their understanding of the concept of layering in architecture, and the architectural characteristics of Istanbul Modern:

While we were making the renovation we never ignored the inputs given by Sedat Hakkı Eldem because we believe in layering in architecture, although the warehouses were constructed temporarily, and even if our museum project was also temporary. The intervention we make today should not walk over the intervention of yesterday. You need to be able to experience all interventions. This I trust is the main idea of a correct restoration or renovation of a building. There are very good examples from all around the world in this sense. There are some examples from Turkey but there are bad examples too. In our architectural understanding, we respect the existing buildings and prefer to add on them but not adding in an eclectic way; we aim to make the building in such a way that it is experienced like one complete soul. In Istanbul Modern the main spaces were transformed into a modern art museum without losing their warehouse character. Once you are inside the building you can feel the old character of the building. You can feel the structure and its general soul. But at the same time, you can also feel it totally as an art museum. This was one of the most important points for the transformation (Interview with Tabanlioğlu, 2012).

Tabanlioğlu's architectural interpretation of conservation as an integration of previous architectural layers with contemporary ones, yet not in an eclectic way, is intriguing. Koo's theory that a structure indicates multiple meanings through inter-contamination between added layers, while sustaining the singularity of the original layer, resonates with Tabanlioğlu's architectural interpretation of her design scheme for warehouse number four's renovation by making sure that the old structure and character of the warehouse can be experienced inside Istanbul Modern.

Istanbul can be considered a very complex palimpsest as well, carrying forward several civilisations' legacy. It is composed of several layers of buildings constructed over the last
centuries, such as Byzantium churches, Ottoman Mosques and baths, traditional timber houses, modern apartment buildings, contemporary skyscrapers, and many more. Rory Olcayto mentions the stratified, yet not so well known architectural heritage of Istanbul in her article about Istanbul Modern and contemporary Turkish architecture (Olcayto, 2008). According to Olcayto, the awe-inspiring classical amphitheatres and the domes of the Ottoman mosques obscures the Turkish architectural culture. For instance, Istanbul's status as a centre of Art Nouveau and the omnipresent architectural style of modernism that was used by Kemal Ataturk to symbolise the newly created Turkish Republic in the 1930s are little known. Even less is known about the government architect Sedat Hakkı Eldem's unique regional modernism. The RIBA exhibition of Tabanlioğlu Architects "Istanbul and Beyond" was a starting point for making the general public more familiar with the contemporary Turkish architectural practice. Olcayto refers to Tabanlioğlu Architect's conversion of warehouse number four, which is claimed to be originally designed by Eldem, and emphasises that the architects cut into one facade to provide new views across the Golden Horn, historical peninsula and the Bosporus.

As mentioned before, the design of the warehouses was attributed to Sedat Hakkı Eldem, a well-known Turkish architect. This fact legitimises the preservation of the warehouses in the site and acts as a parameter for the new design scheme of the museum. The preservation of warehouse number four was considered to be a design condition and the architects decided to be respectful to the original design of the warehouse, which is consistent with the office's general design vision (Interview with Tabanlioğlu, 2012). Radical interventions to the buildings were not permitted due to the fact that they are second degree listed historical buildings. In addition, the existing Shore Laws prohibited any major alterations. There was not much altered about the warehouse during conversion, only some minor elements were changed with a modest touch. Furthermore, the fact that the museum was to be temporary, and that the transformation needed to be completed within a short space of time added to the decision not to make major alterations. Tabanlioğlu Architects were able to add a ramp, an elevator, and a vertical element that they call a 'totem' to the exterior of the building. The process of transformation was participatory: the curator, the director, and the architects were involved in the decision
making process (Interview with Çalıkoğlu, 2011). Çalıkoğlu emphasises the minimal intervention to the original character of the warehouse as well:

We made a minimum touch intervention to this place. There was no burden but we never ever thought to change this place. It has high spaces, with rectangular shapes and not too many articulations on the front facade. It is not complex which is an advantage for us. Constructed on a regular grid of columns, an empty space is an advantage for us for sure. It is a very suitable place to exhibit contemporary art where you need big voids, and high ceilings. We can make changes in the interior without a problem. We have enough storage spaces, and we organised transition areas accordingly. We acted according to the reports prepared by Tabanlioğlu on how to arrange the building and on the kind of solutions that were possible. It is a convenient and sufficient building for sure. In these circumstances it is one of the most correct, functional, and smart buildings in Istanbul. We made all the decisions together with Tabanlioğlu Architects all the time. The linearity of the building, and the way to make arrangements were what we decided together because we knew what we would be exhibiting. And the exhibition had to flow like a story thus the idea of linearity came up from us. Of course, where to locate the library, or cinema were design decisions made by Tabanlioğlu (Interview with Çalıkoğlu, 2011).

Most of the other private museums in Turkey are located on the land in ownership of their benefactors; however, Istanbul Modern is located on public land. According to Doğan Tekeli, the government should encourage the transformation of more buildings for cultural purposes, as this would contribute to the image of the city, the lives of its inhabitants, and the city’s tourism sector. He judged the warehouse as not being a beautiful building, but the decision to transform it and its new use as a museum he viewed positively (Interview with Tekeli D., 2012). Tekeli commented on other museums in the world that act like showcases, with their designs resembling sculptures, however, in the case of Istanbul Modern the modest transformation can be regarded as an architectural success. Apart from the positive remarks about the renovation works, there is also some criticism towards the architectural decisions made by the architects. According to Tekeli, although the museum is a contemporary transformation, a newly and purpose built museum building might have offered more suitable spaces. The reason for limited space inside the transformed warehouse is its architectural structure of 50m² modules, limiting the architects to use only 100m² maximums for the cinema and conference hall. In addition,
the circulation of the building was assessed to be poor and not suitable for a museum building. The transformation project represented a forced usage for him, but taking these circumstances into account, the warehouse was at least transformed in a harmless way. The choice to use grey as the colour for the outside of the building was also a point of critique, prompting Tekeli to wonder if the designers tried to hide the building. The addition of the tower in the entrance and the big ramp on the exterior facade, for the purpose of outside circulation, was interpreted by him as an effort to present the museum as a symbol, although all taken together these two features were actually contributing to the overall design. Tekeli indicated that if he had designed the museum, he would have located the entrance at the ground floor and organised the inner circulation of the building from there.

