

# **Istanbul: Dilemma of Direction**

**Asu Aksoy**

As the city increasingly opens itself to the contemporary global order, the fundamental issue confronting Istanbul is about the kind of openness it will harness. There are two possibilities. On the one hand, what we might call global integration. Thus, what we are seeing is the development of new spaces of consumption and of tourist commodification; the implication of the city in new financial flows and the rapid expansion of the real-estate and service industries; and the proliferation of gated communities and the gentrification of living spaces. The prevalence of neo-liberal values within the Islamic AKP (Justice and Development Party) government, over the last decade or so, is associated with this more assertive, globalising, and entrepreneurially-minded Istanbul. As global processes increasingly, and seemingly irreversibly, affect the daily life of the city's fifteen million residents, older modes of urban living and established forms of public culture are damaged, if not devastated. This represents one contemporary variant of world-openness - the neo-liberal articulation. Openness to global economic forces is associated with escalating social divisions, existential loss of control, and cultural vulnerability.

On the other hand, we have - or let us, rather, say that we might have - the possibility of a social and cultural openness predicated on inclusive and egalitarian principles - a politically inspired, alternative vision of openness. For the advocates of such a trajectory of possibility, what is crucially at issue is Istanbul's potential to articulate a counter-weight to unfettered neo-liberalism, by enhancing a democratic modality of worldliness and openness. In the years following the end of the Cold War, and in the context of Turkey's difficult membership negotiations with the European Union, Istanbul has become a less isolated and enclosed city. There has been greater interaction and collaboration with other European urban cultures, and beyond. And this has translated into a greater awareness of cultural diversity within the metropolis, even into tentative discourses of cosmopolitanism. Of course this is a more fragile and precarious version of what world-openness might, or should, be about. But, in the face of the uncompromising forces of urban globalisation now assaulting Istanbul, it is vitally important to nurture and sustain this civic imagination of the city and of its possibilities.

Effectively, realistically, Istanbul's dilemma is how to hold in balance two seemingly unreconcilable principles and sets of priorities. On the one hand, the logic of globalizing the city, with its drive for wealth creation, and increase in the standard of living, for some of its inhabitants at least. And, on the other, the principle and value of inclusive citizenship, and of a more egalitarian distribution of welfare, as a means of opening the city to all its residents. Istanbul's choice now is about addressing and negotiating this contemporary dilemma of direction.

The issues and the difficulties may be concretely illustrated through the recent experience of Istanbul's 2010 European Capital of Culture programme. In the early days of preparations, consultation, and drafting of the submission for Istanbul's bid for European Capital of Culture status, one of the central themes was precisely the urban transformations underway in the city. In these early days, there was an awareness within the 2010 Initiative group about the way in which the direction of change in the city towards large-scale gentrification was leading to increasing polarization and to disenfranchisement of the poor and disadvantaged. And there was

consequently a concern that Istanbul's culture and heritage would suffer over the long term from such developments. In the masterplan prepared by the Initiative group, the issue of the restructuring of the city became one of the main themes for action. Under the title *Civic Istanbul*, the document stated 'that the city as a public resource is now subject to fundamental structural changes as a result of extensive privatization and massive and irreversible urban regeneration projects.' 'The city is losing its civic persona,'<sup>1</sup> it was argued. In the context of the possibilities to be potentially put on offer by the Capital of Culture programme, the group afforded a key role to arts and culture as a means of enabling and empowering citizens within a 'city for all'.

A second, and closely related, theme of the masterplan addressed the issue of Istanbul's long, unique, and rich cultural heritage. Here too, with respect to the conservation and rehabilitation of the city's cultural heritage, the Initiative Group felt that Istanbul 2010 was facing a major challenge, in the face of an urban transformation process that was becoming increasingly damaging to the historic fabric of the city. The masterplan maintained, therefore, that 2010 programming should promote participative action and should aim to turn cultural heritage 'into resources that enrich the lives and visions of Istanbul's present-day inhabitants.' Here again a very different, and competing, vision was being put forward, as an alternative to that of the tourism-focused and real-estate driven urban renewal projects that had come to prevail in Istanbul's historic districts and neighbourhoods.

The Initiative group worked to put into place a principled and credible cultural and heritage strategy for the city. The 2010 process was seen as a vital opportunity to shift the focus of urban renewal projects towards urban neighbourhood rehabilitation and restitution programmes, prioritising the needs of citizens and residents, and endeavouring to make these central to the public culture and spirit of the city. But, in this endeavour, the group, comprised largely of NGO representatives, made little or no headway against the vastly more powerful counter-forces of capital that were working in their ways to re-shape the city according an entirely different logic. The 2010 Initiative group vision lasted only until the first monitoring panel meeting organised by the EU at the end of 2007. By then, stronger vested interests, both political and commercial, began to take over. Initiative Group was dissolved and a new structure dominated by the power of central government was established. The General Secretary was appointed by the minister in charge of the event, and a substantial amount of money was earmarked with a specific remit to market the city and attract tourists. And so we arrived to where we are at today: to the instrumentalization and exploitation of the Istanbul 2010 project for the purposes of city marketing, tourism and gentrification. The abrupt change of mind and direction in Istanbul concerning its 2010 vision and programme is a cautionary signal that the forces for the non-governmental, non-partisan vision of a civic urban culture to take root are weak and assailable.

In the following discussion, I will try to capture the core dynamics of the urban transformation process in Istanbul today, with a view to situating the challenges and the threats that the historic districts in the city are presently experiencing – we may think of it in terms of what, in December 2009, the ICOMOS Turkish National Committee aptly characterised as a 'double-pronged threat'<sup>2</sup>: the threat of unacceptable interventions in civic architectural heritage; and the threat of the forced displacement of residents from these districts. Hopefully, this analysis will illustrate why the idealistic Istanbul 2010 vision, which I have outlined very briefly above, did not, in the end, become the chosen path for the city. This in order to put into perspective the terms, and the dilemmas,

of Istanbul's choice today. Or, maybe it is, unfortunately, more accurate to say, why possibility of choice now seems and feels to be occluded in the processes of urban transformation. Maybe, that is to say, the possibilities inherent in choice have been erased from Istanbul's agenda?

