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Abstract
The increasing dialogue between the arts and architecture in the period of post-World War Two emerged as a significant issue in the international arena in both architectural discourse and practice, and Turkey was not excluded from this phenomenon at the time. The article rethinks contemporary discussions and the materialized works in Turkey with reference to the wider international frame of the architectural context. Formalized around the concept of ‘situated modernism’ and the publicness of architecture, the example of the Complex of Retail Shops is examined. This subject is questioned with particular focus on the ambivalence between the international and the local in postwar architecture, and the efforts to establish a connection with the public. The novel perspective that the article suggests is a re-reading of the complex together with the questioning process of the international modern and the uneven relationship between the arts and architecture. The article aims to unearth the implicit meaning and the constructive role of this uneven relationship, specially the collaboration efforts, under the circumstances of the period.
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1. Introduction

After World War Two, the modern movement that had dominated early 20th-century architectural culture faced questions regarding its 'modern' sense, i.e. contextual considerations of locality and public meaning, which actually resulted from current demands. It was particularly criticized for preventing adaptation to current circumstances. The intricate line of questioning that emerged, seeking a new architectural discourse, revealed various perspectives and affected design activity. Meanwhile, architecture's relationship with the arts was also re-evaluated and rethought in an attempt to move beyond the impasse in modern architecture.

Similar discussions and practices were witnessed in Turkish art and architectural milieu in this period. It seems that the integration of arts into architecture was an important issue although being barely discussed in the historiography. When searching the publications of the day, it is observed that several themes arose from these discussions: how to implement such collaborative work; the duality between the past and the west; issues of permanency; publicity; functionality; and the mutuality of collaboration.

These considerations brought out not only the debates on integrating the arts but also efforts to realize this ideal. One remarkable artistic initiative was Türk Grup Espace [Turkish Group Espace, 1955], which embarked on the idea of synthesis and total design through team spirit, while another group called Kare Metal [Square Metal, 1955] was closely related to the discourse and the practices of Türk Grup Espace.

While the integration of the arts into architecture was sometimes uneven and precarious - despite starting with inexperienced moves - a discursive background was formed from the mid-1950s onwards, especially between 1955 and 1958, when Türk Grup Espace members were active. In practical terms, the 1950s-1970s witnessed a significant progress, such as the mosaic wall by painter Bedri Rahmi Eyüpoğlu, the pylon by sculptor İlhan Koman for the 1958 Brussels Fair Turkish Pavilion, Istanbul Complex of retail shops with various panels and reliefs, the mosaic panel by ceramic artist Gencay Kasapçı for METU Faculty of Architecture, the ceramic wall in the AKM building by ceramic artist Sadi Diren, and the ceramic wall by ceramic artist Jale Yılmabaşar in Istanbul Governorship Hall. These developments make the postwar period particularly remarkable for reading the uneven relationship between the arts and architecture.

While these examples all have their own dynamics and modes of operation related to integrating the arts, the 1958 Brussels Fair Turkish Pavilion and Istanbul Complex of retail shops are the prominent ones in terms of including artwork as an integral part of an overall architectural design. The former, which could be the subject of another article on its own, situated the mosaic wall at its center as an inextricable part of the design to link two separate units of the structure. While the architects of the latter considered the artworks even during the initial design process. Designed by a team including Doğan Tekeli, Sami Sisa and Metin Hepgüler, Istanbul Complex of Retail Shops exemplifies a 'spatial collection'. So, this makes it a remarkable one for examining how artworks came to be integrated into modern architecture through publicness and an oscillation between the local and the international, particularly its use of several artworks with traditional roots, its way of locating artworks within the structure, and its design process featuring modern approach with planned integration, meaning a collaboration.

The main question that emerges related to the postwar modernist approach to architecture is why, in this period in particular, modern architecture desired to integrate modern art into its structure. In the Turkish case, the aim was to bring an 'aesthetic quality' and 'civic-mindedness' to modern buildings (Bozdoğan & Akan, 2012:131). Another argument about postwar modernism concerned the orientation of postwar architecture in Latin America, the Mediterranean, the Middle East and South Asia, which were 'rewriting' modernism by using local references, thus making it
appropriate for all localities (Bozdoğan, 2008:64).

This study draws on research that embraces the critical aspects of modernism, meaning a cross-reading of the local and the international approaches of the modern. The article therefore rereads the Complex from a perspective that accentuates the role of the planned integration – collaboration - in ‘rewriting modernism’ and redefining the public meaning of architecture. This raises the question of whether there was any connotation in terms of displaying the country’s own form of modernism when collaborating with artists. Also, regarding the public meaning of architecture, another question can be asked: Does art have a role to play in responding to criticisms of modern architecture when its social utility was stressed?

2. Ambivalence between the local and the international

Turkey first experienced a multi-party political system after the World War Two, leading to new economic and socio-cultural developments and a new trajectory in both domestic and foreign politics. Turkey integrated more into the West9 and merged with its capitalist system (Zürcher, 2000: 341), receiving foreign aid and investments that were also a part of developing closer relations with the West (Feroz, 1993: 118). As, the political relationship with the capitalist world intensified, it brought forth a new economic approach, which applied liberal principles. Participating in the international economic system created new demands and a new way of life along with new consumption patterns that resulted in new types of building and transportation (Tapan, 2005: 112). One of the significant government program was the investment in public works and infrastructure. Between the years 1950-1954, the total amount of investments increased by a remarkable 256 percent, which were achieved primarily in the areas of roadwork infrastructure, construction facilities, and agriculture. (Zürcher, 2000: 327).