Reflecting on the fact that Istanbul Modern is located on public property, Uğur Tanyeli mentioned that it is almost impossible to find a location in the middle of the city centre free of charge, and that nowhere else in Istanbul are there vacant buildings with thousands of square metres available (Interview with Tanyeli, 2011). About the use of the warehouse as a museum he was very positive. He stated that there was not much intervention done, with only the opening of the facade for the restaurant representing a major alteration. Despite the limited expenditure, the project can still be evaluated as a successful example of transformation. Similarly, the minimal intervention on the building's interior, with the inner space keeping its original features, was also considered to be a positive feature by Tanyeli, although he doubted that this was done through a genuine architectural consciousness. Regardless of what function is designated to the Tophane site, Tanyeli qualified it as one of the most advantageous sites in the city. The speed of the transformation process was an issue of criticism for Tanyeli though. According to him, the demand to transform the museum very quickly was problematic, and resulted in the absence of any proper consideration of current tendencies in the world concerning the transformation of industrial buildings. To him Istanbul Modern seemed like a quick and easy solution. About the notion of minimum intervention Tanyeli was indecisive:

Maybe it is not convincing in Turkey. I really think that most people look at these projects and question what had been changed here. They can say there is nothing done. We architects, with our peculiar snobbishness, like it but I do not believe the
rest likes it in the same amount. It is very rare to hear someone state that this area was very good for the biennale. It is the same for Istanbul Modern. Unless it shines, the transformation does not gain architectural legitimisation. (Interview with Tanyeli, 2011)

Other celebratory remarks about the transformation of Istanbul Modern can be traced in the media. Journalists seem to share a positive opinion about the minimum intervention to the warehouse building. Journalist Zeynep Oral summarised her appreciation of Istanbul Modern as: "Istanbul Modern is the only window providing a stunning view of Istanbul's historical peninsula with Topkapı Palace, Hagia Sophia, Sultanahmet, the meeting point of Golden Horn and Bosporus, and Üsküdar. A view to which nothing else is alike" (Oral, 2004). Similarly, following the opening of the museum, journalist Alpaslan Ataman wrote a positive review of the Tophane warehouses and Istanbul Modern in an architectural journal, in which he acknowledged the architectural quality that the transformation of the Tophane site has added to the city through the completion of a modern harbour next to the warehouses (Ataman, 2005). He is one of the very few who appreciates the architectural quality of the warehouses. According to Ataman the most interesting elements of the project were the warehouses, which are repetitive and ordered, with their structural framework providing a background to the harbour, an order that is valid for every occasion. He stated that the gradual height increase of the warehouses, as seen from the shore, complements the topography at the back. About the transformation of warehouse number four into Istanbul Modern Ataman stressed the minimum intervention applied by the architects as being modest and respectful. For him, the architectural additions were kept to a minimum, which ensured that the warehouse buildings did not become spoiled:

The first of the warehouses was transformed into a museum without much change. When I went there what I saw was a warehouse transformed properly and with modesty into a museum without spoiling the building. Today there is no credit given to these buildings, which are simple but proper and right. You can see art works and old photographs instead of goods carried from freight ships. It seems like nothing much changed and the solitude in the environment gave me tranquillity. Emre Arolat wondered if it would be better to keep the original colour of the warehouses in the facades. I agreed on that. It would be necessary to thank Tabanlioğlu Architects for transforming the building in such a modest and proper intervention with minimal
additions. We are in an environment where architects are barely visible (Ataman, 2005).

A majority of the stakeholders praised the modest architectural intervention applied during the transformation of the warehouse number four into Istanbul Modern and the subsequent preservation of the original character of the warehouse building and coherent character of the site. In addition, the museum is considered to meet the needs of Istanbulites very well, particularly for a modern art museum. When the newspaper articles regarding the reuse of warehouse number four are analysed, it can be concluded that journalists share the opinion that the site's location, with its unique views, is very central to the transformation project. The museum does not only represent a good addition to the cultural life of the city, but at the same time it also acts as a place for social gathering. Public space has been another significant consideration in the architectural decisions. In the following part, this architectural layer will be discussed in more detail.
Figure 72: The functional layout of the first and ground floors. (Source: Tabanlioğlu Architects archive, 17.02.2012)
Figure 73: Warehouse Number 4 before transformation in 2002 (Source: Photo by Muammer Yanmaz from Tabanlioğlu Architects archives, 17.02.2012)

Figure 74: Interior view of warehouse Number 4 before transformation in 2002 (Source: Photo by Muammer Yanmaz from Tabanlioğlu Architects archives, 17.02.2012)
**Figure 75**: General view of Istanbul Modern (Source: Photo by Murat Germen from Tabanlioğlu Architects archive, 17.02.2012)

**Figure 76**: Istanbul Modern after transformation in 2004 (Source: Photo by Murat Germen from Tabanlioğlu Architects archive, 17.02.2012)
Figure 77: Opening of windows within the museum (Source: photo by Murat Gemen from Tabanlıoğlu Architects archive, 17.02.2012)

Figure 78: What Tabanlıoğlu calls inside out, the modern and the ancient merge through transparency (Source: photo by Murat Gemen from Tabanlıoğlu Architects archive, 17.02.2012)

Figure 79: The library of Istanbul Modern (Source: photo by Murat Gemen from Tabanlıoğlu Architects archive, 17.02.2012)
6.3.3. Public Space

Public space was another feature that played an important part in the architectural design process behind the transformation of warehouse number four into Istanbul Modern. The improvement and beautification of the environment, by adding various social functions to warehouse number four, and the rehabilitation of the Tophane Square were additional interventions to the site. According to Tabanlioğlu, the museum represented the first step towards the realisation of the wider Galataport project and it led to an extension of the public space in the area (Tabaloğlu, 2005). The clock tower, which had been ignored for many years, was renovated and emphasised under the design scheme. Tabanlioğlu criticised the fact that there are no proper public squares in Istanbul where people can come together and socialise, and stressed the significance of Tophane square in the site (Interview with Tabanlioğlu, 2012). She indicated that due to the location of the site, on the intersection of a cultural axis from Beyoğlu and the historic waterway from the Golden Horn, a social square surrounded by cultural, commercial, and social facilities would work very well. Historically, the site of the Tophane square has never been used as a public space, but housed the courtyard of the artillery barracks instead. However, this new public use would be favourable for the citizens of Istanbul. Tabanlioğlu also underlined the benefits of opening Istanbul Modern as a publicly accessible point where the historical peninsula is visible and the silhouette of Istanbul can be experienced from. She indicated that nobody was able to enter this area before, and that nobody could enjoy these views of Istanbul from the site before. This desire to open up the view on the historical peninsula is something Tabanlioğlu stressed several times, also during the concept design of the Galataport project.

Part of the success of Istanbul Modern comes from the fact that it has become a meeting point for Istanbulites and a place for social gathering beyond its function as centre of arts and culture (Tabanlioğlu, Istanbul Modern from warehouse to museum, 2005). In addition, the museum contributed to the creation of a contemporary identity for the site, ensuring that the site has become a precious part of the Bosphorus waterfront, and adding a new aesthetic value to the city. The site, incorporating other warehouses, has progressively transformed into a pleasant cultural-art-activity spot by integrating the Bosphorus waterfront.
with the urban environment. Being situated by the Bosporus, the new scheme also encouraged sea transportation as an alternative to the hectic road traffic. As mentioned before, the architects claimed that the museum was designed not only to house a museum, but also to act as a place for social gathering.