### **'Constructing the City Anew'**

'Constructing the City Anew' was the title of a short article published in 2004 in a conservative weekly news magazine (*Aksiyon*), praising the urban transformation process that had started in one of the municipalities outside the central zone, in an area where ninety per cent of housing was informal (i.e. built without planning permission, and often lacking formal entitlements to property). 'What started in [the municipality of] Küçükçekmece has the potential to transform the look of Istanbul as a whole,' the author claimed.<sup>3</sup> The article stressed that this was not a rehabilitation project, but, far more ambitiously, a complete overhaul, effectively, we might say, a replacement of the area, with new and planned urban neighbourhoods rising in the place of former informal settlements. Küçükçekmece was said to be a pilot and test case that could demonstrate 'how neighbourhoods with no urban quality will be turned into valuable and liveable places,' with the increased property values becoming the main drivers of the urban transformation process itself. The transformation was to be achieved through collaboration between local, metropolitan and central government authorities. Hence, in Küçükçekmece, a protocol was signed, in 2004, between the municipality, the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality, and the central state's Mass Housing Administration (TOKİ), to construct new housing for almost 3000 households on 125 hectares of informally-populated land. Even by the time that the keys for this housing development were being given to the new owners, that is in 2006, the municipal and central government authorities had already drawn up plans for a massive escalation of the urban renewal programme, going so far as to announce that 'half of Istanbul' would have to be pulled down.<sup>4</sup> This development, the 'project of the century', as the metropolitan mayor Kadir Topbaş has put it, was necessary, not just because of the risks associated with the anticipated next earthquake in the city, but, maybe above all, in order for Istanbul 'to rise up and shed its deformed and twisted image and become a world city.'<sup>5</sup> For reasons of prestige, that is to say.

The project of globalising Istanbul has been on the agenda since the 1980s, when the idea was pushed, almost single-handedly, by the ambitious previous mayor of the Metropolitan Municipality (1984-1989), Bedrettin Dalan. At that time, Dalan was seeking to 'transform Istanbul from a tired city, whose glory resided in past history, into a metropolis full of promise for the twenty-first century.'<sup>6</sup> And, in the cause of re-positioning it as a global city, Dalan's administration did indeed accomplish dramatic and drastic changes in the urban form and fabric of Istanbul. However, in the 1980s and throughout the 1990s, this global vision achieved only partial and piecemeal results. Real-estate developments, such as the notorious Park Hotel construction, the Gökkafe Hotel, and residential area clearing projects, such as the intrusive opening of the Tarlabaşı Boulevard, and the sweeping away of the industrial infrastructure along the banks of the Golden Horn, all attracted huge protests from the city's planning circles (the Park Hotel project was left unfinished, and remains so today, due to court proceedings against it). The various shopping malls, residential complexes and commercial headquarters that started to spring up on the edges of the city, remained for the most part isolated and scattered projects of the city's globalising elite (and were driven mainly by local, Turkish-origin conglomerate capital). Istanbul thus

entered the new millennium as only an aspiring, only a partially-achieved, global metropolis - but was already taking its future shape as a dual and divided city, it should be added.<sup>7</sup>

What, today, makes mayor Kadir Topbaş's vision of a globalizing Istanbul more decisive and more absolute is the massive support it is now getting from central government in Ankara. This is what distinguishes the present-day scope and scale of urban transformation from the previous regimes of liberalization and opening of Istanbul to the global economy. Globalization is a central mission of the AKP government, and Istanbul is the privileged arena of operation. In a speech given in 2006, Prime Minister Tayyip Erdoğan warned that 'we must not forget that we are living in a globalizing world.' He continued:

Like every other nation, Turkey now has two options. We can choose to resist change. In this case, we will also have to accept that our current lot is the highest step we can achieve on the ladder of historical evolution. We will have to accept and be content with the state we are currently in, if, that is, we survive. Or, we will choose to change our worn-out discourse dating back to the years of the Cold War. Only then we can recreate ourselves and avoid the dead-ends we are drifting towards.<sup>8</sup>

As has rightly been pointed out, the AKP's pro-globalization stance should be understood within the context of the party's drive to show 'that it has adopted the original Republican mission to catch up with the modern world'.<sup>9</sup> The consequence of Istanbul being governed by an AKP administration has been the emergence of a total accord between central and local governments - between Ankara, where the central government is seated, and Istanbul, which is being promoted to the global stage. The period of 'informal globalization', as the sociologist Çağlar Keyder<sup>10</sup> characterizes it, of the 1980s and the early-1990s, has now been superseded, as a result of the consensus and commitment of both urban and central governments to turn Istanbul into Turkey's global power-base. Prime Minister Erdoğan, in his opening speech at the World Bank and IMF Governors' Council meeting that took place in Istanbul in October 2009, drew the contours of Ankara's vision of the role that Istanbul is positioned to play - and must be positioned to play:

Istanbul is one of the prominent cities in the world and in Turkey in terms of not just its history, tourism and culture but also its economic and commercial profile. I served as mayor in Istanbul for 4.5 years and I had a goal, an ambition in those days to turn Istanbul into a financial capital. Of course, because it was different politics ruling in the central government we couldn't do it then. But now, we are in power in the central government, and also in Istanbul local government. We considered the pros and cons and decided to take prompt action to make Istanbul the financial centre. As we have expressed in our medium-term programme, we will accomplish this, mindful that it amounts to an important structural reform. Private sector financial institutions are already here, we are going to move public finance institutions as well as the regulatory bodies and organizations. Istanbul at this point is entering a new restructuring process.<sup>11</sup>

In order to kick-start this process, Kadir Topbaş has masterminded a new, concerted planning initiative, establishing the Istanbul Metropolitan Planning Office (IMP), with around 500 employees, to draw up metropolitan-scale visions and plans to prepare Istanbul for the restructuring process, and to promote the city's image for global viability and competitiveness. Istanbul's masterplan, approved in 2009, sets out a vision of Istanbul 'becoming a knowledge society that is able to compete globally, with high standards of living.' In order to achieve this objective, the masterplan makes it clear that the city 'needs to go through a comprehensive structural transformation.'<sup>12</sup> The keyword here is 'structural transformation', and what is meant by this is

reducing the role of manufacturing sector in the city's employment (to a quarter of the labour force by 2023) and moving the service industry base to higher-end, knowledge- and information-centred services, finance and informatics. In order to achieve these structural changes, the masterplan proposes that industry should be moved out of the city, and that new central business districts should be created on the east-west axis along the Marmara sea coastline, releasing the pressure on the existing CBD in the centre of the city. The urban space is presently undergoing a massive reorganization in accordance with this vision. Istanbul's urban profile is being reinvented in order to attract investment and promote globalized economic development. Every part of the city is exposed to radical change, as more and more land is pulled into the market sphere, catapulting the whole of Istanbul into an irreversible process of large-scale urban development - it is an overwhelming and seemingly all-encompassing transformation.

