

## **Modernization and the Role of Foreign Experts: W. M. Dudok's Projects for Izmir, Turkey**

In 1954, Izmir's mayor, Rauf Onursal, asked Dutch architect W. M. Dudok to contribute to the city's modernization by consulting on a master plan for the waterfront along the Bay of Izmir; Dudok was also asked to design a municipal theater (Figure 1). This request offered the sixty-nine year-old architect an opportunity to leave a legacy in an international context. Despite widespread recognition of his work, Dudok, architect for the Dutch city of Hilversum, had rarely built outside of the Netherlands. Dudok knew Turkey well, having served on the juries of international Turkish architecture competitions in 1938 and 1949, and he understood the country's political determination to modernize. For local architects and planners, however, Dudok's invitation and subsequent events provoked other reactions beyond his apparently warm reception. Engaged with post-World War II modernization, the new generation of Turkish architects and urban planners had more complex relationships with foreign experts than had previous ones.

Dudok's Izmir projects were not realized, but they shed light on the spread of International Modernism after World War II and reflect the Republic of Turkey's aspiration to participate in a "universal civilization."<sup>1</sup> Like the work of other foreign experts in Turkey, Dudok's was an outcome of the country's longstanding mission to be modern, with urban spaces, housing, city centers, and cultural and government buildings that accorded with contemporary Western standards. My study ponders the relationships between local professionals and foreign experts in 1950s Turkey, focusing on Izmir and

situating Dudok's projects within modernization efforts there. How did foreign experts respond to modern architecture, the politics of modernization, and democratization in Turkey? Had the role of foreign experts there changed by mid-twentieth century? What does the story of Dudok's unrealized projects tell us about Turkish architectural culture with respect to cross-cultural influences in architecture and urbanism during the postwar era? A group of previously unexamined documents and drawings from the Netherlands Architecture Institute (NAI) and the Izmir City Archives forms the basis for my research into these questions, opening a window into the postwar era's complex local and global architectural culture.

### **Dudok's Invitation to Izmir**

Dudok came to Turkey for the first time in 1938, as one of three jury members for a building competition project to design the Turkish Grand National Assembly.<sup>2</sup> Prior to this important project, Turkish architects knew Dudok through the country's only professional journal of the period, *Arkitekt*. In 1931, the journal had published an article about Hilversum City Hall (1924-1931), inspired by Frank Lloyd Wright's prairie architecture, which brought Dudok to international recognition.<sup>3</sup> In 1937, *Arkitekt* published a translation of Dudok's essay, "Urban Planning and Architecture in our Time," which had originally been published in *L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui* in 1936.<sup>4</sup> Dudok's second encounter with Turkey was again as a jury member for another significant competition, this time for the Istanbul Courthouse in 1949. The winning entry, by Turkish architects Sedat Hakkı Eldem and Emin Onat, embodies the shift from an earlier nationalistic approach (the Second National Movement of the 1940s) to the

rationalism and International Style efforts of the 1950s and '60s; it marks a turning point in modern Turkish architecture.<sup>5</sup> Scholars have suggested that Dudok's appointment to this jury clearly signaled the changing trends, given his well-known and much-admired rationalistic work.<sup>6</sup> In the same year as the courthouse competition, *Arkitekt* published Dudok's Utrecht Municipal Theater project (1939-1941) as an example of modern rationalist theater design and of ongoing developments in that field (Figure 2).<sup>7</sup>

This long-standing interest in Dudok's work led to two major invitations from Turkey in 1953. One was from the Social Security Institution to build a housing project in Ankara, the other was from Izmir mayor Rauf Onursal.<sup>8</sup> During a visit to the Netherlands the previous year, Onursal had tried to contact Dudok, who was then travelling. In a letter dated 6 November 1953, Onursal invited Dudok, to whom he referred as "a talented master," to review and make suggestions about the redevelopment of Izmir's city center, known as Konak. Onursal explained that the city was considering holding an international competition for Konak's modernization, and that it also intended to build a city hall, an opera house, and a municipal theater, the last of which Dudok was invited to design. Dudok received Onursal's letter in the United States, where he had been invited to give seminars on his work. Writing to Onursal from Chicago in November 1953, Dudok gladly accepted the invitation to Izmir.<sup>9</sup> In a letter to Hilversum's mayor and city council members, Dudok wrote of Onursal's invitation and requested permission to accept it. His letter conveys both his uncertainty about the offer and his desire to accept it.

I have the honor to inform you that during my stay in the United States I received a letter from the Mayor of Izmir (Smyrna) in which he – as a result of his visit to

Hilversum – invited me to come as soon as possible to Izmir where they are intending to build a city hall, an opera, and a theatre. It is not clear from the letter if they intend to ask me to construct these buildings or they want my advice on the most suitable locations etc.

At this moment it is location research. It is possible that attractive possibilities will ensue, so I would like to accept this invitation; I am expecting to be absent for no more than two weeks, starting the 9th of February. Concerning this I request the City Council to grant me a leave of absence.<sup>10</sup>

Although Dudok's work had received international recognition and awards, including the Gold Medal of the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) in 1935, he had built only a few structures outside of the Netherlands: a residence for S. A. Basil (1936-37) and the Garden House and Light House Cinemas (1936-38), both in Calcutta, and the Netherlands Student House (1939) in Paris.<sup>11</sup> Building in Turkey was, thus, a further opportunity to operate in an international context and expand to his legacy.

When Dudok arrived in Izmir on 10 February 1954, he was received with enthusiasm; this was evident in the local media and it reflected the views of civic officials and the value they put on European and American experts as ambassadors of modernity. Izmir's newspapers portrayed Dudok as an internationally renowned architect and expert in urban planning who would surely contribute to the city's redevelopment.<sup>12</sup> One paper declared, "the city's development plan will greatly benefit from Dudok's expertise because of his capability in architecture."<sup>13</sup> The front-page headline stating that "Izmir

Will Have a Truly European City Image,” spoke to Dudok’s reputation as a foreign expert, while also indicating local eagerness to recreate Izmir as a modern metropolis: “Worthy of its history and contemporary life, Izmir will be reconstructed as a modern city. The renovations and new construction in the city center will especially change the appearance of the city.”<sup>14</sup>

Some of the local news coverage, however, reflected contemporary debates on the roles of foreign experts: “People have diverse opinions surrounding the rationale for inviting a foreign city planner to Izmir; yet his invitation is to oversee a plan that may surpass a cost of one hundred million liras in construction.”<sup>15</sup> As another article noted, Dudok was to meet with Turkish planning consultant Kemal Ahmet Aru, who had won the 1951 competition for Izmir’s urban plan, and to prepare his recommendations and report in consultation with Aru.<sup>16</sup> The jury had had reservations about Aru’s plan for the Konak district, so they left this portion open to new proposals.

In addition to Aru, Dudok worked with a team of architects and planners in the municipality’s Building Directorate, including Building Director Rıza Aşkan and architect Harbi Hotan (Figure 3). Dudok’s task was to review the plans for developing the Konak waterfront district, give advice on situating the intended buildings, and design the theater. (Dudok created alternative schemes for the theater upon his return to the Netherlands.) During his two-week stay in Izmir, the city’s papers widely covered Dudok’s close association with Aşkan, a graduate of the Istanbul Academy of Fine Arts and a former student of the influential architect and educator Eldem (whom Dudok had encountered while serving on the jury for the Istanbul Courthouse competition in 1949). As architect Doğan Tekeli (then a new graduate working for the municipality) said,

Aşkan had a powerful position in managing and controlling the municipality's building projects and operating as chief architect in the Directorate.<sup>17</sup> Before becoming the city's building director, Aşkan had hosted Le Corbusier during a week-long visit to Izmir in 1948, when the Swiss-French architect worked on a plan for the city. Since Aşkan was fluent in French, he developed personal relationships with both Le Corbusier and Dudok, the latter of whom communicated in French with Izmir officials.<sup>18</sup> The interaction and collaborative dynamic between these international architects and the Turkish team—evident in the letters and the media coverage—reveals the changing status of foreign experts and the growing confidence and power of the new generation of native architects and planners during this time.