The intention to act as a place for social gathering was taken seriously by Istanbul Modern as an institution. In summer 2013, Istanbul Modern was involved in one of the most recent and significant examples of public space design scheme which is called YAP: Young Architects Programme. The Young Architects Program is a public space design programme held biannually over the summer and is initiated by The Museum of Modern Art (MoMA). The programme’s first design focus in 1998 was MoMA PS1’s courtyard in New York and in 2010 it went international with the participation of CONSRUCTO in Santiago, Chile, and the National Museum of XXI Century Arts (MAXXI) in Rome the year after. Istanbul Modern was invited to join the program by MoMA and MoMA PS1 in 2012. Architectural experts, representatives from Istanbul Modern and other YAP members formed the jury. The programme offered young architects the opportunity to design a temporary installation in Istanbul Modern's courtyard, thus contributing to the public space of the site. The design theme of YAP encourages its participants to address environmental issues such as sustainability, reuse, and re-cycling. In order to increase the use of open space, elements of shade, water and seating are encouraged for integration into the design so that users are protected from the heat, thereby opening up the potential to host diverse activities and create intimate social spaces for Istanbulites (YAP Istanbul Modern: Young Architects Programme, 2013). In summer 2013 the project "Sky Spotting Stop" (Figure 80-82), designed by Sevince Bayrak and Oral Göktaş, was selected as the preferred temporary public space design. It was exhibited in the site from the end of June till mid November 2013.

Istanbul Modern's decision to cooperate with MoMA and create an opportunity for young architects to design a world class public space that contributes to the dynamism of the site was based on its ambition to become a pioneering institution. Oya Eczacıbaşı evaluated the YAP Istanbul Modern project as a very valuable step towards realising this pioneering architectural role:
Our museum aims to deliver the avant-garde movements in international architectural tendencies and support creative architectural projects in Turkey. To achieve this aim YAP Istanbul Modern is a suitable program. In Turkey, there has been a striking accumulation and production of contemporary architecture. The erection of a special structure on the courtyard of Istanbul Modern and several activities organised over the summer and hosted by YAP Istanbul Modern will encourage new talent and form an international discussion platform in Istanbul on contemporary architecture (Istanbul Modern is starting a new architectural programme in cooperation with MoMA ve MoMA PS1, 2013).

Istanbul Modern has not just acted as a cultural institution but it has also had an additional role as a place for social gathering. When we take a closer look at the building, we can see different dimensions of the site being revealed as well. The Young Architects Program not only creates a lively, well designed public space for social gatherings, at the same time the cooperation with MoMA is intended to lift Istanbul Modern to an international standard. In addition, after the realisation of Istanbul Modern the site started to be referred to as “Art Island”, which provides the site with the opportunity to host various forms of arts. These recent and temporary changes contribute significantly to the dynamism and complexity of the site.

In the previous part of this chapter, three main dimensions of the layer architectural translations were discussed. The first dimension highlighted as part of this architectural concern was urban memory, the second dimension was minimum intervention, and the third dimension was public space. In the following chapter, the layer cultural life will be elaborated on.
Figure 80: YAP Istanbul Modern Project winner "Sky Spotting Stop" designed by Sevince Bayrak and Oral Göktaş (Source: http://www.moma.org/interactives/exhibitions/yap/2013istanbul_so.html, accessed 13.06.2014)

Figure 81: "Sky Spotting Stop" Project (Source: http://www.archdaily.com/397691/so-celebrates-the-opening-of-sky-spotting-stop-in-istanbul/, accessed 13.06.2014)
6.4. Cultural Life

This part of the chapter identifies the layer that Istanbul Modern adds to the cultural life of the city. Since the opening in 2004, the museum has attracted a tremendous amount of visitors due to the fact that it was the first museum of modern art of the country and it was well advertised. In the first year alone, more than 500,000 people visited the museum. Although there is general agreement among all the protagonists of the debate that Istanbul Modern is a leading organisation for art and culture, criticism towards the administration and the collection of the museum remain. On the one hand, some of the interviewees stress the importance of Istanbul Modern due to the fact that it is the first modern art museum in Turkey, and that it accommodates important foreign artists. The museum also provides new facilities for children and youngsters, and has a different art collection to that found in the state museums. On the other hand, some interviewees criticise the method of administration and the lack of diversity in the collection.
Unsurprisingly, the architect of the transformation, Melkan Gürsel Tabanlıoğlu, praised the uniqueness of the museum in terms of its cultural and artistic calibre in Istanbul, and even in the whole of Turkey (Interview with Tabanlıoğlu, 2012). She referred to the Galataport project and mentioned that although the overall project could not be realised, the most essential programme of that project, a cultural facility, was eventually realised in the form of Istanbul Modern. Tabanlıoğlu underlined the fact that Istanbul Modern has become a symbolic focal point for prestigious foreign visitors such as royals and government representatives. The network of foreign museums that Istanbul Modern participates in and the exchange programme involving Istanbul Modern's art collection were mentioned. She evaluated Istanbul Modern's contribution to Turkish cultural life:

The vision that started with an architectural project eventually managed to establish the cultural leadership of Turkey. And after this project, many private sector institutions became enthusiastic and many attempts to establish a museum occurred. Some of them were realised, some were not. Art galleries and other art platforms where good art is depicted all started to occur one after each other. Istanbul Modern is somehow the catalyst of all these. In this sense it gained a very important position. It became an art leader, after that many museums opened. Art started to be talked about. Istanbul Modern has had a serious contribution in this sense, because before the opening of Istanbul Modern people used to visit the archaeology museum, a few government museums like Topkapı Palace and so on. The first private museum that attracted huge visitor numbers is Istanbul Modern. Then it led to other museums being visited too. The idea of founding a museum emerged. This is an important thing for the city... There was no place for exhibiting modern art, the artworks in the depots started to move to exhibition halls. Some important artworks started to be revealed by collectors and were exhibited. In this way the artworks that used to be private property become publicly accessible (Interview with Tabanlıoğlu, 2012).

The pioneering role of Istanbul Modern for the establishment of private art museums is one contribution of Istanbul Modern. The promotion of art to youngsters, by providing suitable facilities, can be regarded as another contribution, especially considering the fact that Istanbul Modern is such a new institution. Students and young people make up a large part of the museum's visitors. Doğan Tekeli underlined the suitability of the facilities of Istanbul Modern for the use of youngsters. He claimed that the art workshops of Istanbul Modern help students to experience and get informed about art through the interaction with the art works, which enables the students to appreciate and to perform art. Such engagement
with youngsters can be observed in Western Museums, but is something new for Turkey according to Tekeli (Interview with Tekeli D., 2012). He mentioned that the state-owned Painting and Sculpture Museum has amazing buildings, however, it is impossible to compare the number of visitors this museum attracts with the number of visitors that are drawn to Istanbul Modern.