The urban transformation unleashed by the coming together of strong political will and aggressive urban entrepreneurialism is driven by the grand ambition captured in the title of magazine article I referred to at the beginning of this section - the project of constructing the city anew, no less. In this cause, land belonging to the treasury, to public institutions, and to the municipal authorities, is the first asset to be capitalized upon. Public authorities survey their properties to see if they can be sold off to private developers. When, in 2007, the Directorate of Privatization Administration sold 100,000 square metres of National Highways Authority land in Zincirlikuyu (an area right at the heart of the central business district of the city) to a Turkish business group for US\$ 800 millions, it was the highest amount obtained until then from the privatization of a single estate. Shortly thereafter, the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality finalised the bid process for a 46,000 square metre warehouse space belonging to the Istanbul Transport Authority, situated immediately adjacent to land belonging to the Highway Authority. It was sold, for US\$ 705 millions, to a Dubai-based real-estate company that had put forward a plan to build the Istanbul 'Dubai Towers', which would become Istanbul's tallest building, at an estimated cost of US\$ 5 billion (the project is now on hold, however). The transfer of land to global commercial interests is no longer limited to any one particular area of the city, as was the case in the mid-1980s. Public spaces located in and around the entire city are coming up, one by one, for large-scale privatization and development initiatives. With the escalating commercialization of the land economy, of course, the value of property in Istanbul is rapidly rising. As a result of the sale of municipal land in the Zincirlikuyu district, for instance, the value of land rose to US\$ 15,000 per square metre there – which is to say, surpassing average values in the central business districts of even London and Tokyo.

Urban regeneration involves not just the privatization of under-utilized public land but also the transformation of a great deal of privately-owned housing stock of Istanbul, and also of the industrial areas in which investors are co-opted into regeneration projects. Here, the Mass Housing Administration (TOKİ - a public agency directly responsible to the Prime Ministry) comes into the picture, equipped with special powers and with copious financial resources to accomplish vast urban transformation projects. In 2007, the head of TOKİ publicly declared that half of Istanbul's housing stock (which totals approximately 3 million buildings) would have to be replaced over the next twenty years; and that work would henceforth begin in twenty slum-housing areas. What this entails, as in the example of the Küçükçekmece project mentioned above, is, in the words of TOKİ's headman, 'the removal of slums from where they are constructed,'<sup>13</sup> and the selling of new housing units

elsewhere to the owners of those slum-buildings at subsidised prices, in new development projects. At the same time, the land in the old slum areas is sold off or developed by TOKİ to generate funding for upgrading, i.e. gentrification, and therefore profit-realisation.

At the present time, TOKİ has signed agreements with a number of municipalities to undertake housing projects, the biggest of which is the Kayabaşı ‘satellite city’ project in Küçükçekmece. This is an area of 11 million square metres of public land, involving the building of 60,000 housing units, which, when completed, will, so it is said, constitute a ‘new city’ within Istanbul. Similarly, industrial areas where entrepreneurs can be incorporated into the transformation process are being targeted one by one for regeneration projects. The Metropolitan Municipality’s portfolio of projects vying for global investors is sizeable, stretching from one side of the city to all the others. With this reconstruction of the city, land values are escalating, of course with an upward effect on the cost of living in this globalizing city. Kadir Topbaş, in his campaign for a second term of office in 2008, did not hesitate to declare that his party would not be tolerating informal slum housing in the city anymore. ‘Istanbul,’ he said, ‘will become a planned world centre as a result of urban regeneration projects. But of course living in this kind of centre is going to be expensive. Just like it is in Paris, London, or New York’.<sup>14</sup> Point taken.

### **The City of Culture and Tourism**

As well as its urban fabric, the city’s image needs to be upgraded too, Topbaş makes clear. In fact, in the new capital city of finance and services, image is everything. When *Newsweek* magazine, in August 2005, put the headline ‘Cool Istanbul: Europe’s Hippest City’ on its cover, this surely sent a compelling, and inviting, global message. The Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality’s masterplan makes a great deal of projecting a ‘contemporary’ image of the city for the city’s competitiveness by way of investing in culture and cultural infrastructure. One of the first accomplishments of the Metropolitan Planning Office was to invite internationally renowned architects, such as Zaha Hadid and Ken Yeang, to compete for projects in the rocketing new development zones of the city. The Metropolitan Municipality has recently completed the rebuilding of the Muhsin Ertuğrul Theatre Hall in Harbiye, in the centre of the city, as a super-modern, prestigious and multi-functional cultural space. Local municipalities, too, have been investing in cultural infrastructure and in public built spaces, such as architect-designed cultural centres, entertainment centres, sport facilities, and recreation areas.

Beyoğlu Municipality was the first to allow private developers to turn an entire street in a run-down part of the centrally-located old Pera district into a themed street, based on a French – in reality, a pseudo-French - lifestyle. Changing the name of the street from Algeria Street to French Street, everything, from street furniture, sculptures and wall paintings, to the design of the restaurant interiors, was styled to evoke a certain (gaudy-fake) image of Montmartre. Increasing numbers of municipalities are considering various luring business strategies to attract cultural investors into their zones, with the explicit aim of improving their image projection. In this, they are helped by recent changes in cultural legislation that aim to provide incentives for private sector cultural investments, through an extensive range of tax breaks and the facilitation of lucrative property deals.<sup>15</sup> Investing

in art and culture has become increasingly fashionable for private investors, too. Major business conglomerates, along with their cultural foundations, have been competing with one another for suitable spaces to build arts and cultural centres. After the opening of Istanbul Modern, founded by the Eczacıbaşı family, one of the city's most prominent business dynasties, came a proposal from the Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation to turn the centrally located TÜYAP area - owned by the metropolitan municipality - into an international centre for culture and arts. This complex, it was proposed, would be designed by none other than Frank Gehry, at an estimated cost of US\$ 160 millions, and sustained by the Kıraç Foundation's US\$ 500 millions reserve for arts and culture. Corporate philanthropists stress that they undertake such large commitments in arts and culture in the spirit of making a gift to the city. As İnan Kıraç has put it, 'our only concern is to bring a modern creation that suits Istanbul.' Kıraç went on to describe the potential impact of Gehry's projected monumental design as something that would transform the area, and that would create a contemporary dialogue with the Süleymaniye Mosque and Aya Sophia.<sup>16</sup>

As more land becomes available for real-estate development, many private sector investments, some led by global companies, go into the business of shopping malls, each new one making a bigger claim to recreation, culture and entertainment provision. The city's public spaces have become a business proposition, increasingly conceived in terms of consumption and recreation possibilities. The Kanyon shopping mall, recently opened in Istanbul's central business district of Maslak, illustrates how public space has been incorporated into the culture of hyper-consumption. With its four floors wrapping around a canyon-like open-air environment, to evoke the sense of being in a street, and lined with up-market retail outlets, as well as well-groomed street vendors selling traditional foods from designer carts, and with arty street-lighting and furniture, Kanyon offers a new interpretation, through the modality of hyper-consumption for the privileged, of the experience of the city.