Tekeli (2005: 28) examines the period from 1950 to 1980 in two parts: 1950-1960 and 1960-1980. In terms of building facilities, he defines the period between the years 1950-60 as a “search for an international solution” that alludes to the effects of the new political orientation with populist approaches and better international relations. Gülşüm Baydar (2012: 119) claims that the ideology of architectural profession paralleled the political ideology of the time. For her, this choice was nothing less than maintaining their very own positions in professional manner (Baydar, 2012: 119). So, it can be said that the architectural milieu adopted moves in line with the political scene, which consisted of a populist tone in its attempts and discourses.

Meltem Gürel (2016: 3) claims that Turkey’s architectural milieu was captivated by the opportunity of participating in the international arena and impressed by the ‘re-interpreted version of inter-war modernism’. This led architects towards solutions integrated with modernist discourse, while dealing with a new client, the private sector, and new public enterprises. This directly affected architecture, creating fertile ground for experimenting in new techniques, materials and approaches. Their application of anonymous international characteristics led Turkish architects to consider themselves part of the West. The dominant approach between 1950 and 1960 employed basic prismatic forms, mostly rectangles and squares, used a grid system on the façade, and mainly included plain surfaces throughout the design. Turgut Cansever states that plain forms were preferred in the 1950s due to modern technology, although he also notes that this formal approach had been seen previously in the plasticity of Ottoman architecture (Cansever, 1970:41). According to Ügür Tanyeli (1998:237), from 1950 to 1960, nobody was concerned about a sense of identity or bringing individualistic touches to a design. But how was this international approach perceived by contemporary architectural circles?

After the proclamation of the new constitution in 1961, a new advancement began, which generated extraordinary changes at various
levels. The positive effect of the new constitution is believed to have created a freer and more socialist atmosphere, which eventually, is said to affect directly the intellectual sphere of the art and architecture milieus. By the 1960s, as a result of the emerging idea of social consciousness, approaching the public and entering in a cycle of self-criticism were seen parallel to the concerns of the Western world. In that kind of context, in response to criticisms of modernist discourse's solid functionalism, Turkish architects sought new solutions, such as breaking the 'international' prism, and being concerned with plasticity, organic forms, and regional and traditional values (Gürel, 2016: 4). Üstün Alsaç (1973: 17) defined the particular decade as that of “the idea of searching for solutions in architecture via free forms.” Tekeli (2005:31) labels developments in the 1960s as 'multi-faceted' in terms of both intellectual area and practice in architecture. Turkish architects were in search of a new architectural ideal that would represent the new course of the country, as well as within the newly defined borders or in broad terms, the prospects of the era. Batur (2005: 54) commented that the socialist views began to affect the very core of the discipline and brought along the promising self-questioning process. Related with these internal queries, Tanyeli (1998: 241) interprets the 1960s and 1970s as the process of the internalization of modern architecture, which incorporates the freeing of ideas, voicing criticism and the search for an acceptable interpretation.

The design of the Complex expressed similar aspirations and decisions. In fact, it has been praised for showing considerable sensitivity to Istanbul's historical silhouette, as every effort was made to integrate it into its surroundings through a 'public-orientated' scheme (Bozdoğan & Akcan, 2012:175). Formed out of a series of small low-rise blocks, and incorporating several courtyards and galleries, the structure occupies a large area in the heart of the city, situated on a large boulevard on the historic peninsula [Figure 1]. According to Üstün Alsaç (1973:22), it represents a synthesis, as a concrete expression of the transformation of modern Turkish architecture from imitation to novel production through adding local and individual flavor appropriate to Turkey's changing circumstances. He asserts that the design is a testimony to the blending of Western construction methods with the traditional bazaar construction. Regarding local references, the materials used in the structure were selected to harmonize with the building's surroundings, aside from just durability (Tanyeli, 1994:63). The horizontal bearings and railings were left as exposed concrete, while the outside facades covered in lattice-style elements were made from brick. Although the Complex has a long façade, measuring 800 meters, the fragmented approach allowed small multi-blocks to suit the historical environment and human scale.

Doğan Tekeli, one of the architects of the project, stated that Le Corbusier had been their main influence during this period. This supports the idea that architects were concerned with embedding local references and making the artworks important parts of their design. The Complex contains nine artworks: ceramic panels by Sadi Diren.
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Also for more information about these groups and postwar architecture in Turkey see Yavuz, E. (2015). Designing the Unity: Türk Grup Espas and Architecture in Postwar Turkey. METU JFA, 32(2), 117-132.

(Anonymous Composition, 1965) and Hüreyas Koral (Abstract Composition, 1965); mosaic panels by Eren Eyüpoglu (Composition: Impressions from Anatolia journeys, 1965), Bedri Rahmi Eyüpoglu (Abstract Composition, 1965 and Istanbul, 1965) and Nedim Günsür (Horses, 1967); a sculpture near the pool by Yavuz Görey; a metal relief by Kuzgun Acar (Birds); and another relief by Ali Teoman Germaner (Abstract Composition, 1965).

Tekeli stated at the time that, because he expected the building to remain permanently, it should include some contemporary Turkish works of art since it would provide them with a secure home (E. Yavuz, personal communication, May 14, 2013). He therefore took an integrated, planned approach to the task so that the artworks would not be simply decorative objects but rather an integral part of the design (E. Yavuz, personal communication, May 14, 2013). In defining his objective, Tekeli referred to the mosaic wall of the 1958 Brussels Pavilion that featured one wall that was entirely artwork, which was exactly what he wanted for the project (E. Yavuz, personal communication, May 14, 2013). The sketches of the building and Tekeli's own account indicate that the project resulted from collaboration.