This contribution of Istanbul Modern to the artistic and cultural life was also emphasised by the curator Levent Çalıkkoğlu. He claimed that through the exhibition of culture and art the warehouses became liveable and that the site is now conceived to be an art island (Interview with Çalıkkoğlu, 2011). After the opening of Istanbul Modern, the warehouses number three and number five, both adjacent to the museum, started to be used by the Istanbul Biennale. Prestigious exhibitions such as the 2011 Body Worlds exhibition have been organised in warehouse number three. Even though Istanbul Modern was not involved in the organisation of some art events happening in the site, these events were usually attributed to Istanbul Modern in the media. According to Çalıkkoğlu, Istanbul Modern is the centrepiece of the transformation process of the site in terms of culture and arts. As the first museum of modern art in Turkey, Istanbul Modern was able to take over all the information and documentation that had been accumulated through previous decades. Çalıkkoğlu stated that with the opening of Istanbul Modern, it was finally possible to exhibit all this accumulated artistic work in facilities that were accessible to all citizens.

Visitor’s preference of Istanbul Modern above state-owned museums was emphasised by Ersen Gürsel as well. The large visitor numbers of Istanbul Modern indicate that the exhibition of contemporary art has become popular, which was not the case for contemporary art exhibitions in state-owned museums (Interview with Gürsel, 2011). The popularity of Istanbul Modern has had a direct impact on the potential of the surrounding area, evident for example in the use of other Tophane warehouses for art biennales. Another impact can be seen in the Tophane neighbourhood, where several small art galleries have been opened after the completion of Istanbul Modern.

According to architecture critics, the importance of Istanbul Modern for modern art has been undermined due to the limited capacity of its collection and its administration model.
Uğur Tanyeli, for example, was very critical about the content of Istanbul Modern (Interview with Tanyeli, 2011). Being aware of the difficulties of running a modern art museum, he evaluated the museum as a disaster when taking into consideration the content of the art collection and the ownership model.

Istanbul Modern is not a museum of modern art, it is a painting museum. The collection is formed by what Oya Eczacıbaşı bought from painters and what is available from her friends. It is a museum that never tends to discuss when modern art started in Turkey, how to represent it, and what can be the contents of it. Museum of modern arts usually involve design, graphic design however this museum does not involve any of these arts, it is a painting museum. Therefore, you can wonder what the difference is between Istanbul Modern and the Painting and Sculpture Museum. Istanbul Modern contains more contemporary art works, however, even the Painting and Sculpture Museum pretty much contains paintings from the same periods. Istanbul Modern does not contain contemporary arts. Most of the collectors do not understand contemporary art or at least Eczacıbaşı does not, it is just a museum of painting. The museum of modern art is nothing more than a museum of painting. (Interview with Tanyeli, 2011)

Yet, as a place to enjoy art, Istanbul Modern still works very well according to Tanyeli. The huge visitor numbers of the museum and the popularity of the restaurant amongst visitors seem to prove this point. The art collection itself is not the focus of critique for Tanyeli, so much as the curatorial policy of the museum. The blame for the failure of this curatorial policy is placed with the owner, and is specifically related to the fact that the owner is trying to dictate museum policy. Tanyeli questions whether a museum can achieve positive results at all when it is managed under such an ownership model, since such a model would block the institutionalisation of the museum. MOMA and the Rockefeller Family were given as an example by him of a case in which the family does not tend to dictate museum policy or does not decide what to exhibit. In the opinion of Tanyeli, it is impossible to found a museum of modern art without institutional effort. He mentioned once more that in Istanbul Modern there is nothing exhibited about modern graphics, modern cinema, modern industrial design, or modern architecture and that this lack of diversity seems to go unnoticed.
6.5. Conclusion

In contrast to the Galataport project, the creation of Istanbul Modern did not provoke many controversial reactions and has received mostly positive remarks instead. The Istanbul Modern project has been widely publicised and publicly celebrated. The transformation of warehouse number four into Istanbul Modern represents a significant architectural achievement that continues to contribute to the use of the site and the preservation of the warehouses to the present day. The creation of the museum did not only entail a first major transformation of one of the Tophane warehouses, but has also led to immediate effects on the site, in the neighbourhood and in the city. Moreover, the museum became an important political tool for enhancing cultural integration with Europe, a purpose that can be regarded as being well beyond a museum's remit. The reuse of the warehouse number four generated transformation in the direct vicinity; other warehouses have been used either for temporary purposes such as art biennales, costume and decor workshops or have been transformed more extensively, for example the transformation of warehouse number five into a contemporary art museum. Together with the opening of Istanbul Modern, there have been significant changes in the use of the public space in the site and the cultural life of Istanbul as well.

The different discussions in the chapter have shown that the creation and subsequent existence of Istanbul Modern combines many aspects besides the institutional and administration aspects. The museum has been shown to possess a much more complex and versatile nature than generally assumed. In order to fully grasp the dynamics and multiple-dimensions of the life of the site, it was necessary to reveal the different layers in the debate around the creation of Istanbul Modern and the architectural realisation of the warehouse transformation. This chapter has provided a detailed account of the non-human actor warehouse number four and its story of transformation into Istanbul Modern. The transformation of warehouse number four into a museum of modern art has had immediate effects on the site. The analysis of architectural decisions behind the transformation of the warehouse is very crucial for understanding the changes in the site. Layering is one out of three methods of analysis that allows us to grasp a complex image of the building, the site and the city. In addition to the previous chapters of this dissertation, which allowed us to
see a detailed account of the site and its multi-actorial character, this chapter made it possible to grasp the multi-dimensional nature of the site by focusing on a particular building? The use of the concept of layering worked as a lens, helping to explore the case in a more complex way and revealing the layers constituting it. As a method of analysis, layering has helped us to detect concerns of actors that were not visible in the previous methods of analysis, such as controversy mapping and thick description. Therefore, layering is a necessary tool of analysis for detecting these other voices and opinions. In this way, it has been possible to cover all the different dimensions that manifest themselves in the site, such as integration with Europe, reuse, architectural design and cultural life. This result defines the contribution of this chapter, while also helping to establish the ultimate contribution of the dissertation, which is to show the complexity and the versatile nature of the site and its transformations through time. In addition, the inventive methodological approach of layering could be seen as a further methodological contribution of the dissertation.
CONCLUSIONS

The investigation of the Tophane site that has been conducted in this research has not only revealed the design process and design parameters behind the physical alterations of the site, but also the social life and the historical trajectories of the site, including the actors involved in this trajectory and the controversies generated by it. At the same time, this investigation has also exposed the dominant socio-economic and political agendas throughout different periods, as well as the urban policies associated with these agendas. The assumption that sites are dynamic entities that have social lives and biographies, much similar to human beings, can be solidified through a careful examination of a site's transformation through time. This process of transformation of a site starts already during the design process, through the accommodation of changing visions of the client, and continues once the site has been completed. Ongoing alterations to a site are necessitated by changing requirements and tastes of the user in addition to progressing technologies. As a result, sites are considered to be "born", as well as "growing" and changing through time.