### **The Changing Roles of Foreign Experts in Turkey, 1920s to 1950s**

Understanding Dudok's interventions in the port city of Izmir, and the local responses to them, requires that we review briefly the evolving roles of foreign experts in the modernization of Turkish architecture and urban design between 1920 and 1950.

Modernization efforts following the foundation of the Republic of Turkey in 1923 seem to follow Paul Ricoeur's assertion that "in order to take part in modern civilization, it is necessary at the same time to take part in scientific, technical, and political rationality, something which very often requires the pure and simple abandon of a whole cultural past."<sup>19</sup> In line with this view and starting in the 1920s, it became common practice to invite foreign experts to Turkey as part of the modernization process. Under founder Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's leadership, the new republic turned to the West in establishing a secular nation-state based on industrial and scientific progress. In pursuit of this vision,

German and Austrian architects and planners were invited to help build the new state. Between the 1920s and 1940s, foreign architects were commissioned by the Republican People's Party to produce urban designs, master plans, and important public buildings. As many as 200 experts from German-speaking countries were known to be working in Turkey at that time, and about 40 of them were architects and planners. Among them were such accomplished figures as Bruno Taut, Martin Wagner, Ernst Reuter, Franz Hillinger, Gustav Oelsner, Wilhelm Lihotzky, and Margarete Schütte-Lihotzky.<sup>20</sup> As these foreigners dominated the public domain, Turkish architects' practices were limited mostly to residential architecture.<sup>21</sup> Foreign professionals' knowledge and practice went largely unchallenged until the 1950s, when a new generation of local architects and planners and new provisions of the Turkish Chamber of Architects, established in 1954, contested their dominance.<sup>22</sup>

Foreign architects also had a significant presence in Turkish architectural schools, influencing the education of the 1950s generation. For example, two prominent architects, Ernst Egli and Bruno Taut, headed the architectural department at Istanbul's Academy of Fine Arts, founded by Osman Hamdi Bey in 1882.<sup>23</sup> Then-young native architects, such as Arif Hikmet Holtay, Sedad Hakkı Eldem and Seyfettin Arkan were Egli's assistants during his tenure there. Under Egli's and Taut's direction, the school's curriculum and pedagogy underwent major reforms directed at moving away from the so-called first national style towards a modern, European-influenced architecture. Their approach encouraged a context-sensitive application of modern forms and methods along with the study of vernacular ones, thus facilitating an exploration of the relationship between the "cultural past" and "universal civilization."<sup>24</sup> Turkey's second-oldest

architecture school, Istanbul's Civil Service School of Engineering established in 1884, also experienced modernizing reforms through the efforts of Emin Onat, who invited the European architects Clemenz Holzmeister and Paul Bonatz to teach there.<sup>25</sup>

At the center of the modernization efforts was a desire to refashion old towns and cities as healthy and sanitary urban centers with open areas, parks, sports arenas, administrative and cultural buildings, and modern housing. From the beginning, politicians and planners used urban space to represent modern Turkish society as understood within the state's ideology--which emphasized secularity, westernization and modernization. For example, German planner Hermann Jansen's plan of 1927 for Ankara envisioned the new capital as a modern city informed by Ebenezer Howard's garden city approach; new recreational areas, public buildings, and residential areas were separated from and developed around the old city.<sup>26</sup> Holzmeister was asked to design the Grand National Assembly of Turkey, along with numerous other administrative buildings.<sup>27</sup> In the case of Istanbul, the country's largest and most cosmopolitan city, French urban designer Henri Prost offered a plan that made sanitation as important as aesthetic considerations; he further attempted to transform the city with new roads, boulevards, and open spaces such as parks and squares.<sup>28</sup> Prost worked with Istanbul's Urban Development Directorate between 1937 and 1951, when his appointment was terminated due to the end of the one-party era and the rise of the new generation of Turkish architects and planners.<sup>29</sup>

Long before Dudok, Prost was also contacted about creating an urban plan for Izmir, the country's second largest city and its most important port after Istanbul. Izmir holds a unique place in Turkish history as the site where the War of Independence ended



in 1922. A considerable segment of this historical port city was destroyed during a great fire at the war's end, lending urgency to the need for a new plan. Rather than designing the new plan himself, Prost recommended engineer-urbanists René and Raymond Danger for the job, and acted as their consultant. Reflecting formalist Beaux-Arts approaches, the Danger-Prost Plan of 1924-25 emphasized public health, open spaces, and parks, and laid the foundations for the Izmir Cultural Park (Izmir Kültürpark) in an area through which the fire had swept (Figure 4). The park was redesigned by the municipality as a 360,000-square-metre public space and built in 1936. It was one of the most important modernization projects of the early Republican period, along with similar public spaces such as the Youth Park (Gençlik Parkı) in Ankara and the Promenade Park (Inönü Gezisi, proposed by Prost) in Istanbul.<sup>30</sup> Formal features of Kültürpark's exhibition halls, gates, and other edifices were strong statements of modernism, exemplifying both 1930s architectural culture and state ideology.<sup>31</sup> Its recreational grounds and entertainment facilities accommodated mixed-gender activities as well as leisure spaces for families. As such, Kültürpark was considered an icon of Republican modernity.

The city continued to implement aspects of the Danger-Prost Plan until 1938, when its charismatic mayor, Dr. Behçet Uz, embraced a more radical approach towards modernization. The Danger-Prost Plan had aimed to conserve older parts of the city, limiting interventions in those to matters of circulation. However, this did not mesh with the mayor's vision of a healthy, modern city.<sup>32</sup> In 1932, Uz invited Hermann Jansen to revise the Danger-Prost plan. Criticizing it as outdated, Jansen proposed a modernist scheme instead. However, due to his high professional fees and the criticism he had received for his earlier Ankara plan, Jansen was ultimately dismissed.<sup>33</sup>

In 1938, Izmir turned to Le Corbusier, then developing his plans for Algiers.<sup>34</sup> Due to the onset of the Second World War, Le Corbusier could not come to Izmir until 1948, at which point his contract was renewed.<sup>35</sup> Izmir officials likely decided to consult Le Corbusier for two reasons: first, authorities there hoped to modernize the entire city; second, the celebrated architect convinced them he could achieve this. The radical and diagrammatic scheme that Le Corbusier sent to Izmir's leaders in January 1949 proposed a green city for 400,000 residents, following the design precepts of the *Congres Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne* (CIAM).<sup>36</sup> Le Corbusier's approach reflected his view of the revolutionary nature of Turkish society and the beginnings of the Republic (Figure 5). Izmir's officials ultimately rejected Le Corbusier's urban plan--which was very schematic and did not take into account private property ownership--considering it utopian and unrealistic. However, as noted below, it did have an influence on future proposals by Turkish professionals.

There are some parallels between Le Corbusier's experience in Izmir in 1948-49 and Dudok's time there in 1954. Although their visits were widely covered by Izmir's local papers, their proposals were not ultimately accepted by local authorities or professionals, and the projects were dropped. One of the reasons for this seems to have been the growing resistance of Turkish professionals toward foreign architects, despite their reverence for luminaries such as Le Corbusier. This opposition was fueled by changes in Turkish architectural culture. One indicator of this stance was the Law of the Union of the Chambers of Turkish Engineers and Architects (1954), which the Turkish Chamber of Architects worked to implement. This law limited foreign practitioners to technical consultancy and educational instruction.<sup>37</sup> Knowledgeable in and inspired by

post-war architectural concepts, the well-trained, native-born professional members of this group challenged the presence of foreign experts in Turkey and sought to demote them from primary to secondary roles.