Since architects do not think or operate in complete isolation from their own context, architecture is a product of both inside and outside agents, or, in other words, local and international considerations (Tekeli, 2005:15). Thus, it is also necessary to consider international discussions and events. In the early years of the 20th century and even in the late 19th century, various groups in the West aspired to the unity of arts and architecture. These initial efforts contributed to postwar achievements by establishing a theoretical background for the re-cooperation of art and architecture. During this period, concrete examples of such a re-cooperation, defined as a synthesis, increasingly appeared in different geographies.

In France, for example, this development was a part of a government funding program for including the fine arts as part of buildings (Redstone, 1968:146), which also aimed to preserve their intellectual and artistic dominance (Damaz 1959:69). In his essay, 'A Synthèse des Arts Majeurs', Le Corbusier promoted this approach to ensure the French art community's welfare (Boesiger, 1999:155). He explains the synthesis as 'a new spirit', which, in Von Moos' words (2010:97), 'stands for a way of thinking and, by implication, the spirit of an entire era – and not primarily for the idea of the total work of art, the Gesamtkunstwerk, comprising painting and sculpture under the aegis of architecture'.

The discussions, meetings and experimental works, many which made the issue of collaboration a focal point, were evidence of the collective spirit and the intense struggles in that era. Indeed, the critical overtones toward modern architecture actually focus on its scope, outcomes and how it is associated with the demands of the time. In this respect, the CIAM meetings were important platforms that gave voice to the collective spirit of the time. These meetings pondered on decreasing distance from everyday life and creating a bond with the people. They implied a different type of spatial experience, which appeals to sensual and aesthetic requirements. At that point, the synthesis of the arts became their focal point, which is the crucial point to touch upon briefly in the scope of this part.

In fact, this synthesis first became prominent at the CIAM (Congrès Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne) Athens meeting of 1933, when Fernand Leger discussed the subject. In 1934, the group l'Art Mural discussed their collective work in the journal Cahiers D'Art, declaring that their main goal was to 'recreate the link' between the architect, sculptor and painter. The journal L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui also featured discussions, such as Andre Bloc's article in the special 'Art et Architecture' volume of 1945, in which he commented on 'Synthèse des arts majeurs: architecture-peinture-sculpture'. The 1946 special issue of the journal concentrated on architecture, painting, sculpture and tapestry works by Le Corbusier, Brancusi, Picasso,

The issue of synthesis maintained its popularity in the following CIAM meetings. At the 1947 meeting, for instance, two questionnaires were presented focusing on the exclusion of the arts from public areas, under the title of 'The Questions of Aesthetics and of Architecture's Relationship to the Other Arts' (Ockman, 2000:65). At the 1949 Bergamo meeting, one session was devoted to the theme of the synthesis of the arts (Mumford, 2000:192). During the discussions, Jose Luis Sert asserted that collaboration was possible among painters, architects and sculptors, while Le Corbusier recommended creating a center to explore what the plastic arts could do for architecture (Mumford, 2000: 80-81, 84). The 1951 Hodeston meeting, which concentrated on 'the core', included a section 'Architecture, Painting and Sculpture in The Core' by Jose Louis Sert. In Paris, specifically, various other collaborative groups emerged, such as the Union pour l'Art, Association pour une Synthese des Arts Plastiques and Group Espace. All these initiatives and discussions raised awareness of the concept of Synthese des Arts Majeurs and increased the search for ways to bring about a unity. These considerations are valuable in the sense that Turkish practitioners were not unconcerned and inevitably, responded to them. Architect Bülent Özer (1964:79) cited examples of Le Corbusier's works in Chandigarh, and those of Giedion, Sert and Wiener in South America, suggesting that these regional approaches could inspire Turkish architects to create something similar in their context. On the other hand, Vedat Nedim Tör (MSUK, SAA, MG 5099) warned that Turkish art and architecture could only become modern by simultaneously integrating contemporary requirements and the tradition in a new synthesis beyond the arbitrary importing of stereotyped forms. He specifically referred to Seyfi Arkan's design for Haberler Bürosu [the Press Office] in the Hilton Hotel into, in which he had integrated traditional art pieces (Tör, MSUK, SAA, MG 5099).

Lewis Mumford (1967:30) claims that regionalism is not a degradation to the use of local materials, nor is it imitation of the formal characteristics of the past; rather, it reflects the aim of acknowledging the 'actual conditions of life' and creating a sense of belonging. This phrase 'actual conditions of life' is reminiscent of a statement by Özer about the actual problems or demands that should be defined in order to internalize and modify modern forms to create appropriate solutions. An important issue that Turkish architects faced during this period is raised by Stuart Hall (1993:33). He argues that the local aspect is a natural reaction when people are subjected to globalization as one of the unavoidable aspects of modernity. This introduces a more complicated rhetoric that remains within the limits of an identification situated between local and international characteristics.

The decision to integrate artworks into the Complex can be linked to these considerations of locality. However, in order to fit within its urban context, the building has a paradoxical character: on the one hand, it marginalizes itself from the traditional environment through the conflicting posture of its modern appearance; on the other hand, its fragmented design and use of artworks is reconciliatory.  