However, it has been with Istanbul becoming a European Capital of Culture in 2010 that the mission formulated by Istanbul's city masterplan, to exploit Istanbul's outstanding potential in culture and tourism, has attained the maximum focus. In a last minute addition to the law concerning the setting up of, and the remit of, the Istanbul 2010 Agency, central government attempted to finish off a much debated issue regarding the restoration or renovation of the symbolically-charged Atatürk Cultural Centre (AKM), at the heart of the city in Taksim Square, intended to be ready by 2010. If a smuggled-in clause concerning the fate of AKM had been successful, the city would have achieved, as Kadir Topbaş put it, 'a prestigious opera house, a cultural centre - with car park - that we could feel proud of.'<sup>17</sup> The first announcement that the newly arrived General-Secretary delivered after his (Ankara-initiated) appointment to the Istanbul 2010 Agency was that turning Istanbul into a 'brand city' would henceforth be the key objective of the 2010 programme. In similar fashion, with the same objective in mind, in his first press conference following the award of 2010 European Capital of Culture status Prime Minister Erdoğan was declaring that 'the aim is to attract 10 million tourists to Istanbul.'

Istanbul's strategy to become a fully-globalized 'open city' involves transforming its image, creating what Topbaş refers to as 'a city with a different attitude towards the world.' What is being heralded is no less than a cultural renaissance for the city. This imagined renaissance is the consequence of a new alliance of state and business interests. It receives support from the state in the form of legal and regulatory changes, including a

controversial new law for the 'renewal' of historic areas (Law No. 5366), in addition to well-financed programmes for the development and promotion of the city's cultural and tourism infrastructure. In the context of the Istanbul 2010 programme, central government has committed an investment equivalent to the Ministry of Culture and Tourism's annual budget towards the restoration and regeneration of the city's rich cultural heritage. At the same time, the state is aligning itself closely with large-scale commercial interests. As business conglomerates compete with one another to invest ever larger investments in museums, art collections, galleries and exhibitions, the old model of centrally controlled cultural provision is becoming obsolete. State-run cultural organizations, such as the State Painting and Sculpture Museum or the Atatürk Cultural Centre, are now having difficulties in maintaining their place in the new cultural scene of Istanbul - difficulties in attracting both audiences and sponsors, and management and financial difficulties as a consequence of being state-controlled. Sponsoring commercially funded events like the Istanbul Biennale now commands status and image for companies - hence Istanbul's Biennale is flourishing, and has now become one of the key visual-art events in Europe. In the new Istanbul, culture is big business.

The city, with its historic heritage districts, de-industrialised and de-industrialising spaces, run-down inner city areas, old-fashioned cultural centres, has become an extensive and a profitable regeneration site. Regeneration extends into the heartland of the historic property of the city - restoring, renewing, and thereby revising, everything in the service of the tourism industry. Recently, the mayor of Fatih Municipality (the municipality now govern the entirety of the Historic Peninsula) announced plans to rearrange the Sultanahmet square, replacing all the pavements, and closing the square off to motor vehicles. To this end, he has been negotiating with the Union of Travel Agencies (TÜRSAB) in order to get them to supply motorized golf carts to carry tourists around - as the newspapers reported ironically, 'now we are going to see a lot of little vehicles running around in the square, if the mayor has his way.'<sup>18</sup>

### **Gucci and Prada in the Historic Neighbourhoods**

Following the award of Capital of Culture status for the city, Prime Minister Erdoğan made a special plea for support from the media: 'There are elements making Istanbul ugly, elements that harm and even destroy our historic values, our cultural assets. These now need to be removed, and this requires serious media support. If there is sympathy with these [elements], if they are protected, then it would be difficult for us to carry on with our job.'<sup>19</sup> The Prime Minister was directly referring to criticisms coming from civil society organizations regarding the renewal projects in the historic districts, which have led to the erasure of whole neighbourhoods and the forced displacement of their residents. The then General-Secretary of the Istanbul 2010 Agency went a step beyond the Prime Minister's plea when he, quite astonishingly, expressed his frustration that 'we still market our plastic wares and shoddy merchandise in the historic peninsula, and we can't bring Gucci or Prada there.'<sup>20</sup>

Istanbul's historic neighbourhoods have, indeed, over the last five years, been subjected to extensive urban renewal projects. Heritage is now being dramatically 'cleaned up'. Public authorities, after decades of abandon, neglect and misconduct, are now 'becoming conscious' of the city's heritage, and of its value for the city's



image and for tourism. This marks a change from what Yıldız Sey and her colleagues noted in a 2003 report on the conservation of historic cultural heritage. This report was prepared for the Tourism Strategy Plan of Turkey 2023, and in it Professor Sey summarizes the situation regarding conservation practices in Istanbul, and in Anatolian areas with intensive historic accumulation, as being 'dire.' The state, she says, is simply 'not on the side of conservation.'<sup>21</sup> Since then, major revisions have been brought to existing legislation, and new laws have been introduced, giving power and financial resources to local authorities to undertake conservation and renewal projects in the historic districts. But, rather than providing a solution, we may say that the way these new legislations have been put into practice have only compounded the 'not on the side of conservation' problems. An amendment in 2004 to the Legislation for the Conservation of Cultural and Natural Heritage (Law No. 2863, amended by Law No. 5226) delegates authority over cultural heritage to local authorities, and creates a special fund for the restoration of heritage properties. A portion of the property taxes collected in each Turkish city is now set aside in separate accounts of the Special Province Administrations, earmarked for conservation projects undertaken by municipalities. 'Site management' is a new concept introduced by this amendment, and local authorities are now required to prepare Site Management Plans for historic areas under their jurisdiction. Another major legislative tool that has been created is the law passed in 2005, and numbered 5366 (the 'Law for the Preservation of Deteriorated Historical and Cultural Immovable Properties by Renovation and Re-use - referred to in short as the urban renewal law). Law No. 5366 gives extraordinary powers to local authorities to declare urban renewal areas, and to implement development plans in run-down areas within historic heritage sites. Municipalities, hand in hand with the Mass Housing Administration, and sometimes with private real-estate developers, are now able to turn historic areas over to new uses (museums, retail development, tourism, recreation, entertainment). Projects can be undertaken by private sector real-estate developers; listed buildings may be demolished, to be replaced by what we might call new historical-looking ones; and renewal projects are now authorized by newly established Renewal Commissions, rather than by the existing regional Conservation Councils. What this all means is that so-called renewal plans have taken precedence over conservation planning. As a senior figure in the Istanbul Branch of the Chamber of City Planners remarked recently, in the face of the slow process of obtaining planning permission according to conservation legislation, the renewal plans offer fast track solutions for targeted areas, thus attracting the attention of private developers.<sup>22</sup> One such fast solution has been the easing of expropriation rules: under Law No. 5366, if property owners do not agree to take part in a proposed project, their properties may be expropriated. Another is the possibility to target whole blocks of buildings for renewal work (rather than working at the scale of individual plots). These solutions are clearly intended to interest and lure private developers.