The Tophane site in Istanbul has experienced different transformations over the course of several centuries, and has been the subject of unsuccessful transformation attempts. Originally, the site had been used as the artillery barracks and has been through several cycles of physical alterations ever since. The Ford Motor Company has used the site for production purposes. In addition, being part of the port of Istanbul has meant that port facilities were added and kept up to standards from time to time. The renewal and construction works taking place on the site have been important stages in its lifetime. The Galataport transformation proposal was one of the most controversial stages for the site’s trajectory. The warehouse number four was transformed into Istanbul Modern, while another warehouse followed soon after with its transformation into a Museum of Contemporary Art. At the same time the Tophane site has housed the Istanbul Biennale, the decor and costume workshops of Ataturk Cultural Centre (AKM) as well as port facilities for cruise ships. Currently, another controversial transformation scheme that is significant for the city has been proposed for the site.
The main body of this dissertation covered the main concepts and theories supported by three bodies of literature, waterfront redevelopment, cultural geography and architectural theory. The Tophane site, like any other site, can be considered to be a living, dynamic entity that has a "social life" and "biography", whose dynamism is derived from time. The logic behind the transformation process of the Tophane site can be understood in the context of waterfront redevelopment. Waterfront redevelopment is a result of shifts in maritime transport technology that have led a gradual replacement of bulk cargo transport by container cargo transport, and the subsequent deindustrialisation and corporatisation of the city. Common purposes of waterfront redevelopment include the enabling of public uses in waterfronts, the improvement of the derelict appearance of waterfronts and the boosting of the city’s economy. Waterfront redevelopment schemes are often programmed with leisure, recreation, and tourism facilities, and usually involve a range of different actors such as urban professionals, real estate developers, local and central government departments, non-profit sectors, and technical consulting organisations. The most common case studies explored in waterfront literature are redevelopment schemes implemented in the United States, Canada and Europe. The comprehensive analysis of the distinct transformation process of the Tophane warehouses expands the geographical focus of existing literature by incorporating a Turkish case study, while also contributing to our understanding of the mechanisms of waterfront redevelopment.

In addition to the urban transformation strategies promoted within the framework of waterfront redevelopment, other strategies impacting on the Tophane site have their origins in the concept of cultural regeneration, such as city-branding, capital of culture and tourism, as well as iconic architecture. Culture has been at the heart of urban development as a tool for urban regeneration in global, service-oriented economies. Cities are promoted to compete in the global scale by using iconicity and cultural elements in order to endorse a destination brand. “Personality branding” of cities with renown architects, “flagship constructions” of iconic buildings or urban areas, of “events branding” are some of the techniques of branding cities in the global arena in order to attract attention, place recognition, promote awareness and raise associations between the place and its assets and in return to contribute to the social and economic growth of the city. Many urban
regeneration programmes encourage cultural activities, recreation and tourism as part of their schemes. Two of the catalysts of urban waterfront redevelopment schemes are recreation and tourism. Most of the regeneration schemes designed for the Tophane site fit in well with these tendencies and involve arts, cultural programs as well as recreation and tourism activities. Istanbul Modern has helped to increase the culture generating capacity of Istanbul. As the whole, the Tophane site is used, even though temporarily, for cultural and artistic activities such as the modern arts museum, for hosting the Istanbul biennale and other temporary exhibitions and for costume and decor workshops.

However, city branding can be criticised as a strategy to create an artificial and delusional narrative to direct the attention away from the growing economic, social, and racial polarisation of cities. This so called “architecture of spectacle” supports surface glitter and temporary enjoyment. Iconic architecture is the architectural manifestation of cultural regeneration schemes. These iconic buildings are usually designed by star-architects and do not have much contributions to public space around them. They are not bound to have contextual connections, and instead operate as self-sufficient machines that are closed off for the use of ordinary citizens.

Istanbul has long aspired to become part of a global network of cities and has been competing in the international arena by adapting globalising trends. This aspiration has manifested itself in the form of a construction boom of luxurious hotels, office towers for international banks, luxurious housing developments, and new shopping malls, all of which give shape to a de-contextualised urban space of global homogeneity. In the 1980s Istanbul was a display case of Turkey’s new era of integration into the global economy. The city witnessed large-scale squatter clearance as part of massive transformation projects as well as regeneration schemes targeting historical neighbourhoods and waterfront redevelopment schemes.

Arguably, urban transformation in the Turkish context possesses four distinct characteristics. First, it mostly involves the regeneration of the unhealthy building stock such as squatter housing. Second, it is a result of the ambition to transform Istanbul into a global city that can compete in the international arena. Third, it is a highly politicised process. And lastly, urban transformation in Turkey is under control of influential
governmental actors such as the Prime Ministry Housing Development Administration of Turkey (TOKI), the Prime Ministry Privatisation Bureau, and the Ministry of Environment and Urban Planning. Urban transformation projects lead to an increase in property values in the surrounding areas due to land speculation, however; the inhabitants of the transformed areas are mostly excluded from this economic gain. The economic interests are the main concern of influential urban actors with politically motivated agendas. In addition, it can be argued that the urban transformation examples of Turkey are anti-democratic, opaque and non-participatory, as well as exclusionary of the urban poor. The public involvement in the decision process is very limited and decisions are not made in a transparent way. In the case of Istanbul, the extend of urban transformation is a cause of concern, as it tends to erase the historical and natural heritage of the city.

Focussing on the micro life of an industrial site has helped us to avoid a reductive understanding, which tends to explain a condition within a framework set by preconceived ideologies, or perspectives. Instead, this focus on the micro scale required a detailed analysis of the trajectory of the site that eventually has assisted in grasping shifting tendencies on a macro scale, such as societal change and variations in the cultural and political context. In order to investigate the various aspects of the case study and to respond to the aims and objectives of the research, this irreductive approach has been supported by research methods such as "thick description" and layering, "actor network theory", and "controversy mapping". The use of these innovative research methods has been useful for analysing the complexity of the site as well as identifying the actors involved in the trajectory of the case study and the controversies surrounding the site.

At this point, it is important to differentiate the unit of analysis of this PhD project, as it is a site, not a building. The dissertation outlines that a site is not just a physical unit, it is much more than that; it is a controversial, heterogeneous, socio-natural entity. It is neither simply a natural object, nor a pure social construction. It is made and re-made constantly by a variety of actors that discuss it, contest it, fight over it and redefine the physical or geographic contours of the site. Applying the methods of layering and controversy mapping to the transformations of the site has allowed us to argue that the site is a complex entity, whose boundaries and outlines are never clearly defined.
Stewart Brand argues that buildings can be considered to be ephemeral, whereas sites are eternal (Brand, 1994). This distinction is important in the context of this research, in which sites are considered to be the dynamic element that are subject to continuous change, while buildings come to the front of the stage only in certain times, similar to actors in a theatre. In a similar way, according to Thrift the city is formed out of a set of diverse and interacting practical orders that are formed, maintained and changed by networks of associations between actors (Thrift, 2000). These networks of associations are under continuous change, always in a state of being made and unmade. Both human and non-human actors are involved in the making of a site, a building and a city.