According to Goldhagen, practitioners' efforts to respond to new social demands and needs by finding local solutions to international forms or concepts led to a socially formed modernism, which she calls 'situated modernism'. Goldhagen (2000:306) defines this as 'situating the users of the buildings socially and historically, in place and time'. The Complex is an ideal case for examining this concept, which includes several parameters that need to be discussed to analyze the main goal of the design, such as transparency, site specificity, the path taken within the space, personal freedom and the reinforcing of a sense of place.

The building has an obviously transparent character within its galleries and courtyards that provide a view of the Süleymaniye Mosque, 6

It is important to mention that most of the influential texts on this particular subject were written by artists, mostly by Bedri Rahmi Eyüpoğlu and Fethi Arda.

7 This phrase actually belongs to Andre Bloc, which is quoted by Siren Çalık (2004:37).

8 The term collaboration refers to a planned integration of the artworks organized by the architect. In such a process, the artwork becomes an indispensable component of the structure. I prefer to use the term insertion for artworks that feature within the structure after its completion without any forethought.

9 With the changing circumstances and the balance of power throughout the world, the U.S. arose as a superpower, a new channel and new intellectual and cultural center, which resulted in a change in the traditional meaning of the west to include both the US and Europe.
Re-evaluating modernism through a spatial collection: İstanbul complex of retail shops and collaboration of art and architecture

The attention paid to this silhouette was a particularly respected and acknowledged quality of the proposal (Vanlı, 2006:269). Indeed, the design’s small-scale, fragmented character was inherited from this location. Beyond this, however, it can be argued that the integration of artworks tied the building to the site as well.

The articulation of space via these artworks and their role in directing users are other prominent aspects. The artworks serve as a welcoming element, with sculptor Kuzgun Acar’s relief particularly highlighting the starting point of the Complex. In this way, the space evolves into another phase where users and passers-by gain a new experience while also answering criticisms that art is isolated from the ‘common man’.13

The architects’ insistence on individual expression and their contributions to the current lexicon of modern architecture are surely associated with the notion of ‘personal freedom’ within the concept of ‘situated modernism’. In the Complex, the architects embedded their personal vision into this very public building by including artworks and collaborating with the artists.

The relationship between the public and the building is also emphasized through another parameter of situated modernism, which ‘reinforces a sense of place’ through design attitudes. Thus, the artworks not only make the Complex’s design humanist but also attempt to create a public identity that culminates in a sense of place from the public’s perspective. That is, by integrating artworks into the project, the architects strengthened the sense of place, primarily through the pieces’ compositional and formal features.

The artists, especially Eyüpoğlu, sought to reintroduce traditional arts and crafts into contemporary art production; that is, they aspired to unite the techniques and the expressive manner of Western painting with traditional narratives [Figure. 3]. They aimed to create a synthesis falling somewhere between modern art and traditional Turkish art. Using abstract features alongside simplified expressions of folkloric themes, the artists contributed to the visual drama of the building while reconciling the local and the international [Figure. 4-8]. Yet, more than that, integrating the arts into the design was a means of communicating and reestablishing ties with the public through the use of familiar signs and symbols related to a shared past. Thus, one can interpret this initiative as a social effort that evokes a notion of public identity and forms a kind of social adherence, invoking feelings of familiarity and/or a sense of belonging.

3. Rapprochement with the public

During the postwar years, the architectural debates tried to figure out how to apply the concept of unity and the arrangement of different languages
and mediums in one entity alongside searching for the publicness of architecture. Regarding the arguments in this article, the agenda of the CIAM meetings, which included the synthesis of arts, creating humanist spaces and the publicness, worth highlighting. In fact, questioning of modern architecture in that kind of a sphere has the potential to trigger similar debates in Turkish architectural milieu. This, on the other hand, supports another assertion in this article, which is emphasizing this particular era, meaning postwar period, when the intensity of these debates is seen.

Criticisms of modern architecture dealt with its isolation from the public, with one possible solution being to reevaluate its principles and embrace society by reintegrating user demands into design so as to create democratic spaces. There seems to have an anxiety about the status of modern architecture that could cause alienation and distance from everyday people, in other words: isolation. At the 1947 CIAM meeting, this idea is also clearly put forward by Giedion together with integrating arts: “If we really agree the right of the emotional world to exist in this sphere, then architecture and town planning can no longer be regarded in isolation from their sister arts.” (Giedion, 1951:35). At the 1949 CIAM meeting, in Commission II, the Report B addressed the issues of contemporary art, the man in the street as well as urbanism and the synthesis of the arts. Under the section “l’Urbanisme et la Synthese des Arts”, it is stated that, in order to gain a social function, the visual arts and architecture have to be integrated. (Ungers, O.M. & Ungers, L., 1979). Critics argued that modern architecture had to be acceptable for all strata of society, and that everyone should be able to recognize and understand it. This implied that architecture should appeal to the public’s feelings in order to be internalized.

In parallel with this concern, architectural debates in Turkey focused on the need to strengthen the dialogue between architecture and society. This ‘anxiety’ (Golhagen & Legault, 2000:13) about the present state of modern architecture was also felt in Turkish architectural circles, particularly during the 1960s. Şevki Vanlı (1970:49), for example, claims that the similarity of 1950s architectural design in Turkey and in the international arena was due
to ignoring the values of the public or the popular majority.