What this has meant for Istanbul is a total overhaul of the previous regime of conservation. Neighbourhoods with listed properties and those which had been declared conservation areas have now been targeted as 'urban renewal areas', to be developed. There are presently renewal projects concerning at least twenty blocks in the historic peninsula of the city (which is a World Historic Heritage site), and nine in Beyoğlu's Tarlabası district. In the historic peninsula, Fatih Municipality has already cleared the 92,000 square metre neighbourhood of Sulukule (the Neslişah and Haticesultan districts, with 620 housing units and 45 shop premises). This was one of the oldest residences of Istanbul's settled Roma community. The renewal project, which was put into action there in 2006, involves the replacement of exiting buildings with new housing and commercial and tourism

facilities. The UNESCO World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Joint Mission to the Historic Areas of Istanbul World Heritage site in 2008 made the following analysis:

The **Sulukule Urban Renewal Area** was designated by the Council of Ministers in 2005 and lies immediately adjacent to the Theodosian Land Walls. Implementation is within the framework of an agreement between Fatih Municipality, Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality and TOKİ – the Mass Housing Authority of the State. The project involves gentrification of the area and displacement of the long-established Roma population, the traditional musicians of the city, far to the west in Taşoluk. The single-storey Romany courtyard houses are to be replaced with taller buildings, including a new hotel and underground car parking, which will radically alter the existing urban tissue of the area. This is a very sensitive issue which has been brought to the attention of the European Parliament and the cabinet of the Prime Minister of Turkey. [...] This project has met considerable debate and **the mission recommends that a balance must be found between conservation, social needs and identity of local communities.**

Meanwhile, similar renewal projects are being approved for the Fener-Balat district (an area of 279,000 square metres), again another historic conservation area, with characteristic buildings still remaining. In fact, twenty per cent of Fatih Municipality is under renewal order, amounting to 2.3 million square metres in total. The historic Tarlabaşı district in Beyoğlu, with its abandoned Greek Orthodox churches and its streets of now dilapidated nineteenth-century houses - and presently occupied by Kurdish populations from the south-east of Turkey, living side by side with local Roma populations and illegal African immigrants - is another area targeted for clean up. This renewal project entails turning the houses into 'attractive' residences, with parking spaces and shopping areas; with facades being one of the few vestiges of the area's unique character to be retained.

Clearly, in the new political economy of globalizing Istanbul, as more and more city spaces are handed over to developers to be turned into money-making assets, historic neighbourhoods of the city increasingly become incorporated into the market logic. The sense of urgency on the part of both politicians and developers is palpable. Thus, Law No. 5366 was passed through the national parliament with unseemly speed, in response to intensive efforts on the part of Istanbul's Beyoğlu and Fatih municipalities (in the media, it was renowned as the Beyoğlu law). 'Renewal' here invariably means demolishing the old built fabric, keeping the facades, or simulacra of the facades, and introducing modern and mixed-use built form behind the 'old' facades. In the Tarlabaşı renewal zone, for instance, Beyoğlu Municipality, says that it is aiming at 'defining the area as a new city that conserves historic and cultural values, and where services, commerce, tourism and cultural activities coexist.' This 'new city' is expected to 'assist Istanbul and Beyoğlu to create a positive and attractive city image in national and international fora.'<sup>23</sup> Similarly, for the mayor of Fatih, the aim of the renewal project in the Sulukule district is the 'clearing of the depressed and deformed settlement areas, and their transformation into a contemporary and liveable city consistent in style with the historic fabric.'<sup>24</sup> The focus in these projects is overwhelmingly and exclusively on the built environment. Entrepreneurial municipal leaders solve the problem of financing the massive restoration costs of these depressed historic neighbourhoods by engaging private (or even public) development corporations, who then make an offer to the property owners in the area (in the Tarlabaşı project, the deal was 42 per cent to property owners and to 58 per cent to the developer, of the square meter of the property<sup>25</sup>). What is achieved with Law No. 5366 is effectively the 'conferment of authority to municipalities to make developers into partners of property owners without consulting the property owners.'<sup>26</sup>

Municipalities do not have to account for their top-down decisions, which have direct effect on the residents (most of whom are poor tenants), nor for their treatment of historic areas as blank pages, to be speedily readied for re-inscription. Historic neighbourhoods, with their architectural heritage, their multi-layered meanings, their cultural and historic references, and their present day social functions, are all made readily available for erasure.

As the Turkish media have been observing, these renewal projects end up being no more than gentrification projects, leading to irrecoverable loss of heritage, as well as to the displacement and disempowerment of (often tight-knit) resident communities.<sup>27</sup> Similarly, the ICOMOS Turkey National Commission recently argued that renewal projects in historic areas of the city are creating a threat for civic architectural heritage, as well as causing the displacement of tenants and property owners in these areas. These projects, they maintain, cannot be said to constitute a 'contemporary approach to conservation', nor to the needs of 'neighbourhood rehabilitation.'<sup>28</sup> In the case of the Sulukule renewal project, for example, the displacement and fragmentation of the community has had a detrimental impact on the intangible cultural heritage of the Roma community that had been living there for centuries. Hence, one of the key recommendations of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Joint Mission, in both 2008 and 2009, has concerned the imperative to address 'the outstanding universal value of the site [Historic Areas of Istanbul World Heritage Site], both in terms of its built and its intangible cultural heritage.' The UNESCO Mission Reports have made clear that 'a balance must be found between conservation, social needs and identity of local communities.'<sup>29</sup>