An important basis for this transformation of professional practice was the development of the private sector following changes in Turkish parliamentary democracy, starting with the establishment of the multi-party system in 1946 and resulting in the victory of the Democrat Party's (DP) in the 1950 elections. The DP government implemented a liberal economy based on US-led democratic capitalist models, which emphasized the role of the private sector in development. The consequent rise of the private sector and of a Turkish bourgeoisie led to new developments in Turkey's construction industry, undermining the state's previous near-monopolistic patronage of architects. Although public buildings (mostly implemented through competitions) still constituted a major part of architectural commissions, privately funded projects now offered a noticeably expanded field for architects to operate in, separate from the state's control.<sup>38</sup> As a result, beginning in the 1950s, private enterprises, architectural partnerships, and the Chamber of Turkish Architects emerged, reflecting the profession's growing autonomy.<sup>39</sup> Unlike their forebearers, these younger architects did not directly propagate the state's political ideology. Meanwhile, although the Turkish government still solicited advice from foreign experts, these now served mainly as "policy advisors and development consultants, commissioned by a myriad of US government agencies for economic cooperation or international organizations like the UN."<sup>40</sup> For example, in 1951, the eminent American firm Skidmore, Owings and Merrill (SOM), under the direction of Gordon Bunshaft, authored a report, "Building, Urban

Planning, and Housing in Turkey,” that recommended solutions for Turkey’s housing problem—the result of rapid urbanization due to population growth and immigration from rural areas to urban centers, an outcome of agricultural mechanization enabled by post-war foreign aid.<sup>41</sup>

The most significant architectural outcome of post-war economic and political cooperation between the US and Turkey was arguably the Istanbul Hilton Hotel, by Bunshaft and SOM in collaboration with the prolific Turkish architect Sedat Hakkı Eldem (Figure 6). Funded by the Turkish Pension Fund and the Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA) in 1951, the project was emblematic of both political modernization and the changing roles of foreign architects. The year the Hilton project was initiated, Eldem spent several months in New York City working with the SOM team on the design.<sup>42</sup> Unlike Eldem’s previous work, which incorporated regional nuances, the Hilton was a massive, long, white, late-International Style block, signifying the global pervasiveness of this type of architectural modernism at mid-century. Situated on a prominent hilltop overlooking the Bosphorus, the building represented not only the DP government’s political ambitions for modernizing Istanbul, but also the mission of creating a “little America,” as Conrad Hilton called it.<sup>43</sup> From its architectural design to its interior equipment, its air-conditioned rooms to its mid-century-modern furniture, the building was viewed as the embodiment of American modernity when finished in 1955.<sup>44</sup> As Annabel Wharton put it, the hotel represented the US’ cultural influence along with Cold War geopolitical struggles and diplomacy at the periphery of the Communist sphere.<sup>45</sup>

The Middle East Technical University (METU), established in Ankara in 1956, is

another landmark modernist project exemplifying a similar case of political and economic cooperation between the US and Turkey, as well as Turkish architects' changing agency during these years. The idea of founding a technical university was conceived at the suggestion of Charles Abrams, an American lawyer and housing policy specialist, during his visit in 1954 to prepare a UN report on housing problems.<sup>46</sup> The university was founded with the assistance of a committee from the University of Pennsylvania under the direction of architect and planner G. Holmes Perkins, who proposed the first design scheme for METU. However, neither Perkins' proposal nor the following competition-winning project of Turkish architect Turgut Cansever were implemented. In the end, Turkish architects Altuğ and Behruz Çinici's project was chosen for METU.<sup>47</sup> As Burak Erdim points out, METU was conceived by the same political and economic power players that supported the Istanbul Hilton, and its history reveals the legitimacy battles fought not only between foreign and local architectural professionals and authorities, but also between local architects who took part in its design.<sup>48</sup>

This was a moment of empowerment for a new generation of Turkish architects and planners who deeply valued notions of "universal civilization," respected foreign experts, and desired to belong to the international community. They viewed themselves as equal partners with their foreign colleagues, and finally, government patrons concurred. For example, when Prost's appointment in Istanbul was terminated in 1951, the DP government, headed by Prime Minister Adnan Menderes, formed consulting commissions composed of Turkish architects and planners to amend Prost's plans and make new suggestions for modernizing Istanbul between 1952 and 1955.<sup>49</sup> The leading

planner on these committees was Kemal Ahmet Aru, a prominent professor at Istanbul Technical University who had won the international competition for Izmir's urban plan in 1951.<sup>50</sup> Increasingly now, foreign experts made contributions as consultants and collaborators, rather than as the primary planners.

### **Konak Square as a Site of Modernization**

One of the central sites targeted by the various master plans for Izmir was the Konak Square district and seashore. It was here that Dudok's efforts would be concentrated. Understanding the square's significance requires a brief recap of its role in local and national political modernization since the nineteenth century.

In the 1800s, Izmir was a cosmopolitan port city with a considerable non-Muslim population, primarily composed of Levantines, Greeks, Jews, and Armenians.<sup>51</sup> As the city's hub, Konak Square first gained its civic character and spatial boundaries with the construction in 1827-1829 of a massive military building, *Kışla-i Humayun*, on the south side of the square (Figures 7 and 8). The building was called *Sarı Kışla* (Yellow Barracks) in reference to the color of its stone. The square took on a new and enhanced significance in 1901 with the construction of a Clock Tower, which became the symbol of Izmir.<sup>52</sup> The tower was part of collection of memorial edifices erected that year to celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of Ottoman Emperor Abdülhamid II's ascension to the throne.<sup>53</sup>

In the late nineteenth century, Konak Square became an important hub for transportation, with a boat dock for regular ferry services in the bay and, beginning in 1880, horse-drawn trams and later street cars.<sup>54</sup> With the Clock Tower at the center,

bounded by Hükümet Konağı (Government Building) on the east side, Sarı Kışla on the south, offices and warehouses on the north, and the Bay of Izmir on the west, Konak Square was a well-defined civic space at the turn of the twentieth century.<sup>55</sup> However, the monumental Sarı Kışla was seen as a problem because it often required repair, blocked the waterfront, and impeded circulation to and from the center of town. Considered outdated— a military barracks was viewed as unfit for a civic square—it was slated for demolition in the Danger brothers' city plan of 1925.<sup>56</sup> In 1955, Sarı Kışla finally was demolished. On the Konak seashore, modernization thus meant clearing old buildings and opening up land for new roads and structures to facilitate and enliven commerce, entertainment, cultural activities, and governance (Figure 9).

The 1951 urban master plan for Izmir, by Kemal Ahmet Aru, Gündüz Özdeş and Emin Canpolat, was a significant representative of these modernization efforts. The plan maintained Konak's status as the city's administrative center (Figures 10 and 11). It envisioned Izmir's population—230,000 in 1950—as climbing to 400,000 by 2000, with the city divided into zones for housing, business, shopping, industry, and port activities. While this functionalist scheme preserved the historical shopping district of Kemeraltı, adjacent to Konak Square, Sarı Kışla was to be demolished.<sup>57</sup> This was required by the terms of the 1951 international competition: “the removal of the military building... in Konak is decided, this cleared space will be arranged for the invigoration of Konak Square and will be allocated to public buildings and entertainment facilities.”<sup>58</sup> The plan of 1951 called for replacing Sarı Kışla with cultural buildings and multi-story office blocks in green areas, a scheme reminiscent of Le Corbusier's 1948 proposal for the city. The new plan's call to place some of these blocks parallel to the sea, which would have

prevented the circulation of sea breezes, gave rise to the jury's main criticism. For this reason, the Konak portion of the 1951 urban master plan was put on hold, even though the rest of the plan was approved in 1953.