Cengiz Bekaş (1970: 38) set forth the notion of designing with respect to the demands of all strata of the society. His criticism focused on the disconnected manner of architecture after 1950; he criticizes it as not having considered the realities of society and doing nothing more than following a trend. The solution, he claimed, was in finding the real and simple solutions (Bekaş, 1970: 38). Aydın Boysan (1970: 39) described how the relationship between architecture and society had begun to evolve after the 1950s. He argued that the first upheaval in the society was made at the intellectual level, which shed light on architecture and its disconnection from the society. Accordingly, the social aspect of Turkish architecture was also an issue for the Chamber of Architects, reflected in its motto ‘Architecture for Society’. In a report for the chamber, architect Vedat Dalokay (1968:13) argued that the notion originated in the economic and political shifts between 1954 and 1968, and their effect on architects. He linked the criticisms within architecture to the context, which could be considered a social act itself. In a context that highlights the social aspect so firmly, how did this Complex create a link with society? A pragmatic solution emerged in the form of humanistic spaces that appeal to all members of the public. However, this raises further questions: What is implied by this humanistic approach in architecture? How it can be framed? Regarding the architecture of humanism, Geoffrey Scott (1969:15, 17) points to the concept of delight as the sine qua non, with its utilitarian purpose; meaning, what gives architecture its aesthetic quality and stimulates the users’ emotions. This concept, as an extension of human function and a major component in design, was another issue discussed at CIAM meetings. Accordingly, collaboration with the arts could be an effective response to this concern.

The painter Ercüment Kalmık (1956: 4) notes in his essay ‘Plastik Sanatlar Birleşimi’ [synthesis of Plastic Arts] that such collaboration can create an atmosphere that satisfies the people’s needs. This emphasizes the people’s demands within a space, as appealing to their emotional needs and labeling the issue as a problem of function. This integration was regarded as a new aspect of design that was expected to fulfill the public’s essential needs humanistically and with social utility, while also addressing the issue of publicness. That is, an artwork fits the space if it creates a stable plastic cohesion that delights beholders.

To this end, the design team of the Complex consolidated the publicness of the building by siting artworks at its entrances, visible from the main street. The Complex’s close proximity to a busy axis in the city means that it is both highly visible and perceptible. It was predicted at the time that the building, constructed on an abandoned site, would provide a link to the boulevard, thereby improving the location’s status.
and drawing attention to the building itself (Arkitekt, 1960:123).

Apart from the mosaic walls, the architects deliberately left one wall blank for the metal relief to serve as a starting point and symbol for the building (E. Yavuz, personal communication, May 14, 2013). As a means of expression and location within the structure, this abstract relief clearly contrasts with the surface it is mounted on. In fact, the building’s rectilinear form is broken up by the relief’s dynamic and relatively natural characteristics. This approach also helps lessen the tension between the rigid geometry of these international forms, the building’s context and the public. The intention in placing the artwork on the public side of the building, deliberately exposing it to public scrutiny, hints at a desire to gain public recognition and reconcile architecture with the people by allowing Acar’s work to leave its mark on the minds of the public.

It thus becomes clear that the architects included artworks with a specific intention rather than as random decisions [Figure. 9]. This makes the placement of artwork within a space important and determinative if architecture is assumed to create a bond with the public. As in this example, artwork can be sited on the outside surface facing the public or within an interior space to welcome the public.

In one of his interviews on the painting-sculpture-architecture synthesis, Sculptor Şadi Çalık (1956:5) claimed that this approach, which is connected to people’s needs, leads to the integration of the arts into their living space. Once they become an integral part of architecture, paintings no longer require a canvas and sculpture is no longer just a self-contained object (Çalık, 1956:5), which is undoubtedly the case in the Complex.

The notion of publicness can also be a concern of artists. For instance, Koral, when describing the creation of her work for this building, stated that she visited the place several times and stood there for hours in front of the wall to examine the different effects of the daylight (Kulin, 2012:396). She then walked repeatedly up and down the boulevard to get a feel of the composition from the perspective of a person in the street. This determined her choice of forms, particularly the three points that could easily be seen from a certain distance on the street (Kulin, 2012:396) [Figure. 10].

The integration of artworks into architecture may be based on either the client’s or architect’s vision for the structure. In particular, the appreciation shown towards public spaces and incorporating artworks into the design can be considered a result of the desire to emphasize a building’s publicness. İlhan Tekeli (2005:28) argues that contemporary politics, described as populist, and the country’s intense international relations at that time affected the design of public buildings. This underlines the changing circumstances due to increased consumerism and the greater role of the private sector.

During this period, the growing association between the artistic realm and the private sector as patron is a remarkable development that coincided with a desire among artists to find suitable outlets for their art, such as private galleries. This supports Bozdoğan’s (2008: 65) argument

---

12 A book published in 1969 by the cooperative presented the Complex of Retail Shops as new in the context of the old Istanbul, stressing the paradox between the new and the old that had been created with the construction of the building within the urban landscape (Ozcan, N. et al., 1969). Yet, this also reveals the contribution of the building to the transformation of the historical peninsula, where the building reflects the modern corporate vision of the new patronage and the new economy in Turkey.
about ‘creating surplus value in architecture’ in relation to the alliance between business and the arts. This development gave architecture the role of providing suitable locations for artworks to perform its role as part of the unity with architecture. That is, architectural practice was able to adapt its perspective and incorporate the desires of its patrons. Apart from the Complex, there are several examples. The humanistic intent of the Vakko Factory’s architect to create an environment that improves the workers’ productivity is clearly expressed (Baysal & Birsel, 1970: 161) while Füreya Koral’s ceramic work, ‘Kuşlar’ [Birds], for the Divan Hotel Patisserie aimed to offer a welcoming element for the space and provide a suitable backdrop for the company’s products.