I have to return again to Law No. 5366. Referring to Article 1 of the Law, as well as to its implementation by the municipalities. UNESCO Mission Reports have been emphasizing that 5366 'results in urban renewal projects with a focus on land development and re-development which are inappropriate for the World Heritage core areas. The 2009 mission therefore reiterates the recommendations of the 2006 and 2008 missions that all such projects should be comprehensively revised to realise the in-situ conservation of existing historic structures rather than rebuilding and new construction.'<sup>30</sup> It is not only that the opprobrious Law No. 5366 opens the way for new constructions, but, equally significantly, it takes the legislation for renewal areas outside already existing planning regulations, and also beyond the scope of conservation planning and conservation decisions that have hitherto been the remit of Conservation Councils. Admittedly, the preparation of the Conservation Development Plans for the Historic Peninsula had taken ten years, and by 2008 they were being challenged in court. And, today, the conservation plans are still in the process of being elaborated for the peninsula. In this ambiguous planning environment, as the Chamber of City Planners has recently characterised it, Law No. 5366 is an effective tool of bypass, for municipalities to put into practice projects that focus on one particular zone without adhering to any overall masterplan logic, or, for that matter, cohering with any consistent overarching vision or principle.<sup>31</sup> The Law simply adds another dimension of complexity into the world of what the OECD Territorial Review Report for Istanbul described as Istanbul's 'semi-planning approach'. As the 2008 Report observes, 'there is a multitude of plans that involve a large number of actors with ill-defined competences leading to a diluted global vision and focus on the principal priorities.'<sup>32</sup> One urban renewal project after another, each contributing to the ambiguity and chaos, and, as one observer puts it, to enormous anxiety and tension among citizens, as most of these projects lack any social dimensions or participative mechanisms.<sup>33</sup>

This instrumental logic of fast and focused resolution in run-down neighbourhoods through the use of real-estate mechanisms seems now to be the predominant modality of intervention in the historic neighbourhoods of Istanbul. This modality of operation has a number of significant, and overwhelming, implications. Clearly the poorer residents and the small workshops of these neighbourhoods fare the worst in these renewal programmes, as they often cannot afford to remain in the new gentrified spaces. Renewal projects work to undermine the social capital of communities and to break up the social networks that have been important in sustaining livelihoods. Rather than *in situ* conservation, involving the upgrading and rehabilitation of neighbourhoods with the participation of locals (thus facilitating their integration into the city), the present approach of using development companies to achieve fast results leads inevitably to the commodification and gentrification of urban space. Public aspects of the urban culture suffer as a result, with urban citizenship being reduced to a bargaining relationship and process between development companies and ‘consumers’. Furthermore, we should note, projects implemented by way of Law No. 5366 come with a highly debatable aesthetic resolution to - authentically and authoritatively, it is claimed - restore the Ottoman heritage of the historic areas of the city. On this final issue, though I cannot go into detail here, the recent ‘Appeal of the Istanbul Chamber of Architects calling for the conservation of Historic Peninsula through a contemporary and scientific approach’ is very much to the point. The new urban renewal projects, it is said, amount to ‘cultural crime’, through the conception of such places as the historical Süleymaniye district as no more than stage décor, all in the name of Ottoman revival.<sup>34</sup> What are being conceived are no more than ‘hypothetical reconstructions’, as UNESCO rightly designates, and decries, them.<sup>35</sup> As Yıldız Sey has commented, ‘these “decorative conservation works” that prioritize the expectations and desire of the tourism industry [and now, I would add, the values of gentrification] more than the historic value of buildings jeopardise the principle of conserving the distinctive originality and historic character of the city’s heritage.’<sup>36</sup> So, in practice, we are back to the hopeless state of affairs in conservation practice that Sey and her colleagues identified back in 2003, before all these legislative changes were introduced.

### **Soft Underbelly and Achilles’ Heel**

What I have been describing is the global opening of Istanbul according to an escalating and relentless neo-liberal dynamic, and the implications that this logic has particularly for the historic areas of the city. In so far as the ruling AKP government has helped in opening Istanbul to market-driven global forces, the city’s transformation has been a state-led project. This restructuring of the city, along the lines I have been describing, suits the aspirations of its globalizing elites, and of an expanding base of property owners. A considerable proportion of the urban population is directly implicated in, and now benefiting from, the changing economy of the city. The ‘projected city’ is a collection of gentrified spaces, and the cultural imaginary is being increasingly shaped by this project of gentrification. What is significant, in the context of Istanbul, is the relentless ascendancy of this imaginary. In hegemonic circles, there is now a shared aspiration and a vision of Istanbul as a globalized and gentrified city, with clean and orderly public spaces and residential zones, with an attractive public image, world-class services, and with an incomparable heritage. The spatial politics of the city are governed by the needs of the new economy of consumption, tourism, recreation and high-end services.

But, as the city is colonised by this kind of logic of global openness, paradoxically it is losing another kind of openness, and it is, I would argue, a far more significant kind of openness - the kind of openness that has allowed citizens of all kinds to coexist, and allowed disadvantaged, marginal and incoming migrant communities to survive and make a space for themselves in the city. As Istanbul now becomes fragmented into an archipelago of gated communities, residential complexes, recreational zones, tourist areas, and so on, it ceases to be a real city, and becomes simply an immense agglomeration of disparate zones and constructions. Historic districts take their toll in this process, becoming, like all other zones, no more than 'mono-blocks', as Gülay Yedekçi Arslan, a CHP representative in the Fatih municipality assembly recently put it.<sup>37</sup> Mono-blocks in all senses of the word - architecturally, aesthetically, socially, culturally...

It may, however, be the case that the historic areas constitute the soft underbelly of the tough urban renewal programmes. Judging from the extensive critical coverage of the Sulukule renewal project in the media, and also recent criticisms regarding the projects in the historic Fener-Balat district, the strategy and the conduct of the developers are becoming a focus for opposition. These renewal projects are now being challenged by residents, professionals, NGOs, and by international organizations such as UNESCO, both in courts of law and in local and international forums. The historic areas of the city have thus become the focal point of a clash between a self-assured and determined politics of renewal, on the one hand, and a disunited collection of oppositional positions (ranging from conservationists to architects and urban planners to social and cultural campaigners), on the other.

The regeneration logic marches on with alarming boldness and resolution, however. Only very recently the mayor of Fatih Municipality, Mustafa Demir, in defence of his project in and against Sulukule, was quoted as saying that 'if they want to hang me in the name of human rights in Sulukule, then let them hang me.'<sup>38</sup> How might the civic actors properly address such a bloody-minded stance? Judging from the demise of the Initiative group's vision at the outset of the Istanbul 2010 European Capital of Culture process, the civic actors have some considerable way to go in articulating a new politics for a genuinely open city. How to communicate the idea that historic districts could be rehabilitated with the active participation and the direct involvement of local residents, in such ways as to achieve some of the objectives of the regenerationists as well as those of the so-called conservationists? How to convince the authorities that 'upgrading' does not need to be exclusionary, and that inclusiveness can present positive benefits for the city? And, perhaps most importantly, how to arrive at a consensual position, as Peter Marcuse characterizes it in a recent essay<sup>39</sup>, in which citizens, their movements, and their NGOs, articulate the fact that 'they are not after profit, but seek a decent and supportive living environment'?