### **Dudok's Unrealized Schemes**

Dudok's files—including his scaled drawings for the theater, letters, notes, and marked sketches, as well as a master plan for the Konak Square and seashore—reveal the architect's deep involvement in redeveloping the Konak district.<sup>59</sup> In 1954, he served as a consultant to the Turkish design team headed by Aru. The 1954 proposal for Konak envisions the Square as a site of urban renewal and recommends demolishing the city center's historic character and spaces. Based on earlier plans (See Figure 1), the 1954 proposal included a cinema, courthouse, theater, government building, city hall, and office buildings that were intended to develop Konak as an administrative, commercial, cultural, and entertainment center, even while it remained a hub for buses, cars, and ferries. Responding to the jury's criticism of the 1951 proposal, new multi-storey blocks were placed perpendicular to the shoreline to let sea breezes cool the inner portions of the Konak district. In keeping with previous schemes, the plan aimed to connect the city's north and south districts by a large boulevard with a greenbelt in the middle. This boulevard, along with the adjacent roads and parking lots, indicated the increased importance of vehicular transportation in the city, and reflected the American technical and financial aid that helped build road networks in Turkey during the post-war era.<sup>60</sup>

During his visit in February 1954, Dudok generated proposals for the new city hall and the theater. His sketch of the proposed city hall, dated 15 February 1954, depicts



his quest for a monumental yet modernist aesthetic, one clearly encouraged by his local collaborators (Figure 12). Although his sketch reflects contemporary trends in architecture and urbanism, Dudok did not favor a particular movement or style. As he stated, “[M]y work does not have the strength of conviction of [an] architectonic impression of a single conception. I know also that it is difficult to classify my work.”<sup>61</sup> The three blocks of his U-shaped building enclosed Konak Square, leaving it open on the east and providing access to the bazaar street known as Kemeraltı. Neither the perspective sketches nor the master plan show the Clock Tower; the only nod to its existence is a roughly drawn square. The eight-story block on the west side was set on pilotis to provide ground-level access to the shore and allow sea breezes to circulate throughout the square. Measuring 95 meters in length, 16m in width, and 26m in height, the slender tower recalled Le Corbusier’s Unité d’Habitation (1947-1952) in Marseilles.

This unrealized sketch is surprising. Situating such a high block parallel to the sea on the west side of the square would have been unacceptable to Dudok’s local collaborators for two major reasons. First, as mentioned in the 1951 jury report, such an approach, even when the building was lifted on pilotis as Dudok’s was, would cut off the sea breeze.<sup>62</sup> Second, it would block views from the boulevard—a significant concern.

Dudok’s proposed theater was located at the edge of the sea, where the boulevard curved (see Figure 1). It contained a main hall for 1,200 spectators, a small concert hall for 300, a children’s theater, restaurant, café, nightclub (*gazino*), and service areas.<sup>63</sup> The design recalled Dudok’s Utrecht Municipal Theater in the composition of its masses, the rhythm of its openings and solid-void relationships, and the use of statues and surface treatments on its façades (Figure 13). Dudok’s initial idea for the theatre, on which he

worked as soon as he returned to the Netherlands at the end of February 1954, was an asymmetrical scheme, with the entrance placed off center on the boulevard that connected the city's north and south districts. (Figure 14). At ground level, the building was accessed through a monumental canopy; visitors would have flowed first into the ticket area and then into a large entrance hall with a coat check. This hall stretched along the east side of the building, with stairs at the end that led to a foyer on the second floor. The main theater was located in the center, and was accessed from this foyer. The small concert hall was placed above the entrance hall, on the upper floor. The children's theater had a separate and smaller entrance on the building's south side. On the sea side of the south façade, the main mass of the building incorporated a slender wing that housed offices on the ground level and a restaurant and café above. An exterior colonnade opened both levels on the sea side. Behind the stage was a two-story nightclub that overlooked the bay through floor-to-ceiling windows (Figures 13 and 15). The linearity of the west façade, achieved by the massing of the nightclub and the colonnaded wing, indicated Dudok's interest in designing the building as a screen between land and water.<sup>64</sup>

While in the Netherlands, Dudok also generated an alternative, symmetrical scheme for the theater which placed the building's entrance in the middle of the east façade (Figure 16). In a letter of late March 1954, he explained to Aşkan the reason for this scheme, which he devised after consulting a Dutch theatrical designer. As Dudok explained, "the ideal modern solution would be to use symmetry, meaning having a stage with annexes on both sides and one in the back."<sup>65</sup> A variation of this symmetrical scheme was detailed in a set of drawings which differ from the earlier schemes of February and March (Figure 17 and 18). Some of these sketches were probably not

Dudok's work, but made instead by R.M.H. Magnée, Dudok's main collaborator.<sup>66</sup>

Strikingly, these drawings indicate domes, subtly recalling the design of the Clock Tower half a century earlier, with its four domes at ground level, and the domed eighteenth century mosque standing at the periphery of the square.

This Neo-Ottoman approach sets these later schemes apart from Dudok's earlier proposal for the theater, and certainly from the expectations of local collaborators for a modern design of the sort seen in his early sketches (Figure 19). Dudok had agreed to finish the project by August 1954, but received no response to his letter to Aşkan of 31 March, nor to a letter to Onursal of 16 April.<sup>67</sup> Nor did Dudok receive the contract and payment he had requested in his letter to Aşkan. I can only speculate that Dudok's collaborator Magnée generated the last set of drawings after Dudok lost hope for the project, with the assumption that these new sketches might better appeal to the locals.

With the general elections on 2 May 1954, Mayor Onursal became a congressman and moved to Ankara. Around the same time, his friend Muzaffer Göksenin, governor of Izmir, was appointed to Baghdad as ambassador. With these developments, Dudok's project was abandoned. The disappointment and resentment this caused him is readily apparent in his ensuing letters of August 1954. This disappointment was perhaps reciprocal, as the city lost out on having a theater and landmark designed by an international expert.<sup>68</sup>

### **The Lessons Learned After Dudok**

Dudok's involvement with Izmir's quest for modernization is an unstudied episode in the history of international post-war modernism. This era was marked by the consultancy of

foreign architects and planning experts, Le Corbusier, W. M. Dudok, and Richard Neutra, among others, all of whom were invited to Izmir. A photograph showing Neutra with Aşkan and his team in front of a model for the Konak project is another artifact of this era, offering further evidence of the collaborations between Turkish and foreign architects at mid-century (Figure 20). Neutra was invited to Izmir to consult on the Konak project in 1955, and like Dudok, his views were meant to inform a new competition for the district that same year. The winning entry, by Doğan Tekeli, Tekin Aydın, and Sami Sisa, was announced in 1956, and it was similar to the 1954 plan (Figure 21),<sup>69</sup> Like the earlier plan, this one also hinged on a central boulevard connecting the city's north and south halves, with blocky buildings placed in green areas perpendicular to the shore lining the boulevard and a theater occupying the same spot as before. As Güngör Kaftancı, the second runner-up, stated, contestants were asked to follow the 1954 plan; the earlier plan was even shared with competitors so that they might use it as the basis for their proposals.<sup>70</sup> The intent was to find a common solution or a synthesis with the previous plan. Yet this time out, the competition program called for an uninterrupted sea view from the boulevard, marking a break from the earlier plan and from Dudok's proposal for the city hall, which had blocked the sea view from the boulevard at the square. Besides the wide-open treatment of the square, another major difference between the new winning scheme and Dudok's proposal was the relation of the theater to the shore; the building was pulled back to open a promenade connecting to the square at the seaside.