The site is a living, changing, never resting dynamic entity. The recollection of the trajectory of the Tophane site allows us to rethink the concept of "life" of a built form or buildings as suggested by Brand. The site is a much more dynamic and living entity— it is moving, it is being re-made constantly. One of the contributions of the dissertation is that it does not simply accept Brand's notion of "life" as related to the changes of use a building is submitted to, in other words, the way a building learns. The dissertation is able to identify other ways of learning, other ways to testify for the turbulent life of a site: the mutations, the movements, buildings appearing and disappearing on the site, changes of owners, changes of different groups of supporters and allies or opponents of the specific suggested transformations. In brief there is much more going on in a site compared to a building, as its complexity leads to a much greater dynamics of transformation.

The different connections between the hybrid, complex, and heterogeneous nature of the site and the different rhythm of its transformations have been grasped with different methods of analysis. By studying the associations of a site with its actors and the transformations through time the definition of the boundaries of the site becomes blurry. The fluidity of the entity is established by its changing boundaries. The more complex the site is the more versatile its rhythms of transformation become. We have seen that the more actors involved in the trajectory of a site the more unclear and dynamic the life of the site becomes because of the network of different concerns of different actors who play crucial roles in the site's life. The associations become more messy, "fibrous, thread-like,
wiry, stringy" (Latour, 1997) so that they can only be understood by looking at different layers and components and by sorting out the trajectories and controversies.

In order to present the social trajectories of the Tophane site, "thick description" has been used as a method of analysis. This method is helpful in displaying a detailed account of the political and social history of the site. By focussing on the micro life of the site the complexity and controversial nature of the site has been revealed, which has facilitated a better understanding of the macro scale. A site is a moving project, a dynamic entity with its own history and a social trajectory and is not just a piece of land that contains buildings. The aim of recollecting the history of the Tophane site is to reveal its dynamic nature and changeability, which is achieved by underlining the transformations that have shaped and reshaped the site. This "thick description" of the case study has shown us the transformation the site has been through with the use of archival data. The Tophane site has witnessed important changes through its existence.

The Tophane site occupies a very central and prominent location in the city and is surrounded by historical monuments. The site is a good example of showcasing the power structure of the planning system in the 19th century. It was part of Dolmabahçe Palace’s glacis, which is a security zone designed to keep any potential threat away from the Palace. The site was also part of spatial network of military barracks located in Taksim and Maçka. The emergence of the steam ships and the shift from caravan trade towards ship trade necessitated the construction of a port in Istanbul. In 1892 the Tophane area was chosen as the location for the construction of the port. With the development of the port came a demand for the construction of the warehouses for storing the goods arriving at the harbour. The Tophane site has been the subject of constant change since the beginning of the 1900s, and until the end of the 1940s the site underwent major refurbishment, enlargement and infrastructural improvement, which was reflected in the use of the port by an increase in different actors. Global tendencies as well as international actors have played an essential role in the transformation and architectural manifestation of the Tophane site as well. Ford was one of these significant international actors.

The establishment of the Ford Motor Factory’s assembly facilities define a significant period in the history of the site as well as the city. Ford wanted to define Istanbul as the
new regional production and distribution centre. Ford Motor Factory in Tophane was the first car factory and the first free zone to be established in the country. The factory plays a significant role in the industrialisation process of Turkey. Workers in the factory were trained in car manufacturing and the production process in the factory was well organised and efficient. The perfection, discipline, punctuality, division of labour and assembly line in the Ford Factory were particularly praised in the media.

Together with the assertion of a new political movement in the 1950s, as witnessed in the rise of the Democrat Party, there was more positive interaction with international actors and a subsequent expansion of foreign trade. Due to an increase in demand for storage facilities, the Tophane port was improved and enlarged with bigger warehouses. These warehouses were among the most significant investments of the Democrat Party period, as the decision to proceed with the construction meant that the issue of the location of the port was resolved, and that the industrial facilities in the Golden Horn became obsolete. The central, prominent location of the site has resulted in the incorporation of the site into intense networks of trade and movement, allowing large flows of ships, goods, tourists and locals to pass through the site. As a result, the prospective development of the site has always been a major concern for the city, because the site occupies a prominent location in the silhouette of Istanbul.

In addition to the physical changes of the Tophane site, the site has been the stage for conflicts involving a variety of actors with different opinions on the future of the site, including the proposed Galataport project. An appropriate method for analysing this contested nature of the site is "controversy mapping" (Yaneva, 2012), a method that can reveal the site's multi-actorial specificity as well as the concerns of the actors. The most cited controversies surrounding the Tophane site have been identified as: the congestion in the port; the privatisation of the site; the prioritisation of economic development above cultural concerns; the architect and architectural value; and the opaque nature of urban politics. The major dimensions of these controversies have been analysed, in order to record the voices of the involved actors and bring them to the front of the stage.

During the 1970s and 1980s, when the site did not have sufficient facilities for the increase in port activities, congestion was one of the significant problems in the site. Especially
during the summer months, when there is a significant increase in the number of cruise ships, tourists had to wait for hours before being able to discover the city. As no extension of the port was constructed or under consideration, the solution was to allocate the port to cruise ships only. The important role played by the Tophane site for hosting suitcase tourism ceased to exist, thereby losing its significance as a place not only for spreading foreign goods but also foreign ideas and lifestyles.

The location and architectural value of the warehouses are other controversial points. The initial decision to construct the warehouses in the Tophane shore is criticised by many, as the location is central and unique. The warehouses act like a barrier in front of the waterfront. The identity of the architect responsible for the design of the warehouses was an important subject of dispute as well. Although some attribute the warehouses to a celebrated architect active during the 1950s, Sedat Hakkı Eldem, there is no proof that he designed the warehouses. Therefore some of the interviewees favoured the removal of the warehouses while others supported the idea of preserving the warehouses as a memory of the site’s industrial past.

The Tophane site has long been used as a port for freight ships carrying goods to the city but is nowadays only used as a port for cruise ships. It is the only cruise ship port for Istanbul and it is one of the most popular destinations of cruise routes. However, the use of the site as port facilities for cruise ship is also controversial and problematic. The central location of the site means there is limited infrastructure available for the transportation of big numbers of cruise passengers. The limited size of the site prevents the anchoring of more than two cruise ships at a time. The additional touristic and commercial functions coming along with cruise tourism threatens the urban tissue of the Salıpazarı, Tophane and Karaköy districts by creating land speculation. The sheer size of the cruise ships anchoring in the site hinder the view to or from the Bosphorus and the warehouses in the site obstruct the view of the historical peninsula. In addition, as an international port of entry, the presence of custom functions is necessitated and unauthorised access to the site for locals is not permitted.
Another important controversy surrounding the site involved the different perspectives on the use of the site. The site was either being privatised and used for tourism by an international audience that arrive to the city by cruise ships or it would be used as public space by the citizens. This latter perspective was more concerned with the preservation of the cultural heritage of the site. The conflict between these two standpoints became more evident with the privatisation of the site and the subsequent declaration of the site as tourism area. The urban programme that was prepared for the site as part of the Galataport project was probably one of the most controversial aspects of privatisation. The design of the project was prepared by Tabanlioglu Architect, who proposed a contemporary look for the site by adding congress facilities, a hotel, an aquarium, residences and an art museum. The project was rejected by the Preservation Council based on its desire to protect the historical monuments on the site, as well as its concerns with the proposed silhouette of the shore, the urban density and building heights in the site. If the project had realised, the site would have been closed for public use as a result of the construction of luxurious hotels and congress facilities.