As the eminent architect Nezhir Eldem once put it, 'difficulties and necessities are the friends of architects.'<sup>40</sup> The historic districts of Istanbul - with their complexity; their geographical and symbolic significance; their rich but interrupted layers of history and meaning; their depressed and impoverished neighbourhoods; their dilapidated building stock - open up many challenges and difficulties for civic actors. But maybe the most challenging of all, though, is the complexity and diversity of dispositions among the social actors and the citizens of Istanbul. This may well be the Achilles' heel of the civic-democratic movement. In facing these difficulties, the civic actors

will surely find themselves on a 'long march, through the institutions'<sup>41</sup>, and in continuing dialogue with the citizens.

---

<sup>1</sup> 'Istanbul 2010 European Capital of Culture Master Plan' The Istanbul 2010 Master Plan was prepared by the Initiative Group's Project Evaluation team and has been approved by the Group's Executive Board, 2007.

<sup>2</sup> ICOMOS Türkiye Milli Komitesi Yönetim Kurulu, 'Kamuoyuna Duyuru ve Davet', (ICOMOS Turkey National Committee Executive Board, Invitation and Announcement to the Public), 4 December 2009.

<sup>3</sup> Öztürk, Muhsin, 'Şehri Yeniden Kurmak' (Constructing the City Anew), *Aksiyon*, No. 522, 2004.

<sup>4</sup> 'İstanbul'da 1 Milyon Ev Yıkılacak' (1 Million Houses Will be Demolished in Istanbul), *Ekonomist*, 11 November 2007.

<sup>5</sup> 'İkitelli Kentsel Dönüşüm Projesi' (İkitelli Transformation Project), 13 June 2004, <http://arsiv.ntvmsnbc.com/news/273974.asp?0m=n20c>, accessed on 21 March 2010.

<sup>6</sup> Keyder, Çağlar and Öncü, Ayşe. *Istanbul and the Concept of World Cities*, Istanbul, Friedrich Ebert Foundation, 1993, p.29.

<sup>7</sup> Aksoy, Asu and Robins, Kevin, 'Istanbul Between Civilisation and Discontent', *New Perspectives on Turkey*, No. 10, 1994, p. 66.

<sup>8</sup> The Address of Tayyip Erdoğan, The Prime Minister and the AK Party Group Leader, AK Party Group Meeting, 21 February 2006, <http://www.akparti.org.tr/tbmm/grupkon.asp>, accessed on 12 February 2010.

<sup>9</sup> Çınar, Menderes. 'Is the Progressive Agenda being Handed over to Globalization?', *Görüş*, March 2003.

<sup>10</sup> Keyder, Çağlar, 'The Setting', pp. 3-28 in Çağlar Keyder (ed), *Istanbul: Between the Global and the Local*, Lanham, Rowman & Littlefield, 1999.

<sup>11</sup> IMF-Dünya Bankası Yıllık Toplantıları, AK Parti Genel Başkanı, Başbakan Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, (IMF-World Bank Annual Meetings, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, the Prime Minister and the head of AK Party) [http://www.akparti.org.tr/basbakan-erdogan-imf-dunya-bankasi-yillik-toplantilari-cerc\\_6371.html](http://www.akparti.org.tr/basbakan-erdogan-imf-dunya-bankasi-yillik-toplantilari-cerc_6371.html), accessed on 21 February 2010.

<sup>12</sup> 1/100.000 Ölçekli İstanbul Çevre Düzeni Planı, Özet, (Istanbul's MasterPlan, an Executive Summary), İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi İmar ve Şehircilik Daire Başkanlığı Şehir Planlama Müdürlüğü, [http://77www.ibb.gov.tr/tr-TR/kurumsal/Birimler/SehirPlanlamaMd/Documents/CDP\\_YONETICI\\_OZETI.-15.06.2009.pdf](http://77www.ibb.gov.tr/tr-TR/kurumsal/Birimler/SehirPlanlamaMd/Documents/CDP_YONETICI_OZETI.-15.06.2009.pdf), accessed on 27 March 2010.

<sup>13</sup> 'İstanbul'da önce 20 ana gecekondü bölgesi yıkılacak' (First, 20 main slum areas are going to be demolished in Istanbul), *Ekonomist*, 11 November 2007.

<sup>14</sup> Topbaş, Kadir, 'İstanbul için Yeniden Adayım', (I am a Candidate for Istanbul Again), *Bugün*, 20 January 2008.

<sup>15</sup> See Aksoy, Asu, 'The Atatürk Cultural Centre and AKP's "Mindshift" Policy', in Serhan Ada and H. Ayça İnce (eds), *Introduction to Cultural Policy in Turkey*, Istanbul, Istanbul Bilgi University Press, 2009.

<sup>16</sup> Can, Eyüp, 'Tepebaşı'na Yapılması Düşünülen Suna İnan Kıraç Sanat Merkezi ile İlgili Ne Yapılabilir?' (What Can be Done about the Suna İnan Kıraç Art Centre Being Planned in Tepebaşı?), *Hürriyet*, 9 December 2009.

<sup>17</sup> 'Topbaş'tan AKM itirafı: Yöntem Yanlılıgımız oldu', (Topbaş's AKM Confession: We made Methodological Errors) <http://www.arkitera.com/news.php?action=displayNewsItem&ID=20991&month=1&year=2009&month=12&year=2008>, accessed on 27 March 2010.

<sup>18</sup> "'Tarihi" değil, "modern" yarımada' (Not a 'historic', but a 'modern', peninsula), *Milliyet*, 24 February 2010.

---

<sup>19</sup> İstanbul 2010 Avrupa Kültür Başkenti-Başbakan Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, (İstanbul 2010 European Capital of Culture, Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan), <http://www.abgs.gov.tr/index.php?p=40254&101>, accessed on 21 February 2010.

<sup>20</sup> Altuğ, Evrim, ‘Avrupa“Tadilat” Başkenti’ (European ‘Refurbishment’ Capital), *Sabah*, 17 November 2008.

<sup>21</sup> Sey, Yıldız, ‘Vizyon 2023 Öngörü Panelleri: Sürdürülebilir Kalkınma/Tarihi Kültürel Mirasın Korunması’ (Vision 2023 Projections Panels: Sustainable Development/Conservation of Historic Cultural Heritage) , [http://www.tubitak.gov.tr/tubitak\\_content\\_files/vizyon2023/csk/EK-13.pdf](http://www.tubitak.gov.tr/tubitak_content_files/vizyon2023/csk/EK-13.pdf), accessed on 21 March 2010.