Two other projects in Konak, designed by Aşkan after Dudok, responded to the previous disputes. The first was the Izmir Municipal Theater designed in collaboration

with Harbi Hotan in 1955, a year after Dudok's unrealized design (Figure 22). While differing in many ways from Dudok's, this scheme displayed a number of similarities to his proposal, including the size, character, and fragmentation of its building masses, the proportional relationship among its forms, and the solid-void composition of its elevations. One major difference was in the siting of the building. While Dudok's theater was placed next to the sea, separating the land from the water, Aşkan and Hotan situated their theater in a park on the land side of the boulevard so as to open the seashore to roads and promenades. Like Dudok's, Aşkan and Hotan's theater also went unrealized.<sup>71</sup> Although construction on the building was begun, it remained unfinished for many years and was finally demolished.

The second project Aşkan undertook at Konak was a café (Atıf Şehir Lokali, 1961-81) beside the ferry dock, at the precise location where Dudok had proposed placing his city hall (Figure 23). Like Dudok's proposal, the slender shape of the building aimed to redefine the square by forming an edge at the seaside. The later scheme recalled Dudok's interest in developing designs to separate nature from the city. Yet Aşkan did this with a one-story structure, emphasizing horizontality rather than verticality. Contrary to Dudok's approach, Aşkan's low-scale modernist structure made a quiet backdrop for the historic Clock Tower. While Dudok's building connected the sea and the square by raising the block on pilotis, Aşkan's blurred the boundary between the two with spacious verandas and glass-walled interiors. Conceived as a public café where people could wait for the ferry, catch fish, or simply relax by the water, the structure encouraged leisure, downplaying the administrative character of the square.<sup>72</sup>

## Conclusion

Today, demolishing the historic Sarı Kışla would be a highly controversial move. Yet, as an elderly Turkish architect told me recently, “back then we were into modernization, and approached urban design competitions by creating modernist blocks in green areas.”<sup>73</sup> In aiming to accommodate modern lifestyles and increased traffic flows, and to create healthier environments, the historic building fabric of many cities was demolished, erasing parts of the past along with traditional urban patterns.

In Turkey in the 1950s, such erasure was the *leitmotif* of the DP’s politics of modernization as much as it was a reflection of international post-war modernism. Prime Minister Adnan Menderes was personally involved with a number of modernist urban reconstruction projects, working with mayors, architects, planners, and engineers. As a critical public space in a major Turkish city, Konak Square’s had great symbolic value, and its modernization was seen as a laudable and desirable goal. For one, removing the military barracks spoke to the spirit of democracy in the post-war era, coinciding with the beginning of the multi-party system and the DP’s ensuing election. For another, it suggested liberating Izmir from what was old and unsanitary, and turning it into a modern metropolis.<sup>74</sup> Architectural modernism was a tool for political authorities to accomplish their mission. The present city hall on the north side of the square, designed in 1967 (though not finished until the 1970s) and highly reminiscent of Le Corbusier’s work, manifests the continuing interest in modernism long after Dudok’s proposal.<sup>75</sup> However, Sarı Kışla’s former site remained a void for nearly half a century--a vast open space serving as a transportation hub for minibuses, taxis, and buses, until it was finally turned into a public park as part of another urban design competition project in the beginning of

the 2000s (visible to the left in figure 23).<sup>76</sup> This emptiness at the city's heart challenged the square's physical definition while signifying and promoting a more general cultural amnesia.

Dudok perhaps predicted the physical and metaphorical voids that demolishing Sarı Kışla would have created when he proposed his highly defined plans for Konak Square, with a tall building dividing the square's open space from the water's edge. While that recommendation was unacceptable to the decision makers, Aşkan understood Dudok's intentions when proposing his own interventions there. However, Aşkan's take on the café and theater buildings indicate that he better understood local concerns and ways of living than had Dudok. While Dudok relied on Aşkan and other local architects, he did not receive the level of collaboration and support he was seeking. After all, Dudok's invitation came from the political authority—who wished to validate its own modernization visions— and not from the architectural community. When the political players changed, the project collapsed.

Curiously, the visits to Izmir of distinguished international architects such as Le Corbusier, Dudok, and Neutra were not mentioned in national architectural publications at the time. This too indicates the changing status of local architects in Turkey with respect to foreign experts. In contrast with their peers during the early years of the Republic, the new generation of Turkish architects at the mid-twentieth century claimed legitimacy in the public domain and challenged foreign experts' authority even while learning from them. Le Corbusier's plan for Izmir was criticized as unrealistic, and he was seen as not having taken the task seriously.<sup>77</sup> If true, his attitude was perhaps due in

part to the broader lack of attention the Turkish architectural community had given to his presence in the country.

Dudok was more pragmatic than Le Corbusier. He offered sound proposals for Izmir, and he struggled to get his projects there built. Yet the evident differences between his views and those of local architects around the function and articulation of the sea front at Konak contributed to a widely held belief that “only local designers could understand and respond to Izmir.”<sup>78</sup> Izmir’s long history of consulting foreign experts offers evidence both to dispute and support this belief.

## Notes

---

1 My use of the term “universal civilization” follows Paul Ricoeur, “Universal Civilization and National Cultures,” in *History and Truth*, trans. Charles A. Kelbley (1961; Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1965), 276-77.

2 See “Kamutay Musabakası Programı Hulâsası” [A summary of the Turkish parliament competition program], *Arkitekt*, no. 88 (Apr. 1938), 99-132. The other jury members were Ivar Tengbom of Sweden and Howard Robertson of England. “Duyumlar” [Hearings], *Arkitekt*, no. 82-83 (Oct. 1937), 313-14.

3 Willem M. Dudok, “Hilversum Belediye Binası” [Hilversum City Hall], *Arkitekt*, no. 11-12 (Nov. 1931), 375-77.

4 Willem M. Dudok, “Zamanımızda Şehircilik ve Mimari” [City planning and architecture in our time], *Arkitekt*, no. 73 (Jan. 1937), 16-17.



---

5 For example, Mete Tapan, “International Style: Liberalism in Architecture,” in *Modern Turkish Architecture*, ed. Renata Holod and Ahmet Evin (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984), 109.

6 Ibid.

7 Willem M. Dudok, “Utrecht Belediye Tiyatrosu” [Utrecht City Theater], *Arkitekt*, no. 207-208 (Mar. 1949), 81-84, 91.

8 General Directorate of the Institution of Worker’s Insurance Director to Dudok, 10 December 1953, NAI/DUDO 195M.101B, Stadsschouwburg Izmir Turkije (ontwerp W.M. Dudok), Het Nieuwe Instituut, Rotterdam. Onursal to Dudok, 6 November 1953, NAI/DUDO 195M.101B, Stadsschouwburg Izmir Turkije (ontwerp W.M. Dudok), Het Nieuwe Instituut, Rotterdam.

9 Dudok to Onursal, 28 November 1953, NAI/DUDO 195M.101A, Stadsschouwburg Izmir Turkije (ontwerp W.M. Dudok), Het Nieuwe Instituut, Rotterdam.

10 Dudok to Hilversum Municipality, NAI/DUDO 195M.101A, Stadsschouwburg Izmir Turkije (ontwerp W.M. Dudok), Het Nieuwe Instituut, Rotterdam. Original letter is in City Archives of Hilversum, letter archive no. 881. Translation by Wolter Braamhorst.

11 Deborah A. Barnstone, “Willem Marinus Dudok: The Lyrical Music of Architecture,” *The Journal of Architecture* 20, no. 2 (May 2015), 171. Herman van Bergeijk, *Willem Marinus Dudok Architect-Stedebouwkundige, 1884-1974*, (Naarden: V+K Publishing/Inmerc, 1995). Herman van Bergeijk, *W. M. Dudok* (Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2001), 14.

12 “Izmir’de Opera Binası” [An opera building in Izmir], *Yeni Asır*, 1, 11 Feb. 1954.