The assertion about engaging with society reveals another issue at the center of the artistic realm. As Hilde Heynen points out, the duality of the social and the individual aspects feature in the arts. Following Adorno’s view, Heynen (1999:192) argues that artistic practices may be perceived in two distinctive ways: ‘in the perspective of their social definition and social relevance’ and ‘in the perspective of their autonomy as aesthetically shaped objects’. She explains this social aspect and its influence on the arts using the term ‘material’, quoting from Adorno’s argument, clarifying that the term refers to both ‘the physical material’ and ‘the techniques at the artist’s disposal, his arsenal of images and memories, the influence of the context on the work’ (Heynen, 1999:188).

Adorno describes this notion, a fait social, as follows:

‘Social forces of production, as well as relations of production, return in artworks as mere forms divested of their facticity because artistic labor is social labor; moreover, they are always the product of this labor’ (Adorno, 2002:236).

This fait social argument also applies to Turkish architecture culture. Regarding the artistic and architectural discussions of the time, criticism was unsurprisingly redirected to a social level. Artists also became involved in the social relations of production, having sought permanent shelter and a wider audience for their work, and having voiced their concerns about arts’ permeation into daily life, considering the spatial designs of architects.

According to Turan Erol (1967:2), the state should provide the means for art to contribute to society and penetrate people’s lives. His formulation consists of extending the borders of paintings and turning them to ceramic or fresco surfaces or stained-glass works. This suggested recipe recalls Bedri Rahmi Eyüpoğlu’s (1952:3) statements in which he offered a solution to avoid the painting from being a transient piece or in his own terms, “from a nomadic life”.

4. Conclusion

Istanbul Complex of Retail Shops is considered an important milestone because it represents a shift within Turkish architectural culture away from merely replicating modern architectural practice (Alsaç, 1973:22). That is, the structure applied an international vocabulary without compromising the local, with the inclusion of artworks making a crucial contribution to its hybridity. More importantly, the collaborative execution of the project and its intended integration support the claim that it exemplifies ‘situated modernism.’ The project’s intentions thus situate it beyond the uneven territory of a possible relationship lying between the arts and architecture.

The architects’ approach and the integration of artworks demonstrate the simultaneous pursuit of a new rhetoric and adaptation of international formulas. Indeed, the move towards collaboration with the arts occurred at a convenient time to fill a newly-recognized need. In the Complex, it seems that art was a tool for resolving the issues facing modern architecture. The building’s design concept shows that the applied approach goes beyond merely collecting artworks because they in fact become an important component of the structure. In the same way, the artworks find themselves effective roles in the ongoing oscillation between the local and the international.
The effort to revise modern architecture's principles in an attempt to respond to contemporary critiques, the initiative of utilizing arts by embedding them into the spatial considerations, undoubtedly, helped architects realize the vision of “architecture for society”. Within the tension between the functionalists versus the humanist approaches, even the use of traditional references in artworks undertook the role of a mediator. Due to their potential to provide a connection with the public and generate a sense of belonging, these artworks, eventually, became major elements to strengthen the publicness of the building.

This critical analysis of the Complex shows how the building’s intended integration helped transcend the split between different fields and resolve ambiguities between the arts and architecture, specifically the uneven relationship between them. In short, this building is a remarkable example from Turkey’s postwar architecture of this engaging relationship, in that it manifests a local dialectic of modernism while mediating between the arts and society.
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Building, architect, year, city, artist-(Application year of the artwork)

12 Radar Tower, Ragip Buluç, Istanbul, Mustafa Pilevneli-2002


Ahmet Kanatlı High School, Eskişehir, Devrim Erbil-1970

Akbank Şişli Branch, Istanbul, Nasip İyem-1967

Akbank Şişli Branch, Istanbul, Nasip İyem

Akün, Emek İnşaat, Adnan Unaran, Adnan Yücel, 1968, Ankara, Cemil Eren

American-Turkish Foreign Trade Bank, Istanbul, Nasip İyem-1965

Anitkabir, Emin Önat, Orhan Safa, 1952, Ankara, Hüseyin Anka, Zühtü Mürüoglobin, İlhan Koman, Hadi Bara

Anka Ajans, Eren Eyüpoğlu-1964

Ankara University Faculty Of Medicine Hospital, Ankara, Eren Eyüpoğlu, Bedri Rahmi Eyüpoğlu-1965