<sup>22</sup> Güney, Zeynep, ‘5366 Sayılı Yasa’nın Tarla başı’na Getirdiği Kentsel Çözüm’, (Urban Solution Introduced to Tarla başı by Law No. 5366), 27 June 2008, <http://www.arkitera.com/h30925-5366-sayili-yasanin-tarlabasina-getirdigi-kentsel-cozum.html>, accessed on 28 March 2010.

<sup>23</sup> ‘Beyoğlu İlçesi Tarla başı 1. Etap Yenileme Alanı Yenileme Avan ve Uygulama Projesinin Hazırlanması ve Uygulanması İş İdari Şartnamesi’ (Administrative Terms of Reference for the Preparation and Implementation of the Beyoğlu Municipality Tarla başı First Stage Renewal and Area Implementation Project), [http://www.tarlabasiyenileniyor.com/download/idari\\_sartname.pdf](http://www.tarlabasiyenileniyor.com/download/idari_sartname.pdf), accessed on 28 March 2010.

<sup>24</sup> ‘Neslişah Ve Hatice Sultan (Sulukule) Mahalleleri Yenileme Projesi’ (Neslişah and Haticesultan Districts [Sulukule] Renewal Project), 19 August, 2006, [http://www.fatih.bel.tr/kate\\_detay.asp?id=46&tur=387](http://www.fatih.bel.tr/kate_detay.asp?id=46&tur=387), accessed on 27 March 2010.

<sup>25</sup> Aşık, Melih, ‘Tarla başı Projesi’, Arkitera, 9 April 2007, <http://www.arkitera.com/h15877-tarlabasi-projesi.html>, accessed on 21 March 2010.

<sup>26</sup> Dinçer, İcelal, ‘Kentsel Koruma ve Yenileme Sorunlarını Örnekler Üzerinden Tartışmak: Süleymaniye ve Tarla başı’ (Discussing Urban Conservation and Renewal through Examples: Süleymaniye and Tarla başı), *Planlama Dergisi*, 26 January 2009, <http://www.planlama.org/new/planlama.org-yazilari/kentsel-koruma-ve-yenileme-sorunlarini-ornekler-uzerinden-tartismak-suleymaniye-ve-tarlabasi.html>, accessed on 2 April 2010.

<sup>27</sup> Benmayor, Gila, ‘Romanlar TOKİ evlerini çoktan terk etmiş’ (Roma have already left their TOKİ houses) <http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/yazarlar/14241405.asp?yazarid=20&gid=61>, accessed on 28 March 2010.

<sup>28</sup> ‘Kamuoyuna Duyuru ve Davet’, ICOMOS Türkiye Milli Komitesi Yönetim Kurulu (Invitation and Announcement to the Public), ICOMOS Turkey National Committee, Executive Board, 4 December 2009.

<sup>29</sup> ‘Report on the Joint UNESCO World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Mission to the Historic Areas of Istanbul World Heritage Site, from 8 to 13 May 2008’, and from 27 to 30 April 2009, Paris, UNESCO, 2009.

<sup>30</sup> Report on the joint UNESCO World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission to the World Heritage Site of Historic Areas of Istanbul From 27 to 30 April 2009, Paris, UNESCO, 2009, p.55. Article 1 of Law No. 5366 says: ‘The aim of this law is to rebuild and restore the regions and the conservation areas within them that have been worn-out and beginning to lose their characteristics; those that had been declared and registered as conservation areas by the Regional Conservation Councils of Immovable Cultural and Natural Heritage. Rebuilding and restoration to be done in accordance with the development characteristics of the area, by metropolitan municipalities, district municipalities within metropolitan municipalities, by city, district municipalities and municipalities of areas with more than 50,000 population, by Special Provincial Administrations that have areas under their responsibility beyond municipal areas. Rebuilding and restoration works to form housing, commerce, cultural, tourism and social infrastructures in these areas, that are secured against natural disasters and the principle is conservation of the historic and cultural immovable assets by renewal and by turning them into living environments.’

<sup>31</sup> *Belirsizlik Ortamında İstanbul’un Planlama Gündemi*, (İstanbul’s Planning Agenda in the face of an Ambiguous Agenda), İstanbul, İstanbulluşmaları, TMMOB Şehir Plancıları Odası, October 2009.

---

<sup>32</sup> OECD Territorial Review, *Istanbul, Turkey*, Paris, OECD, 2008, p.172.

<sup>33</sup> Özden, Pelin Pınar, ‘Tematik Sunuş’ (Thematic Introduction), *Belirsizlik Ortamında İstanbul’un Planlama Gündemi*(Istanbul’s Planning Agenda in the Face of an Ambiguous Agenda), İstanbul, İstanbulluların, TMMOB Şehir Plancıları Odası, October 2009.

<sup>34</sup> ‘Tarihi Yarımada’yı Çağdaş ve Bilimsel bir Yaklaşımla Korumaya Çağrı’ (Appeal to Conserve the Historic Peninsula through a Contemporary and Scientific Approach), Mimarlar Odası İstanbul Büyükkent Şubesi ‘‘Tarihi Yarımada Sempozyumu’’ Sonuç Bildirgesi (The Final Declaration of Historic Peninsula Symposium organised by the Istanbul Branch of the Chamber of Architects), 2007.

<sup>35</sup> Report on the joint UNESCO World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission to the World Heritage Site of Historic Areas of Istanbul, from 27 to 30 April 2009, Paris, UNESCO, 2009, p.50.

<sup>36</sup> Sey, Yıldız, *op.cit.*

<sup>37</sup> Mimar Gülay Yedekçi'nin Fener-Balat-Ayvansaray proje eleştirisi tartışma yarattı...’ (Architect Gülay Yedekçi’s criticism of the project of Fener-Balat created a discussion...), <http://www.febayder.com/content/mimar-guelay-yedekcinin-fener-balat-ayvansaray-proje-elestirisi-tartisma-yaratti-0>, accessed 31 March 2010.

<sup>38</sup> Özkan, Funda. ‘Mustafa Demir: Sulukule’de beni asacaklarsa, assınlar’ (Mustafa Demir: if they want to hang me in Sulukule, let them hang me), *Radikal*, 30 March 2010.

<sup>39</sup> Marcuse, Peter, ‘From Critical Urban Theory to the Right to the City’, *City*, Vol.13, No.2-3, 2009, p.195.

<sup>40</sup> Eldem, Nezih. ‘Tarih Bilinci ve Çağdaş Kimlik’ (Consciousness of History and Modern Identity) *Arradamento Dekorasyon*, May 1992, p.100-101.

<sup>41</sup> Rudi Dutschke, quoted in Marcuse, Peter, *op. cit.*, p.196.