---

“Hollandalı Mimar Dün İzmir’e Geldi” [Dutch architect arrived in Izmir yesterday], *Yeni Asır*, 2, 11 Feb. 1954. “Hollandalı Yüksek Mimar Dūdok İzmir Şehir Planı hakkında izahat alıyor” [Dutch master architect Dudok receiving an explanation of Izmir’s city plan], *Yeni Asır*, 1, 12 Feb. 1954. “Hollandalı Mimarın Tetkikleri” [Investigations of the Dutch architect], *Yeni Asır*, 2, 12 Feb. 1954. “İzmir Tam Bir Avrupa Şehri Manzarasına Sahip Olacak” [Izmir will have the exact vista of a European city], *Yeni Asır*, 1, 4, 18 Feb. 1954. “Hollandalı Mühassısın Tetkikleri Devam Ediyor” [the investigations of the Dutch expert continue], *Demokrat İzmir*, 2, 18 Feb. 1954. “Şehircilik Uzmanı Geldi” [the city planning expert has arrived], *Ege Ekspres*, 1954. “Mühassıs Mr. Dūdok ve İzmir’in İmar Planı” [The expert Mr. Dudok and the plan of Izmir], *Ege Ekspres*, 1954.

13 “Hollandalı Mühassısın Tetkikleri Devam Ediyor,” 2.

14 “İzmir Tam Bir Avrupa Şehri Manzarasına Sahip Olacak,” 1, 4. At that time, a “European image” meant constructing modern buildings, demolishing old or run-down buildings, and constructing new road networks.

15 “Mühassıs Mr. Dūdok ve İzmir’in İmar Planı.”

16 Ibid.

17 Dogan Tekeli, *Mimarlık - Zor Sanat* [Architecture – a difficult art form] (Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2015), 51.

18 Dudok considered Aşkan his local collaborator and referred to him as his *confrère* (colleague) in his letters. Dudok to Aşkan, 31 March 1954, NAI/DUDO 195K.34, 195M.101, Stadsschouwburg Izmir Turkije (ontwerp W.M. Dudok), Het Nieuwe Instituut, Rotterdam.

---

19 Ricoeur, 276-77.

20 Inviting German and Austrian architects to Turkey indicated the strong cultural and historical ties between the early Republic and these German-speaking countries. After 1933, following the onset of the National Socialist regime in Germany, a great number of Jewish and socialist architects and planners escaped to Turkey, further contributing to its modernization. The Industrial Incentive Act of 1927 facilitated foreign technical personnel, architects, planners, and engineers working in Turkey. See, Afife Batur, “To Be Modern: Search for a Republican Architecture,” in *Modern Turkish Architecture*, ed. Renata Holod and Ahmet Evin (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984), 68-93. İlhan Tekeli, “The Social Context of the Development of Architecture in Turkey,” in *Modern Turkish Architecture*, ed. Renata Holod and Ahmet Evin (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984), 21. İnci Aslanoğlu, *Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Mimarlığı* [Early Republican architecture] (Ankara: O.D.T.Ü. Mimarlık Fakültesi, 2001). Sibel Bozdoğan, *Modernism and Nation Building: Turkish Architectural Culture in the Early Republic* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2001), 71. Bernd Nicolai, *Modern ve Sürgün: Almanca Konuşulan Ülkelerin Mimarları Türkiye’de 1925–1955* [Modern and Exile], trans. Yüksel Pöğün Zander (Ankara: Mimarlar Odası Yayınları, 2011). Sibel Bozdoğan and Esra Akcan, *Turkey: Modern Architectures in History* (London: Reaktion Books, 2012), 27.

21 A celebrated exception to this rule was Şevki Balmumcu, with his design of the Exhibition Hall (1936) in Ankara. For the latter project see, “Sergi Binası Müsabakası” [Exhibition Building Competition], *Arkitekt*, no. 29 (1933), 131-153. Bruno Taut’s

---

Faculty of Language, History and Geography Building (1937), Ernst Egli's Ismet İnönü Girls' Institute (1930-1931), Martin Elsaesser's Sumerbank Building (1937) in Ankara, Theodor Jost's Bacteriology Institute (1927-1929), and Clemenz Holzmeister's Grand National Assembly (1937-1960) are only some of the canonical buildings demonstrating the prominent presence of foreign professionals in Turkey.

22 See Gülsüm Baydar Nalbantoğlu, "The Professionalization of the Ottoman-Turkish Architect," Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1989. Sibel Bozdoğan points out, "The professional identity of the older generation of early Republican architects was intimately tied to the ideology of the nation state. Almost all practicing architects of the 1930s and 1940s were either educators in the architectural and engineering schools or salaried government employees in the planning and technical units of different ministries: railway stations were designed in the body of the Ministry of Transportation; schools in the Ministry of Education and so on (which also accounts for a certain degree of aesthetic uniformity of public buildings in the interwar era)." Sibel Bozdoğan, "Turkey's Postwar Modernism: A Retrospective Overview of Architecture, Urbanism and Politics in the 1950s," in *Mid-Century Modernism in Turkey: Architecture across Cultures in the 1950s and 1960s*, ed. Meltem Ö. Gürel (New York: Routledge, 2016), 15.

23 Today's Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University was first called Mekteb-i Sanayi-i Nefise. The curriculum was modeled after Paris' Ecole des Beaux Arts. Ernst Egli's term followed the resignations of Giulio Mongeri in 1928 and Vedat Tek in 1930 – two masters of the First National Style, an Ottoman revivalist style that came to be viewed as inappropriate for the ideology of the new nation. Bruno Taut succeeded Egli in 1936.

---

24 Ricoeur, 276-77. For a discussion on culture and civilization see Kenneth Frampton, "Towards a Critical Regionalism: Six Points for an Architecture of Resistance," in *The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture*, ed. Hal Foster (Port Townsend, WA: Bay Press, 1983), 16-30. Alan Colquhoun, "The Concept of Regionalism," in *Postcolonial Spaces*, eds. Gülsüm Baydar Nalbantoglu and Wong Chong Thai (New York: Princeton Press, 1997), 13-23.

25 The school was first called Hendese-i Mülkiye Mektebi and imported German and Austrian instructors. It was renamed Istanbul Technical University (ITU) in 1944.

26 Gönül Tankut, *Bir Başkentin İmarı /Ankara: 1929-1939* [The Planning of a Capital] (Ankara: METU, 1990). Bozdoğan, *Modernism and Nation Building*, 70. Bozdoğan and Akcan, *Turkey*, 28-29, 55. Esra Akcan, *Architecture in Translation: Germany, Turkey, and the Modern House* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2012), 40-45. Zeynep Kezer, *Building Modern Turkey* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2015), 33-36, 42.

The Jansen plan was an outcome of an international competition and was approved in 1932. Ankara's first master plan was prepared by another German planner, Carl C.

Lörcher, in 1924. Ali Cengizkan, "Ankara 1924-25 Lörcher Planı: Bir Başkenti Tasarlamak ve Sonrası," [Ankara 1924-25 Lörcher plan: designing a capital and afterwards], in *Modernin Saati* (Istanbul: Boyut Yayın Grubu, 2002), 37-59.

27 For this project, see "Kamutay Musabakası Programı Hulâsası," 99-132. Other prominent foreigners were invited to Turkey to implement the building of the new capital. For a catalogue of these, see Leyla Alpagut and Achim Wagner, eds., *Bir Başkentin Oluşumu : Avusturyalı, Alman ve İsviçreli Mimarların Ankara'daki İzleri = das*

---

*werden einer hauptstadt : Spuren deutschsprachiger architekten in Ankara* (Ankara: Goethe-Institut, 2011). On the significance of Ankara in the histories of modernization and nation building, see, Francis Ching, Mark Jarzombek, and Vikramaditya Prakash, *A Global History of Architecture* (New Jersey: Wiley & Sons, 2007), 740.