American-Antique Store, Istanbul, Esad Suher. Istanbul,
Füreya Koral
Ari Cinema, Ankara, Cemil Eren 1968, Hamiye Çolakoğlu, Eren Eyüpoğlu
As Cinema, İstanbul, Şadi Çalik 1966
Atatürk Cultural Centre, Ruknettin Güney, Feridun Kip-Phase 1, Hayati Tabanlioğlu-Phase 2-3, 1946-1969, İstanbul, Mustafa Pilevelni, Sadi Diren Aygaz Headquarters, İstanbul, Mustafa Pilevelni 1978
Bağcılar Renkli Cinema, Ankara, Ferruh Başağa-1955-56
Başak Insurance Building, İstanbul, Füreya Koral
Bilkent University Faculty Of Engineering, Ankara, Hamiye Çolakoğlu 1999
Bilkent University Library, Erkut Şahinbaş, Selim Vural, 1993-95, Ankara, Hamiye Çolakoğlu
Bonn Turkish Republic Foreign Affairs Embassy, Oral Vural, Cengiz Bektaş, Vedit Özsan, 1967, Bonn, Bedri Rahmi Eyüpoğlu
Capital Market Building, Ankara, Sadi Diren
Central Bank, Samsun, Yavuz Görey-Before 1973
Cep Cinema, Ankara, Sadi Diren
Cerrahpaşa Hospital, İstanbul, Eren Eyüpoğlu 1978
Coca Cola Factory, Adana, Sadi Diren
Çeşme Motel, İzmir, Devrim Erbil-1975
Çınar Hotel, Rana Zipci, Ahmet Akın, Emin Ertam, 1959, İstanbul, Unknown- Wall Panel And Mural Darka Swimming Pool, İzmir, Sadi Diren
Divan Hotel, Rüknettin Güney, Renovation:Abdurrahman Hanci And Aydın Boysan, 1972-75, İstanbul, Mustafa Pilevelni, Erol Akyavaş, Jale Yimabaşar, Füreya Koral, İlhan Koman, Bedri Rahmi Eyüpoğlu, Mustafa İslimyeli, Gençay Kasapçı, Hayati Misman Dragos Hotel, İstanbul, Devrim Erbil-1978
Eczacıbaşı Headquarters, İstanbul, Şadi Çalış-1962
Re-evaluating modernism through a spatial collection: İstanbul complex of retail shops and collaboration of art and architecture

Eren Eyüpoğlu, Güngör Kabakçioğlu
Cevat Şakir, Bedri Rahmi Eyüpoğlu,
Ferruh Başağa, Cevdet Altuğ, Erdoğan
Ersen, Adnan Turani, Yavuz Görey,
Erdoğan Değer

Hacettepe Children’s Hospital,
Ankara, Eren Eyüpoğlu 1978

Hacettepe University Hospital,
Ankara, Eren Eyüpoğlu-1966

Hacettepe University Department
Of Morphology, Ankara, Atilla
Galatali, Eren Eyüpoğlu-1965

Hacettepe University Faculty Of
Dentistry, Ankara, Füreya Koral 1965

Halil Bektaş Primary School,
Denizli, Turan Erol-1970

Harbiye Officers’ Club, İstanbul,
Atilla Galatali

Haydarpaşa Chest Diseases Hospital,
İstanbul, Eren Eyüpoğlu 1979

Heybeliada Naval College, İstanbul,
Ferrun Başağa 1956

Hilton Hotel, Som, Sedat Hakki
Eldem, 1952, İstanbul, Bedri Rahmi
Eyüpoğlu, Jale Yılmabaşar

Hilmi Bodur House, Hamiye
Çolakoğlu 1991

Intercontinental Hotel (Today
The Marmara Hotel), Fatin Uran.

Müellifler: Ruknettin Güney,
Dekorasyon: Abdurrahman Hanci,
Aydin Burtçe, Reşat Seviçsoy,
1975, İstanbul, Altan Adali, Oktay
Anilamert, Sadi Diren, Afet
Ereğezgin, Bülent Erkmen, Atilla
Galatali, Fuat Izer, Reyhan Kaya,
Hüsumettin Koçan, Ismail Hakki Öcal,
Mausofa Plevnle, Mazhar Resmor,
Mausofa Aslier, Elif Ayiter, Muammer
Bakir, Ferrun Başağa, Barbaros Baykal,
Sabri Berker, Gülşen Çalış Can,
Mahmut Celâylı, Mengü Ertel, Veyser
Erüstün, GÜngör İbikçi, Hasan İlday,
Ergin İnan, Ragıp İstek, Feyzi Karakoç,
Fethi Kayaap, Gülseren Kayali, Kadri
Özyayten, Sonar Sarpay, A. Ismail
Türeman, Uğur Üstünkaya, Demet
Yersel, Saim Süleyman Tekcan

İstanbul City Hall, Nevzat Erol,
1953-60, İstanbul, Nuri Iyem, Ferruh
Başağa, Sadi Çalış, Hüseyin Gezer,
Nazım Koşkan

İstanbul Naval Museum, İstanbul,
Atilla Galatali

İstanbul University Faculty Of
Sciences, Emin Onat, Sedat Hakki
Eldem1944, İstanbul, Neşet Gündal
-After 1954

İstanbul University Faculty Of
Economics, İstanbul, Şadi Çalış 1964

Italian Airlines Office, Feridun
Akozan, Hüseyin Baban, 1957,
İstanbul, Unknown-Mosaic Panel

İhsan Doğramaci House, Hamiye
Çolakoğlu 1990

İstanbul Chamber Of Commerce
Building, New, İstanbul, Mustafa
Pilevneli 2000

İstanbul Governorship Hall, İlhan
Tayman, Avni Yüncüoğlu, İstanbul,
Jale Yılmabaşar

İş Bank Headquarters, Ankara,
Ferruh Başağa 1965, Gencya Kasapçi
İşbank Osmaney Branch, İstanbul,
Devrim Erbil-1973