The bidding process of the Galataport project was even more controversial and opaque. Secret meetings of politicians with the bidders, court cases, government interpellation requests, as well as the resignation of ministers have been linked with the bidding, which turned the bidding process into a political scandal. This bidding process was a reflection of the government strategies aimed at the restructuring of cities, which is heavily based on redevelopment of the built environment.

The main resistance to the privatisation of the site and the implementation of the Galataport project and the related bidding process came from the professional chambers, with extensive support provided by the media and opposition politicians. However, unpredictable alliances have also been formed between Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality and the Chamber of Planners in order to protest the Galataport project in court. This rapid increase in associations between the various actors after the Galataport project proposals is captured in the actor network concern diagrams.
The preparation of actor network diagrams has facilitated the investigation of the multi-sited understanding of the actors. Historical maps, newspaper clippings and architectural drawings have been utilised for presenting the series of transformations, while in-depth interviews conducted with the actors helped to shape the main concerns involved in the various controversies. The actor-network diagrams included in this research show the involvement of various actors at different times of the trajectory. The actor network relations of the Tophane site are very complex, involving several governmental institutions, professional chambers, architects, planners, private companies, politicians, journalists and funding institutions. These various actors all play different roles in the transformation of the site, either as user, planner, owner, decision maker or as adversary. We can detect some groupings of actors when taking their professional background into consideration. Politicians, private companies and governmental institutions have similar networks and share concerns around the bidding process and ownership of the site, whereas architects, planners, and academics have similar networks and concerns as well, particularly regarding the design aspect of the site.

The actor network diagrams do not only help us to understand which actors involved in the transformation of the site are, but also their concerns and the moments in time they were involved in the trajectory. The actors are not always human individuals; we can detect the involvement of non-human actors such as private companies, governmental institutions and the fluid actor water. Water, here, is not regarded as just a passive natural element; instead it is considered as an active and significant non-human actor. The historical industrial notion of water and its transformation from an object of function to an object of recreation and pleasure in contemporary societies can be clearly recognised in the case of the Tophane site, a process that has been particularly facilitated by the prominent location of Tophane site at the intersection of the Bosporus and the Golden Horn. Water has played an indispensible role for the dynamism of the Tophane site, not only as an instigator of on-going reinterpretation of the built environment, but also as a facilitator for social confrontation and exchange, for movement of ideas. The simultaneous participation of water and human actors in the transformation of the site defines the site as a heterogeneous and dynamic entity.
The multi-dimensional, dynamic character of the Tophane site is essentially created by the involvement of various actors with various agendas, a notion that is captured very well by the actor network diagrams. The application of the concept of layer, both as a method of analysis and as an interpretation of "thick description", functioned as a tool for analysing the site in a more complex way by. Layering as a method allows architects, planners and designers to analyse the layers of history embedded within a site which helps to create a sense of place while fully understanding the different dimensions of it. The method of layering resonates very well with the fact that Istanbul is a complex palimpsest containing several civilisations’ legacy, made up of several layers of buildings constructed over the centuries. Layering allows us to detect the different layers that constitute the Tophane site itself.

The transformation story of the non-human actor warehouse number four into the Museum of Modern Art Istanbul Modern was the subject of focus in the last part of this research. The investigation of different layers revealed the different dimensions of the transformation process. The first layer of transformation is Building a Bridge with Europe, which discusses the importance attributed to Istanbul Modern and its collection in regards to cultural integration with Europe. Reuse discusses the reuse of industrial buildings, specifically in the case of Tophane warehouses. The third layer is Architectural Translations which contains three layers itself: urban memory, minimum intervention, and public space. The fourth layer, Cultural Life, investigates the contribution of Istanbul Modern in the cultural and artistic level.

Istanbul Modern has been regarded as a key to integration with Europe in terms of its ability to showcase the artistic and cultural life of Turkey. Istanbul Modern was presented as the new indicator of the future development of the metropolis, creating a new image for Istanbul. Media interest in the opening of Istanbul Modern was significant, both on national and international levels. Journals and newspapers have depicted Istanbul Modern as a valuable contribution to the global art scene and have acknowledged the museums’ important role model as an example of European integration. This ascribed purpose to Istanbul Modern is open to discussion as it is rather ambiguous. Yet Istanbul Modern has
been an enormous contribution to the dynamism of the Tophane site and even to the neighbourhood.

The transformation process of warehouse number 4 into Istanbul Modern was spontaneous and variable. The permanency or the budget of the museum was unknown at the beginning of the transformation. There was limited time and money for the realisation of the project, however a dedicated core group of actors were involved. The process of transformation was participatory: the curator, the director, and the architects were involved in the decision making process. The central location of the warehouses presented a fantastic setting for the exhibition of modern art and the warehouses were adaptable for reuse. The creation of a site that is accessible to the general public and the addition of a cultural attraction point, the main ideas behind the Galataport project according to the architects, have both been made possible with the realisation of Istanbul Modern. This is the main reason why the transformation of warehouse number four into Istanbul Modern has been widely accepted and celebrated. The architectural materialisation of the transformation was with minimum intervention to the warehouse building in order to keep the character of the warehouse intact. In this way coherence with the neighbouring warehouses was maintained, as well as respect for the previous architectural endeavours. The architects chose to use neutral colours and materials; the structural composition of the warehouse was kept intact. Istanbul Modern’s modest transformation can be regarded as an architectural success. Since the opening, the museum has attracted a tremendous amount of visitors, particularly youngsters, as a result of the new facilities designed particularly for this user group. It accommodates artistic work of foreign and contemporary artists, and acts as an attraction for international visitors.

The cooperation of Istanbul Modern with MoMA provides opportunities for young architects to showcase their work in a world-class public space design. These recent and temporary developments in the site have made a significant contribution to the dynamism of the site and to Istanbul Modern as a pioneering institution. The museum does not only represent a good addition to the cultural life of Istanbul but at the same time it has become a meeting point, a place for social gathering for Istanbulites. The introduction of various social functions and the improvement and beautification of the environment has had positive
effects on the site and the neighbourhood, with the opening of small galleries nearby. The successful transformation of the warehouses have made the surrounding sites very attractive for private developers, and many of the buildings in Tophane and Karaköy have been bought up by developers and speculators, a process that might show its effects in the coming decades.