28 A competition was held for Istanbul's master plan in 1933. Prost, director of Paris' new master plan, two other French planners, Donat-Alfred Agache and Jacques Henri Lambert, and Hermann Ehlgötz from Germany were invited to participate in this competition. Prost declined the invitation because he was too busy with Paris' plan. Although Ehlgötz's project won the competition, it was not implemented. In 1935, Prost was invited again by the municipality and he accepted. Mete Tapan, "İstanbul'un İmar Sorunları" [Planning Issues of Istanbul], 1994, <http://www.ito.org.tr/itoyayin/0007055.pdf> (accessed 22 February 2016).

29 On Prost, see Ipek Akpınar, "Urbanization Represented in the Historical Peninsula: Turkification of Istanbul in the 1950s," in *Mid-Century Modernism in Turkey: Architecture across Cultures in the 1950s and 1960s*, ed. Meltem Ö. Gürel (New York: Routledge, 2016), 56; Zeynep Çelik, "Le Corbusier, Orientalism, Colonialism," *Assemblage*, no. 17 (Apr. 1992), 76; André Siegfried et al., *L'Oeuvre d'Henri Prost: Architecte et urbaniste* (Paris: Academie d'architecture, 1960); and Jean Royer, "Henri Prost: L'Urbanisation," *Urbanisme*, no.88 (1965), 3-31.

30 Gençlik Parkı was proposed in Jansen's 1934 master plan and later altered by the landscape architect and planner Theo Leveau. See Zeynep Uludağ, "Cumhuriyet

---

Döneminde Rekrasyon ve Gençlik Parkı Örneği” [Recreation in the republican period and the case of the youth park], in *75 Yılda Değişen Kent ve Mimarlık* [75 years of city and architecture], ed. Yıldız Sey (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 1998), 65–74. For a recent publication on Kültürpark, see Kıvanç Kılınç, Ahenk Yılmaz, Burkey Pasin (eds.), *Kültürpark'ın Anımsa(ma)dıkları: Temsiller, Mekanlar, Aktörler*, [The Culturepark's Remembrance], (İstanbul: İletişim, 2015).

31 These include the State Monopolies Pavilion (1936), designed by Emin Necip Uzman; the Sumerbank Pavilion (1936), by Seyfettin Arkan; the Culture Pavilion (1938–1939) by Bruno Taut; the Is Bankası Pavilion (1939) by Mazhar Resmor; the Exhibition Hall (1939) and the Ninth September Gate (1939) by Ferruh Orel. See ‘1939 İzmir Beynelmîlel Fuarı’ [1939 İzmir International Fair], *Arkitekt*, vol. 9, nos 9–10 (1939), 198–211 and *Yeni Asır* (August issues, 1936–1939). Meltem Ö. Gürel, “Architectural Mimicry, Spaces of Modernity: the Island Casino, İzmir, Turkey,” *Journal of Architecture*, no.16:2, (Apr. 2011), 165–190.

32 Ulvi Olgaç, *Güzel İzmir Ne İdi, Ne Oldu?* [Beautiful İzmir, What it was, What it became] (İzmir: Meşher Basımevi, 1939). Ülker Baykan Seymen, “Tek Partili Dönemi Belediyeciliğinde Behçet Uz Örneği” [Example of Behçet Uz in the single party era], in *Üç İzmir* [Three Izmir] (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1992), 311–12. Cana Bilsel, “Ideology and Urbanism During the Early Republican Period: Two Master Plans for İzmir and Scenarios of Modernization,” *METU JFA* 16, no. 1-2 (1996), 13–30. For this point also see, Volker Ziegler, “Le Corbusier and İzmir,” unpublished manuscript. İlhan Tekeli, “Konak Meydanının Osmanlı Toplumunun Modernleşme Süreci İçinde Oluşumu

---

ve Türkiye'nin İkinci Dünya Savaş Sonrasında Yaşadığı Hızlı Kentleşme Döneminde Kendisini Yok Edişi ve Yeniden Kazanma Çabalarının Öyküsü" [The story of Konak Square], unpublished manuscript.

33 Erkan Serçe, *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e İzmir'de Belediye (1868-1945)* [Municipality in Izmir from Tanzimat to the Republic] (Izmir: Dokuz Eylül Yayınları, 1998).

34 Çelik, "Le Corbusier, Orientalism, Colonialism," 58-77.

35 See Le Corbusier's correspondence, Orçun Türkay, trans., "Le Corbusier'nin Türkiye Mektuplaşmalarından Bir Seçki" [A Selection of Le Corbusier's Letters to Turkey], *Sanat Dünyamız*, no. 86-87 (2003), 141-149.

<sup>36</sup> Aysel Bayraktar, "Le Corbusier'nin bir Şehir Planı Önerisi" [A city plan proposal by Le Corbusier] in *Üç İzmir* [Three Izmir] (Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1992), 323-326.

37 Baydar, "The Professionalization of the Ottoman-Turkish Architect," 1989.

38 Meltem Ö. Gürel, "Domestic Space, Modernity, and Identity: The Apartment in Mid-20th Century Turkey," (PhD diss., University of Illinois at Urbana- Champaign, 2007).

39 On this point, see Ugur Tanyeli, "Haluk Baysal, Melih Birsal," *Arredamento Mimarlık* 102, (Apr. 1998), 72-79. Meltem Ö. Gürel, "Introduction" in *Mid-Century Modernism in Turkey: Architecture across Cultures in the 1950s and 1960s*, ed. Meltem Ö. Gürel (New York: Routledge, 2016), 3. Bozdoğan, "Turkey's Postwar Modernism," 16.

40 Bozdoğan, "Turkey's Postwar Modernism," 17. Also see Tekeli, "Konak Meydanının Osmanlı Toplumunun Modernleşme Süreci İçinde Oluşumu..."



---

41 Other experts offering reports included Donald Monson (1953), Charles Abrams (1955), Bernard Wagner (1956), Frederick Bath (1960), E.H.B. Wedler (1961), M. Chailloux-Dantel (1961), A. Johansson (1961), Werner Lehman (1962), Richard Metcalf (1963). See, İlhan Tekeli, *Türkiye’de Yaşamda ve Yazında Konut Sorununun Gelişimi* [Housing problems in life and in printed matter in Turkey] (Ankara: Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığı, 1996), 99. Also see, Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, *Construction, Town Planning and Housing in Turkey*, report prepared for the Turkish ministry of Public Works, (Dec. 1951).

42 Bunshaft characterized him as a gentleman who “looked like an elegant French prince”; his behavior reflected his distinguished Ottoman ancestry. For the nature of this collaboration, see C. H. Krinsky, *Gordon Bunshaft of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1988), 53.

43 Conrad Hilton, *Be My Guest* (New York: Prentice Hall, 1957), 264-265.

44 Notably, its interior design and furnishings deeply influenced Turkish home designs in the 1950s and 1960s. See Meltem Ö. Gürel, “Consumption of Modern Furniture as a Strategy of Distinction in Turkey,” *Journal of Design History* 22, no. 1 (2009), 47-67.

45 Annabel J. Wharton, “The Istanbul Hilton, 1951-2014: Modernity and Its Demise,” in *Mid-Century Modernism in Turkey: Architecture across Cultures in the 1950s and 1960s*, ed. Meltem Ö. Gürel (New York: Routledge, 2016), 141-162. Also see Annabel J. Wharton, *Building the Cold War: Hilton International Hotels and Modern Architecture* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago, 2001).

---

46 Abrams recommended the government endorse the technical education of experts in engineering, architecture, and planning to incorporate international technological and scientific principles into local practices. The story of METU is discussed in more detail in Burak Erdim, “Under the flags of the Marshall Plan: Multiple modernisms and professional legitimacy in the Cold War Middle East, 1950–1964,” in *Mid-Century Modernism in Turkey: Architecture across Cultures in the 1950s and 1960s*, ed. Meltem Ö. Gürel (New York: Routledge, 2016), 113-140. Also see Burak Erdim, “Middle East Technical University and Revolution: Development, Planning and Architectural Education During the Cold War 1950-1962,” (PhD diss., University of Virginia, 2012).