İşbank Pangaalı Branch, İstanbul,
Devrim Erbil-1970

İşbank Taksim Branch, İstanbul,
Devrim Erbil-1972

İşbank Taksim Branch, İstanbul,
Devrim Erbil-1974

Jak Kamhi Waterside House, Utarit
İzgi, İstanbul, Şadi Çalış-1974

İ Karakoş Aksu İşhani, İstanbul,
Bedri Rahmi Eyüpoğlu

İ Karakoş Pharmacy, İstanbul, Sadi
Diren

İ Karakoş Tatlicilar Patisserie,
İstanbul, Eren Eyüpoğlu-1965

İz Bank İşhani, Ankara, Eren
Eyüpoğlu-1966

Koç Company, İstanbul, Sadi Diren

Konak Cinema, Ruknettin Güney,
1959, İstanbul, Şadi Çalış

İ Lale Cinema And Theatre, Ankara,
Eren Eyüpoğlu-1972

İ Land Forces Headquarters, Ankara,
Hamiye Çolakoğlu 1984

İ Lido Swimming Pool, Halit Femir,
1941-44, İstanbul, Bedri Rahmi
Eyüpoğlu

İ Lisbon Turkish Republic Foreign
Affairs Embassy, Orhan Şahinler,
Muhlis Türkmen, Hamdi Şensoy, 1963,
İ Lisbon, Gülşün Devrim Erbil,
İstanbul, Şadi Çalış, Sabri Berker, Hüseyin Gezer

İ Maçka Hotel, İstanbul, Ruzin

İ Markiz Patisserie, İstanbul, Mazhar
Resmor

İ Marmara Hotel, Ankara, Füreyya
Koral, Sadi Diren, Bedirahmi
Eyüpoğlu, Eren Eyüpoğlu 1966

İ Masion Of Chief Of General Staff
And Commanders In Chief Of Armed
Forces, Ankara, Turan Erol-1964-65
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Mersin Harbor, Mersin, Şadi Çalışk-1963
Metu U3 Lecture Hall, Altuğ-Behruz Çinici, Ankara, Şadi Çalışk
Ministry Of Energy And Natural Sources Building, Ankara, Devrim Erbil-1975
Ministry Of Public Works, Cihat Burak
Nato Headquarters, Jacques Carlu (Abdurrahman Hancı Was Involved In The Team For Interior Design), 1960, Paris, Bedri Rahmi Eyüpoğlu
Necip Sait Barlas Waterside House, İstanbul, Nasip İyem-1963
Oda Kale Center, Kaya Tecimen, Ali Kemal Taner, 1976, İstanbul, Salih Acar
Opera House, Şevki Balmumcu, Paul Bonatz, 1948, Ankara, Bedri Rahmi Eyüpoğlu, Cemal Tolu
Ottoman Bank Ankara Branch, Ankara, Nasip İyem-1969
Ottoman Bank Bursa Branch Office, Bursa, Bedri Rahmi Eyüpoğlu 1971
Pension Fund Building, Eskişehir, Devrim Erbil-1973
Pe-Re-Ja Factory, İstanbul, Sadi Diren
Residence In Kireçburnu, İstanbul, Devrim Erbil-1966
Residence Of The President, Ankara, Mustafa Pilevneli 1989, Sadi Diren
Restaurant Mehmetalı, Gümüş Kaftancı, 1965, Güzelyalı, Devrim Erbil
Riza Yalman House, Abdurrahman Hancı, 1952, İstanbul, Bedri Rahmi Eyüpoğlu
Sadiklar Apartment, Emin Necip Uzman, 1951, İstanbul, Mazhar Resmor
Samatya Ssk Hospital, İstanbul, Bedri Rahmi Eyüpoğlu-1959
Sheraton Hotel, Ahe Mimarlık, İstanbul, Eren Eyüpoğlu-1972-73
Sumerbank Pavilion, Affan Kirimli, Muhlis Türkmen, Muhteşem Giray, 1948, İzmir, Hüseyin Anka
Şekerbank Kızılay Branch, Ankara, Gencay Kasapçı, Sadi Diren
Tam Sigorta Building, Ankara, Füreya Koral 1969
Tarabya Hotel, Kadri Erdoğan, 1964, İstanbul, Ferruh Başağa, Mustafa Pilevneli, Nasip İyem, Sadi Diren, Salih Acar
Teacher’s Bank Headquarters, Ankara, Gülşün-Devrim Erbil
Tofaş Headquarters, İstanbul, Mustafa Pilevneli 1974
Tpao Head Office, Ankara, Atilla Galatalı
Turkish İşbank Kadiköy Branch And Apartment, Perran Doğançlı, Altay Erol, S. Giritlioğlu, Cavit Özdey 1957, İstanbul, Medhi Akarsu
Turkish National Assembly, Clemens Holzmeister, 1963, Ankara, Ferruh Başağa
Turkish Petrol Headquarters, Demirtaş Kamçı, Rahmi Bediz, 1962-74, Ankara, Unknown Metal Stylized Wall Panel, Ceramic Panel
Turkish Petrol Gölbashi Night Club, Ankara, Nuri İyem 1970
Uğur Mumcu House, Ankara, Hamiye Çolakoğlu 1996
Ulus Center, Bozkurt, Beken, Bolak, 1954, Ankara, Adnan Turani, Arif Kaptan, Füreya Koral, Nuri İyem, Eren Eyüpoğlu
Vakıflar Bankası Galatasaray Branch, İstanbul, Nasip İyem
Yapı Kredi Bank Beyoğlu Branch, İstanbul, Nasip İyem
Yapı Kredi Bank Antalya Branch, İstanbul, Erdiç Bakla
Yapı Kredi Bank Beykoz Branch, Ahmet Oral, 1971, İstanbul, Erdinç Bakla
Yapı Kredi Bank Headquarters, Ahmet Oral, 1971, İstanbul, Ruzin And Atilla Galatalı, Gültakin Çıçgen
Yapı Kredi Bank Headquarters, Ankara, Eren Eyüpoğlu-1970
Yapı Kredi Bank Kordon Branch,
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