Tophane site has been used as a location for industrial functions most of its lifetime, it was the location for the trade port and storage facilities of Istanbul. The waterfront of the site has never been for public use in the spatial memory of the city. However Istanbulites reclaim their urban waterfront, the prospect of the transformation of the site, generated consensus that the site should be made accessible to citizens and become public space. With the Galataport proposal this industrial function aimed to be replaced with leisure, entertainment and tourism. The privatisation of the site has also created controversies in terms of public use of the site. Government organisation representatives generally support the privatisation of the site with the tourism and promotion prospects, whereas, representatives of professional chambers and academics tend to be against it, instead they support public access to the site by strengthening the relation to the waterfront with cultural and public facilities. That is why the transformation of warehouse number four into Istanbul Modern has been widely accepted and celebrated. The museum has made possible to enter the site and see Istanbul from there.

The site is expected to be subject to a dramatic transformation in the near future, if the latest proposal will be realised. In spite of all the objections from civil societies and professional chambers, the government move towards transforming the site into a main cruise port once again. A new bidding process for thirty-year use of the Tophane site started in May 2013. The media giant Dogus Holding was announced as the successful bidder through their bid of 700 million dollars, which is much less than the 3.5 billion Euros that was announced as a result of the 2005 bidding process. The new bidding process has been covered in the media with great attention, and real estate values in the neighbourhood have started to increase already. The new project and the related bidding process have generated new controversies. The Istanbul City Defence initiative was among the first to protest the new project, arguing that the transformation is profit
orientated and ignores the quality of life. This is testament to the expectation that the Tophane site will continue to be contested and controversial in the future through the continuing involvement of a wide range of actors with different concerns.

The most important aim of this dissertation has been to uncover the complexity and the versatile nature of the Tophane site and its changing phases and layers through time. The claim that a site can be considered as a dynamic entity, and that actors play crucial roles in its transformation, constitutes the originality of this PhD research. Its contribution to cultural geography literature comes from its emphasis on a site, as opposed to the usual focus on buildings and cities as dynamic entities. This research contributes to the existing body of waterfront redevelopment literature as well. Waterfront redevelopment literature focuses extensively on conditions and purposes of regeneration; however, it seems to dedicate far less attention to the role and position of the actors. This research stresses the specificity of the role of the actors within the process of urban redevelopment. In addition, this research has a geographical contribution to the literature on Turkey. The research is methodologically very distinctive, yet it represents an extensive study on a very important contested site within the Turkish context.

Despite comprehensive urban transformation proposals, the Tophane site has not yet been completely transformed due to its contested nature. Instead, transformation in the site started with an intervention in one of the warehouses followed by minor changes in other warehouses on the site. These small and temporary changes make the site dynamic, and create the possibility of unanticipated change. The lack of a permanent urban programme initiates the creativity of different stakeholders. In this sense, this research presents a version of waterfront redevelopment that is in contrast with successfully completed waterfront redevelopment schemes that are mostly included in the existing literature. In addition, existing waterfront redevelopment literature lacks an in-depth analysis of the involvement of actors in waterfront redevelopment processes, even though urban professionals often play a significant role in the design and execution of regeneration schemes. By focussing on the significance of the involvement of urban professionals in the process of waterfront regeneration schemes, a detailed analysis of the trajectory of the Tophane site has been achieved.
Another way in which this research is expected to contribute to architectural theory and cultural geography literature is its use of innovative research methods. This methodological contribution of this PhD project comes from the fact that it makes use of a variety of research methods for tackling the complexity and dynamics of the site, such as archival research, in-depth interviews, thick description, controversy mapping, and layering. Given the complex, dynamic and controversial nature of the site, its transformation through time cannot be fully understood by only utilising traditional research methods such as archival research or interviews. In order to be able to witness the dynamism and the heterogeneity, a variety of methods have been used, which grasp the unique site dynamics and complexity that is, its "life", which cannot be grasped with static methods. Versatile methods were deemed to be most appropriate for the analysis of a versatile object, in this case the "life", of a specific site.

The use of the concept of layering as an innovative methodological approach has assisted in grasping the multi-dimensional nature of the site by focussing on a particular building, and can be considered a methodological contribution of this dissertation. In doing so, layering has facilitated the detection of different voices, the discussion of different viewpoints, and the understanding of the complex nature of the site. In addition, the original use of research methods such as “thick description”, “actor network theory”, and “controversy mapping” aspires to contribute to architectural research methods. Furthermore, the focus on the Tophane site in Istanbul aims to expand the geographical scope of both waterfront redevelopment and cultural regeneration literature. The ultimate contribution of the dissertation is to demonstrate how a thorough analysis of the complexity and the versatile nature of a site, including its changing phases and layers, can lead to a better understanding of the macro scale processes that shape the urban environment.

Each of the methods mentioned before has helped us to understand a different aspect of the site. In order to illuminate the controversies surrounding the trajectory of the site archival research was required to supplement and elaborate the data collected from the interviews. The contested nature of the site could be shown through the use of controversy mapping, which helped not only to analyse the subject of the controversies, but also the
actors involved in these controversies, as well as their concerns and viewpoints. The multidimensional aspect of the trajectory of the site could be examined and simplified by analysing each layer individually. The use of these various methods has helped us to comprehend the complexity and dynamism of the site in a systematic way.

This research has been restricted by time. The detailed data analysis had to be restricted to the fieldwork period in order to be able to analyse the collected empirical data and complete the dissertation. Therefore some of the most recent transformation could not be included in a detailed way nor could the most recent actors be interviewed. In addition, the interviews had to be restricted with the actors who showed interest in the research. Some of the actors did not want to conduct an interview, such as the winners of the Galataport bidding. The involvement of representatives from governmental and other political bodies as interviewees has also been restricted as it was rather problematic to approach them for an interview request. The controversial nature of the bidding process might be the reason for their refusal to the interview requests. The most recent developments such as the construction of the Museum of Contemporary Art, the newest bidding proposal, the controversies surrounding these new developments and the actors involved in them could be further investigated and analysed. The task to include these recent developments will fall on any future research that builds on this dissertation.

Another important innovative aspect of this research is the fact that it is dealing with a site, not with a building. This research argues that architectural design is not a simple action of fitting a building into a site, when it is seen through the micro lenses of layers, mapping, and thick description, and taking into consideration the timeline of events impacting on a site and actor network diagrams of the actors involved in the trajectory of the site. The site should not be considered as a static entity, or buildings as dynamic ones. What this research reveals is that the site can be equally dynamic and challenging. Architectural design is not just a simple move of re-adjusting the site according to a less dynamic ‘life’ of a building, such as a listed building, that has a slower speed of change.

Both buildings and sites are complex, heterogeneous and dynamic entities; therefore the challenge that architectural design faces consists of finding ways of adjusting those two
complex entities, synchronising the dynamics and rhythms of transformation. Rather than fitting a living building into a static site, or shaping a living site according to a static building, adjustment is the formula of success. If we manage to account for the complex actors and actorial dynamics that shape both buildings and sites, we will be better prepared for the design challenges that architects, planners and developers in Istanbul will face when they engage in modernising the city.
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