47 Ibid. Also see A. Payaslıoğlu, *Türk Yükseköğretiminde Bir Yeniliğin Tarihi Barakadan Kampuse 1954-1964* [The History of a Novelty in Turkish Higher Education From Shed to Campus 1954-1964] (Ankara: METU Publications, 1996).

48 Erdim, “Under the flags of the Marshall Plan,” 136.

49 Kemal Ahmet Aru along with Mukbil Gökdoğan, Cevat Erbil, Emin Onat served in the committee. Tapan, “İstanbul'un İmar Sorunları,” 26. Akpınar, “Urbanization Represented in the Historical Peninsula,” 56.

50 “İzmir Şehri İmar Plânı Milletlerarası Proje Müsabakası Şartnamesi (1 Mayıs 1951 – 1 Aralık 1951)” [Izmir city masterplan international project competition specifications (May 1 1951 – December 1 1951)], *Arkitekt*, no. 249-250-251-252 (May 1952), 144-146.

51 See *Üç İzmir* [Three Izmir] (Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1992).

52 Clock towers became an important element of worldwide architecture in the nineteenth century as a result of the development of technology and use of railroads for

---

transportation. The concept of speed changed the notion of time. Train stations often incorporated clocks and clock towers to regulate daily life and help people catch the train on time.

53 Mehmet Bengü Uluengin, “Secularizing Anatolia Tick by Tick: Clock Towers in the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Republic,” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 42, no.1 (2010), 25.

54 The first horse-tram route starting operation from Konak in 1880 was followed by a second route from Konak in 1885. From the 1850s, steam vessels started to operate in the bay, and by 1880, British, Russian and Greek ships were active. There was a pontoon pier in Konak, and Konak-based ferry lines began to run in 1884. See Tekeli, “Konak Meydanının Osmanlı Toplumunun Modernleşme Süreci İçinde Oluşumu...”

55 This character can readily be seen in postcards and other pictures.

56 Tekeli, “Konak Meydanının Osmanlı Toplumunun Modernleşme Süreci İçinde Oluşumu...”

57 Işın Can, “Urban Design and the Planning System in Izmir,” *Journal of Landscape Studies*, no.3, (2010), 185.

58 “İzmir Şehri İmar Plânı...,” 144-146.

59 Dudok’s archive at NAI contains a number of hand-drawn sketches, perspective drawings, 1/200 scale plans, sections, elevations of the theater proposals, a master plan of Konak area, correspondence (received letters and copies of sent letters), markings on tourist maps, calculations, and business cards of Izmir’s officials. *Beyaz Kitap* [White

---

book], (Izmir: Izmir Belediyesi Yayınları, 1954) is found in the Ahmet Pristina City Archive.

60 Meltem Ö. Gürel, “Seashore readings: The road from sea baths to summerhouses in mid-twentieth century Izmir,” in *Mid-Century Modernism in Turkey: Architecture across Cultures in the 1950s and 1960s*, ed. Meltem Ö. Gürel (New York: Routledge, 2016), 38.

61 Cited in Barnstone, “The Lyrical Music of Architecture,” 171, from W. M. Dudok, ‘Stedebouw en architectuur als uitdrukking van eigen tijd’, in *Forum* 1950, 159; excerpts in *Willem M. Dudok*, R. M. H. Magnée, ed. (Amsterdam: Van Saane, 1954), 140. To architecture critic and historian Sigfried Giedion, Dudok was a sentimentalist; to Reyner Banham, he was a “middle of the road modernist.” Barnstone, “The Lyrical Music of Architecture,” 171; Reyner Banham, *Theory and Design in the First Machine Age* (London: Architectural Press, 1960), 164.

62 “İzmir Şehri Milletlerarası İmar Plânı Müsabakası Jüri Raporu” [Izmir city international masterplan competition jury report], *Arkitekt*, no. 249-250-251-252 (May 1952), 119-138.

63 The *gazino* was a very popular part of Turkish entertainment culture. See Gürel, “Architectural Mimicry, Spaces of Modernity,” 165–190.

64 I would like to thank architectural historian Herman van Bergeijk, who has done extensive research on Dudok, for pointing out this relationship in Dudok’s designs.

65 Dudok to Aşkan 31 Mart 1954, NAI/DUDO 195M.101B, Stadsschouwburg Izmir Turkije (ontwerp W.M. Dudok), Het Nieuwe Instituut, Rotterdam.

---

66 In discussion with Herman van Bergeijk.

67 Dudok to Onursal 16 April 1954; to Aşkan 31 Mart 1954, NAI/DUDO 195M.101B, Stadsschouwburg Izmir Turkije (ontwerp W.M. Dudok), Het Nieuwe Instituut, Rotterdam.

68 Dudok to Onursal 23 August 1954, NAI/DUDO 195M.101B, Stadsschouwburg Izmir Turkije (ontwerp W.M. Dudok), Het Nieuwe Instituut, Rotterdam.

69 See “Izmir Konak Sitesi Proje Müsabakası” [Izmir Konak development project competition], *Arkitekt*, no. 284 (Feb. 1956), 57-65, 73.

70 Doğan Tekeli in discussion with Alp Aşkan and Eray Ergenç during an office visit, 1 February 2016. I would like to thank them for this point. Also see Alp Aşkan, “1922-1960 Yılları Arasında, İzmir'deki Mimarlık ve Kentsel Planlama Bağlamında Rıza Aşkan” [Rıza Aşkan in the context of architectural and urban planning 1922-1960], (MS thesis, Istanbul Teknik Üniversitesi, 2011), 220. Güngör Kaftancı, “Kentimizin Geçmişinde Planlama Çalışmalarının Yeri ve Önemi, İzmir Büyükşehir Belediyesi Yayıncılık ve Tanıtım Hizmetleri ve A.Ş.” [The importance of planning efforts in the history of our city, Izmir Municipal Printing and Promotion Services Corporation], *Izmir Kent Kültürü Dergisi*, no. 2 (2000).

71 Sabri Süphandağlı, “Izmir Tiyatrosu, Tiyatro Sarayı ve Sütunları” [Izmir theater, theatrical palace and its columns], *Yeni Asır*, 31 Dec. 1959.

72 Meltem Ö. Gürel, “Izmir’de Moderni Nesnelleştirmek: Bir Dönem, Üç Mekan ve Rıza Aşkan” [Objectivising the modern in Izmir: one era, three spaces and Rıza Aşkan], *Mimarlık*, no. 354 (Jul. - Aug. 2010). The café left a strong mark in public memory, but it

---

too was demolished in the next incarnation of the Konak shoreline in the 2000s, following its adaptive reuse as an administrative building in the early 1980s. Only the palm tree that grew in its courtyard was spared.

<sup>73</sup> Conversation with Ersen Gürsel, 2016. Arguably, this view is still very much valid in Turkey.

<sup>74</sup> For Menderes's views see the press conference in Istanbul on 23 September 1956, published in *Cumhuriyet* and *Hürriyet* on 24 September 1956, *Belediyeler Dergisi*, no.132 (Oct.1956), 644-645.

<sup>75</sup> Architects of the building are Özdemir Arnas, Altan Aki, and Erhan Demirok

<sup>76</sup> This project was designed by EPA Mimarlık, Şehircilik, and headed by Ersen Gürsel.

Although the dust remained from the demolition of Sarı Kışla, its source was unknown to the generations of locals who used the field as a transit stop.

<sup>77</sup> Ugur Tanyeli, "Çağdaş İzmir'in Mimarlık Serüveni" [Comporary Izmir's architectural adventure] in *Üç İzmir* [Three Izmirs] (Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1992), 336-337.

<sup>78</sup> Conversation with Gürsel